

Conserving wild dogs (*Lycaon pictus*) outside state protected areas in South
Africa: ecological, sociological and economic determinants of success

by

Peter Andrew Lindsey

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy (Zoology)

in the Faculty of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

June 2003



Conserving wild dogs (*Lycaon pictus*) outside state protected areas in South Africa: ecological, sociological and economic determinants of success

Peter Andrew Lindsey

Supervisors: Prof. J.T. du Toit
Director: Mammal Research Institute
Department of Zoology and Entomology
University of Pretoria

Prof. M.G.L. Mills
Specialist Scientist: Kruger National Park
Carnivore Conservation Group
Endangered Wildlife Trust

Submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (Zoology) in the Faculty of Natural & Agricultural Sciences

Summary

The restricted geographic range and tenuous conservation status of wild dogs in South Africa were the motivating factors behind this study. Wild dogs have been extirpated from most of their historic range in South Africa, and now occur in three limited distributions: a) one viable population in Kruger National Park; b) a protected meta-population, consisting of 11 packs in six sub-populations (four on state owned reserves - Hluhluwe-Umfolozi Park, Madikwe Game Reserve, Marakele National Park, Pilanesberg National Park, and two on privately owned reserves - Karongwe Game Reserve, and Venetia Limpopo Nature Reserve), and; c) ~ 76 unprotected individuals in 17 packs and dispersing groups occurring outside protected areas, primarily in the game ranching areas of the extreme north and north east.

Prior to the establishment of the proposed transfrontier parks, the best prospects for range expansion likely exist on private land. My study investigated some of the ecological, sociological and economic issues associated with wild dog conservation on private land under various scenarios.

Over the last few years, the focus of conservation efforts and donor funding expenditure (72.6% of funding) has been the establishment of the meta-population. This been effective - the target size (nine packs) of the meta-population has been exceeded in six years, four years less than the targeted schedule (10 years). From here, there are two ways in which donor funding might be used to achieve further range expansion outside state protected areas, through expansion of the meta-population by reintroducing wild dogs onto private nature reserves, and through the conservation of wild dogs *in situ* on ranchland. For either strategy, an estimated minimum area of 158.5 km² is required to support the predation requirements of a pack of 12 wild dogs in northern South Africa, 172.8 km² in eastern South Africa, and 354.2 km² in northeastern South Africa.

Private reserve owners may not be willing to accept the costs of predation by wild dogs in the absence of compensation. Compensation for predation (\$9,563 - \$101,762 / year), in addition to the high start up costs of wild dog reintroductions (\$36,880) would increase annual donor funding requirements by 1.3 - 4 times, and reduce the cost efficiency of this strategy below that of alternative conservation options. However, there is potential to generate substantial revenue from wild dog-based ecotourism (\$11,000 - \$60,000 / pack / year), and given careful reserve selection, tourism benefits can exceed the costs.

Consequently, private reserve owners might be encouraged to reintroduce wild dogs at their own cost. In line with this, the Wild dog Advisory Group-SA has received enquiries from several private reserve owners interested in reintroducing wild dogs onto their properties. The expansion of the meta-population should be limited to state-owned reserves and private reserves willing to carry the costs.

There are more wild dogs occurring outside protected areas than previously recognised. Potentially important founder populations occur in game ranching areas in eastern (1 – 3 resident packs and dispersing groups), northern (1 – 5 resident packs and dispersing groups) and western Limpopo (1 – 5 resident packs and dispersing groups), and large areas (88,750 km²) of potentially suitable habitat for range expansion are currently available. Persecution by landowners remains a significant problem, however, and until this is controlled, range expansion is unlikely to occur. Negative attitudes (47.7% of ranchers) are typically based upon perceived or real economic costs associated with wild dogs, and the removal of cost burdens from landowners is the most direct way in which attitudes might be improved. Despite the high annual costs associated with predation by wild dogs on ranchland (\$11,942 - \$115,761), the low logistical costs (\$3,572 initially, and then \$15,382 annually thereafter) associated with conserving wild dogs *in situ* on ranchland render this option more cost efficient than the reintroduction of wild dogs onto private reserves (14 – 27 packs conserved / \$100,000 cf. 3 – 19 packs / \$100,000). Furthermore, tourism revenue from wild dogs has the potential to offset the costs of their predation on ranchland under most scenarios, and promoting the conservation of wild dogs *in situ* on ranchland by assisting ranchers in establishing wild dog-ecotourism

