**Addendum –General fact sheet, and general SANParks statement, and responses to “petition” questions**

**Parliamentary response**

**Colloquium – 21 and 22 August 2018**

1. **General fact sheet**
2. SANParks does not hunt in National Parks, and no hunting is allowed in the Kruger National Park (KNP).
3. SANParks-KNP did not support the hunt of a lion (6 February 2018), due to the initial lack of information.
4. MTPA did a due diligence process that supported the issuing of a permit, based on their consultation processes, and further ecological information obtained.
5. APNR and KNP was verbally informed that a permit was issued. The MTPA did consult with Umbabat parties, and consultation did take place verbally with the open system and Umbabat lodes. It was not procedurally required that KNP “had to change their mind”.
6. The lion was hunted in Umbabat, a private reserve bordering KNP.
7. The lion named “Skye” is not known by KNP. Certain lodges within Umbabat identified this lion, and photos were presented of which lion may not be hunted. Photo records of the lion that was hunted, is different from what was presented by lodges in Umbabat.
8. Adjacent conservation areas are reviewing their Management Plans. This includes zonation for resource use etc.
9. The MTPA has shown photos of the lion hunted – the lion hunted vs the named lion “Skye”, is not the same. Please request the MTPA to provide the photos.
10. The MTPA and LEDET can disclose information of approved quotas, and further amendments made. SANParks do not have copies of the final approved quotas.
11. All procedures were followed in the pre- and post off-take processes: SANParks play a major role in facilitating good governance, with regulation by the MTPA and LEDET.
12. Reserves need to reflect their financial sustainability in the Management plans, and the regulatory bodies oversee the reporting. This information could be requested from the MTPA and LEDET.
13. KNP has provided information to questions in writing, also following to PAIA requests.
14. Information provided to the PAIA parties and journalists, are misrepresented.
15. In terms of governance and institutional arrangements for the Greater Kruger system: this is for the first time consistently addressed and being aligned. This is enabled by the GLTFCA Cooperative Agreement and associated protocols. This is well aligned by the regularisation process, currently underway.
16. **Specific facts pertaining to the hunting at Umbabat**
17. **Permit aspects**

* A legitimate permit was issued.
* Copy of permit shown (names of permit holder was not shown)
* Restrictions were indicated on the permit, e.g. where the lion may not be hunted.
* Baiting allowed on permit (according to Mpumalanga provincial legislation)
* The permit number could be made available on request. The client’s details can’t be made available.

1. **On which property was the lion hunted?**

* Independent party.

1. **Please advise ito the lion skin – what marks did it have – was it “Skye” or not?**

* Two photos were shown and could be requested from the MTPA.
* Lion that was allegedly hunted, did not have the mark over the eye (“Skye”). Photos were provided by the Umbabat lodge, and the lion hunted, was not the one shown by the lodges (“Skye”). The lion hunted was 8 years or older.
* No branding marks
* The skin is the property of the client. Please engage with the MTPA on the matter.

1. **Lion census numbers (Umbabat and the APNR; and the Greater KNP numbers), and other supporting information that supported the issuing of a permit for a lion?**
2. Estimated numbers

* Estimated to be around 2000 for the Greater Kruger area (KNP included).
* Estimated 200-300 for the APNR
* The MTPA did the scientific verification, with further scientific monitoring done by Dr M Peel (ARC)

1. Procedurally

* There are no supporting minutes, or further written communique that supported the approval for the hunt of the lion. However, this was verbally communicated with Umbabat, and the open partners, including KNP.
* However, MTPA was satisfied, after a due diligence process, that the permit could be issued.
* Procedurally (according to the current protocol), it is not necessary to obtain approval/further written consent once the due diligence process has been done.
* Moving forward, this should procedurally be addressed and parties be informed in writing about final approved quotas/amendments following due diligence & associated consultation processes. Add a clause to the Protocol in this regard.
* There was communication/consultation though in Umbabat and with relevant parties prior to the lion hunt.

1. **What is the MTPA’s policy/regulations wrt baiting, and do you have a full “investigation” report which could be provided to us following the hunt;**

* MTPA legislation allows for baiting.
* Not TOPS delegated.
* A due diligence process and internal reporting was done by MTPA.