operations should be the focus of future conservation efforts. A substantial proportion of ranchers (52.3%) are positive towards wild dogs, and private landowners are potentially important facilitators in the conservation of the species in South Africa.

The focus of future conservation efforts involving wild dogs in South Africa should be to establish wild dog populations in the proposed Limpopo / Shashi and Lubombo transfrontier conservation areas as soon as they are established, to encourage private reserve owners to reintroduce wild dogs at their own expense, and to promote the conservation of naturally occurring wild dogs *in situ* on ranchland, by encouraging and assisting ranchers to establish wild dog-ecotourism programmes.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank everyone who assisted my research with financial, intellectual, or moral support. I thank the Green Trust for funding the research and making my project possible. The University of Pretoria, the Moss-Blundell Memorial Scholarship, the Charles Thomas Astley Maberly Scholarship and the Endangered Wildlife Trust all provided additional, invaluable financial support for which I am very grateful.

A huge thank you to Prof. Johan du Toit and Prof. Gus Mills for their supervision and support during all phases of my research. I learned an incredible amount from their guidance. Special thanks to Rob Alexander for providing invaluable assistance, for replying to countless emails and for spending two days of solid brain storming!

Deon Cilliers was incredibly helpful in providing sightings of wild dogs, and generally helping with several aspects of data collection. I am also indebted to Limpopo Province Nature Conservation, Northwest Nature Conservation, Mpumalanga Province Nature Conservation, and KZN Wildlife for their continual assistance in the provision of wild dog sightings. Many thanks to Gerrie Camacho, Steve Dell, Pat Fletcher, Markus Hofmeyr, Graham Main, Philip Owen, Mike Somers, Gus van Dyk and all members of WAG-SA for the provision of so much valuable information and for enduring my endless phone calls.

Big thanks to Harriet Davies for the provision of data, and for partaking in regular brain storming sessions during my project design. Thanks too, Harriet and Sean Dewil for helping me with rancher interviews and for accommodating me during my trips to the Limpopo Valley. I would like to thank Darryn Knoble, Peter Fish, and Ryan Johnson for assisting me in the “laborious task” (to use Darryn’s words!) of interviewing tourists at Kruger and Pilanesberg National Parks. Many thanks to Alistair Pole and Patrick Aust for helping me during the Zimbabwe leg of my studies, and to Barrie and Berti Duckworth for looking after me during my studies in the Save Valley Conservancy.

I am grateful to the ranchers of South Africa, and Zimbabwe for taking the time to partake in my interview survey. The hospitality of the Zimbabwean ranchers, in particular, was quite incredible.

A huge thanks to Chris Roche for helping me so generously with the collection of wild dog sightings, and for making questionnaire sampling at Ngala possible. Really, that was a huge help. I am very grateful to CCAfrica for being so helpful with my tourist questionnaire survey and for the permission to sample their guests. Thanks too to Rob Burns and Djuma Game Reserve for the help provided with my questionnaire sampling there.

Thank you Ingrid Booysen, for your help with GIS, and to Gretel Crafford for your statistical advice.

Thanks to my father for supporting me morally and financially during my PhD, and finally, thank you to Stephanie for all of your help, for supporting me when things weren't going well, and for making the good times even better.