1. **What is the outcome of the DEA investigation?**

* DEA Environmental Management Inspectors (EMI’s) conducted an investigation and an internal report was handed over to the Chief Director: Enforcement and the Deputy Director General: Legal Authorisations, Compliance and Enforcement.
* According to the report from the investigating officers, the hunt took place under a permit issued in terms of provincial legislation and the Department will therefore not be taking enforcement action against the hunter, the professional hunter involved or the Umbabat Nature Reserve.
* The Scientific authority (SANBI) cleared the process.

1. **Financial sustainability of Umbabat – how is income used?**

Umbabat could be approached to clarify contributions to conservation ,social investment, safety and security etc.

1. **Responses to questions received from the “Skye” petition parties (please note that a broad position statement was given, where after the below detailed questions were again submitted to KNP.**

**SANParks though have maintained with the position statement, unless a PAIA request have been submitted.**

*The South African National Parks (SANParks) is committed in supporting ethical, sustainable and resilient wildlife economy initiatives in both private and provincial conservation areas adjacent and open to National Parks. Key guiding principles govern such approaches: ethical practices, maintaining the sustainability and integrity of systems, compliance with the legal framework and relevant protocols, transparent decision-making, accountability, and co-operative partnerships allowing for the fair and equitable distribution of benefits from the use of the natural resources. It is recognised that diverse conservation models and practices could be compatible to the functions and objectives of a National Parks, as long as parties share a same understanding, are compliant to joint principles and operate within the legal framework.*

*Whilst SANParks is not the issuing authority for hunting in systems open to KNP, SANParks will not condone any practices outside the legal framework, or outside Protocols supportive of ethical and sustainable resource use, or practices that might negatively impact on biodiversity management. Parties within the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area (GLTFCA) footprint are well underway with the review and formalisation of consistent Cooperative Agreements and Protocols within the open system, in line with the respective Management Plans. This process includes close consultation with the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Joint Management Board, Department of Environmental Affairs (DEA), MTPA, LEDET, community and private managed conservation areas open and adjacent to KNP.*

*The SANParks Policy Framework and revised KNP Management Plan (near complete) provides for cooperative arrangements in an open system, and stipulates that hunting is a legitimate activity which is consistent with the sustainable management of wildlife, provided that it is conducted in accordance with the appropriate legislative framework and regulation set by the national and provincial conservation authorities, subject to Cooperative Agreements and Protocols, with this activity being reflected in the Management plans of Cooperative partners. Neighbouring conservation areas submit annual scientific monitoring reports, specialist studies and further requested information as per Protocol and cooperative arrangements. These entities also sign protocols that govern any animal off-takes, with such off-takes being regulated by the Provincial Conservation Authorities (MTPA and LEDET).*

*In short, with reference to your queries to the Umbabat report: the report does not reflect the vision of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area and is factually flawed. It does not provide balanced view, and it does not reflect an understanding of the legislation, or parties having protected area management experience in support of holistic conservation, social and economic outcomes.*

*Whilst your concern further seems to be focused on hunting practices, there is a much broader basket of matters that are equally important with respect to responsible protected area management, which includes all aspects of resource use, e.g. water resource use by Commercial/Tourism practices, managing the associated environmental impacts (waste, noise, infrastructure impacts, visual pollution etc.), securing land under conservation compatible areas, as well as safety and security concerns.*

*SANParks will continue to pursue and support transparent and ethical practices with the GLTFCA footprint, including with our Contractual and Cooperative Conservation partners. In the spirit of transparency and open communication, you are urged to follow the formal engagement routes by consulting with the issuing authorities MTPA, LEDET, with DEA, and with the Private reserve representatives (copied on the email). In this process, pertinently declare your stake and interest in Umbabat and the Greater Kruger protected area network.*

**Detailed questions, and responses (not presented unless a PAIA has been submitted)**

1. Given SANParks stated support for transparent decision-making and accountability, we need to know what made a well-documented and microchipped pride male lion named Skye disappear. He has not been seen since June the 7th, the day on the hunt in Umbabat. Where is he? Can you please tell us? Is he alive? Is he dead? Was he killed? Where is his body? He was a beloved lion, people want to know. If the hunting of this or another lion in Umbabat was legitimate, why is there so much secrecy around it?