CONTENTS

Summary.....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	vi
Contents.....	ix
List of Tables.....	xvi
List of Figures.....	xx
Chapter 1: Conserving large carnivores outside state protected areas: an introduction...	1
1.1 Reasons for large carnivore / human conflict, and the difficulty associated with conserving remaining populations.....	1
1.1.1 Ranging behaviour and life history characteristics.....	2
1.1.2 Competition with humans for prey.....	2
1.1.3 Predation on humans.....	3
1.1.4 Exploitation of commercially valuable carnivore species.....	4
1.1.5 Human prejudice.....	5
1.2 Approaches to the conservation of large carnivores.....	5
1.2.1 Ecological approaches.....	6
1.2.2 Sociological approaches.....	8
1.2.3 Economic approaches.....	9
1.3 Carnivore conservation outside state protected areas: wild dogs in South Africa as a case study.....	12
1.3.1 Current conservation status of wild dogs.....	13

1.3.2 Current conservation efforts.....	15
1.4 This study.....	17
1.4.1 Objective.....	17
1.4.2 Rationale.....	17
1.4.3 Key questions.....	19
1.5 Overview of the thesis.....	20
1.6 References.....	22
Chapter 2: The distribution and population status of wild dogs <i>Lycaon pictus</i> outside	
protected areas in South Africa.....	33
2.1 Introduction.....	33
2.2 Methods.....	35
2.2.1 Total number of wild dogs outside protected areas.....	38
2.2.2 Resident versus dispersing wild dogs – upper and lower limits.....	38
2.2.3 Geographic distribution.....	39
2.2.4 Wild dog distribution relative to environmental variables.....	40
2.2.5 Available habitat for expansion of the wild dog population outside protected	
areas.....	41
2.3 Results.....	42
2.3.1 Total number of wild dogs outside state protected areas.....	42
2.3.2 Group sizes.....	45
2.3.3 Wild dog distribution.....	45
2.3.4 Relationship between wild dog sightings and environmental variables.....	50

2.3.5 Available habitat for expansion of the wild dog population outside protected areas	54
2.3.6 Population status of wild dogs in South Africa.....	54
2.4 Discussion.....	54
2.4.1 Potential for range expansion.....	60
2.4.2 Total South African wild dog population.....	61
2.5 References.....	64

Chapter 3: Area and prey requirements of wild dogs *Lycaon pictus* under varying habitat and land use conditions: implications for reintroductions..... 70

3.1 Introduction.....	70
3.2 Methods.....	72
3.3 Results.....	77
3.4 Discussion.....	82
3.5 References.....	89

Chapter 4: Attitudes of ranchers towards African wild dogs *Lycaon pictus*: conservation implications on private land..... 96

4.1 Introduction.....	96
4.2 Methods.....	99
4.2.1 Statistical analysis.....	101
4.3 Results.....	102
4.3.1 Relationship between attitudes and ranch characteristics.....	111

4.4 Discussion.....	114
4.4.1 Conditions conducive to conflict between wild dogs and ranchers.....	115
4.4.2 Strategies to improve rancher's attitudes.....	116
4.4.3 Potential for private land to contribute to wild dog conservation.....	119
4.5 References.....	122

Chapter 5: The potential contribution of ecotourism to wild dog *Lycaon pictus*

conservation.....	129
5.1 Introduction.....	129
5.1.1 Current status of wild dogs in South Africa.....	131
5.2 Methods.....	132
5.2.1 Costs per pack within a viable population (Kruger).....	133
5.2.2 Costs per pack of reintroducing and maintaining wild dogs on a private nature reserve.....	134
5.2.3 Costs of conserving a wild dog pack on ranchland.....	140
5.2.4 Potential revenue from wild dog based ecotourism.....	140
5.2.5 Present values (PVs) of revenue from wild dog ecotourism operation.....	143
5.3 Results.....	145
5.3.1 Costs per pack within a viable population (Kruger).....	145
5.3.2 Costs per pack of reintroducing and maintaining a wild dog pack on a private nature reserve.....	145
5.3.3 Costs of conserving a wild dog pack on ranchland.....	150
5.3.4 Potential revenue from wild dog based ecotourism.....	150