* *SANParks do not name lions, and neither was a lion named “Skye” known to the KNP.*
* *Photos shown by the MTPA, shows that the lion hunted, was not Skye.*
* *KNP can’t comment on the micro-chipping of the lion, but this could be addressed to the MTPA and Umbabat to clarify.*

2. SANParks, in an official letter to Umbabat dated 6 February 2018, stated that it did not support its request to trophy hunt a lion. Was this letter ignored? Was it not? What happened? What scientific reasons were there to ignore SANParks recommendations?

* *SANParks did not support the initial request, due to a lack on scientific information.*
* *The MTPA, as issuing authority, did a due diligence, where after they felt confident that the hunt of a lion could be ecologically supported. Procedurally, KNP does not need to change its mind, and the MTPA does not need to obtain permission following a due diligence. Procedurally though, official feedback is required.*

3. Did the lion trophy hunted traverse between Kruger and Umbabat?

* *No hunting make take place in National Park, and no traversing is allowed.*

4. What lion was trophy hunted? How old was he? Why was the lion targeted for trophy hunting and on what scientific basis?

* *See earlier comments*
* *The Greater Kruger Hunting protocol provides guidance in terms of the trophy hunting, including age classes*
* *The MTPA did a due diligence review, in addition to the studies by Dr Mike Peel (ARC), and could be approach for the relevant scientific base.*
* *Approximately 2000 lion occur in the Greater Kruger open system*
* *The lion that was shot, is 8 years or more in age – hence not being “Skye” (or the photo of “Skye” that was presented.*

5. Does SANParks have an up-to-date and credible lion census for the area in which the lion was hunted?

* *Approximately 2000 lion occur in the Greater Kruger open system/*
* *The APNR, as private reserves, conduct the census in the private reserves (this does not fall under the management of KNP, but information is shared). Approximately 200-300 lions occur in the APNR area.*
* *Please request the information from the MTPA as regulating authority, the APNR and Dr Mike Peel (ARC).*

6. Did SANParks verify the identity of the lion hunted?

* *Refer to question 1.*
* *SANParks is not the regulatory authority.*
* *No hunting is allowed in the KNP.*
* *The hunting took place in private land.*
* *The MTPA, with Umbabat entities, consulted with parties prior to the hunt.*

7. The lion was apparently baited. This is in contravention of TOPS. What is SANParks doing to help to investigate this matter?

* *DEA is investigating the matter, and the report is pending.*
* *The baiting of the lion is allowed as per MTPA Act.*

8. Is SANParks making sure, considering that there is good reason to believe that the lion hunted was not the animal which was specified in the permit, that a transparent investigation on the case is being done? What is the outcome so far?

* *See earlier answers.*
* *SANParks is not the regulatory authority.*
* *DEA is investigating the matter, and the report is pending.*
* *Photos of the lions showed that the lion hunted, is not a lion called “Skye”. Please obtain from the MTPA.*

9. Where is the skin of the hunted lion now? If SANParks “does not condone any practices that might negatively impact on biodiversity management”, as you stated, why would a foreign trophy hunter be allowed to upset the balance of this pride, with one cub being killed and the three young males of this pride going missing after only a few days following the hunt? What is the ecological and economic benefit of such hunt for the Kruger National Park? Please explain.

* *See earlier comments.*
* *Approach the MTPA with regard to the viewing of the skin – this should be consulted with the client*
* *Please note that there are 2000 lions in the Greater Kruger system, and scientific studies have shown an increase in numbers.*
* *Lions are not a threatened species, and neither is the balance in the Greater Kruger being disturbed.*
* *Please provide DEA with the facts of the cub that was killed due to the pride male missing. Photos shown indicates that “Skye” has not been hunted. Please provide further scientific support that “Skye” has been the pride male.*
* *The Umbabat could provide you with the financial overview of how hunting off-takes contribute to the management objectives of the reserve, ranging from security, to social investment to conservation management of the area.*

10. Did any INDEPENDENT authority ever get a chance to verify the identity of the lion hunted? Who was this INDEPENDENT authority?

* *DEA is investigating the matter.*
* *Please note that the MTPA as issuing authority needs to be approached, and the specific request and stake in this matter, be clarified.*