5.3.5 NPV of a combined conservation-ecotourism programme for a pack of wild dogs under each scenario in perpetuity.....	151
5.4 Discussion.....	154
5.5 References.....	161

Chapter 6: The cost efficiency of wild dog *Lycaon pictus* conservation in South

Africa.....	170
6.1 Introduction.....	170
6.1.1 Current conservation efforts involving wild dogs in South Africa.....	172
6.2 Methods.....	174
6.2.1 Expenditure on wild dog conservation in South Africa (1997 – 2001).....	174
6.2.2 Cost efficiency indices.....	176
6.2.3 Cost efficiency of conserving wild dogs within a large protected area (Kruger).....	178
6.2.4 Cost efficiency of the establishment of the meta-population.....	178
6.2.5 Cost efficiency of the expansion of the meta-population through reintroduction into private nature reserves.....	179
6.2.6 Cost efficiency of the conservation of wild dogs occurring on ranchland	180
6.3 Results.....	182
6.3.1 Expenditure on wild dog conservation (1997-2001).....	182
6.3.2 Cost efficiency of conserving wild dogs within a large protected area (Kruger).....	184
6.3.3 Cost efficiency of the establishment of the meta-population.....	189

6.3.4 Cost efficiency of the expansion of the meta-population through reintroduction into private nature reserves.....	190
6.3.5 Cost efficiency of the conservation of wild dogs on ranchland.....	190
6.4 Discussion.....	191
6.4.1 Expenditure on wild dog conservation (1997-2001).....	191
6.4.2 The cost efficiency of wild dog conservation.....	192
6.5 References.....	198
Chapter 7: Summary and conclusions.....	204
7.1 Answers to questions addressed in this study.....	204
7.1.1 What is the present distribution and population status of wild dogs outside state-protected areas in South Africa?.....	204
7.1.2 What are the minimum area and prey requirements for a pack in the areas in which wild dogs occur in South Africa?.....	206
7.1.3 What are the attitudes of landowners towards wild dogs, and the reasons for these attitudes in the areas in which wild dogs occur on private land in South Africa?.....	206
7.1.4 What are the costs and potential benefits associated with conserving wild dogs within a viable population, through reintroduction into a reserve, and <i>in situ</i> , on ranchland?.....	208
7.1.5 To what extent has donor funding subsidised wild dog conservation in South Africa in recent years?.....	209

7.1.6 What is the most cost efficient strategy for improving the status of wild dogs in South Africa?.....	210
7.2 Final conclusions.....	211
7.2.1 Large protected areas.....	212
7.2.2 The meta-population.....	212
7.2.3 On ranchland.....	213
7.3 The applicability of this study to the conservation of other carnivores.....	214
7.3.1 Ecological approaches.....	215
7.3.2 Sociological approaches.....	216
7.3.3 Economic approaches.....	217
7.5 References.....	219
APPENDIX A.....	224
APPENDIX B.....	225
APPENDIX C.....	228
APPENDIX D.....	229
APPENDIX E.....	230
APPENDIX F.....	231
APPENDIX G.....	232
APPENDIX H.....	238

List of Tables

Table 2.1 The number of resident and dispersing wild dogs occurring outside protected areas during 1996 - 2002 (number of sightings in parentheses).....	43
Table 2.2 The number of resident packs and dispersing groups occurring outside protected areas during 1996 - 2002 (number of sightings in parentheses).....	44
Table 2.3 The percentage of sightings made in each of six land use categories (number of sightings in parentheses).....	47
Table 2.4 The relationship between the occurrence of wild dogs, human density, land cover and distance from source populations.....	51
Table 3.1 Percent biomass made up by each prey species in the diet of wild dogs in three ecosystems.....	76
Table 3.2 Minimum population sizes and areas required to support predation by a pack of 12 wild dogs (pack of seven dogs, plus one year's offspring at one year of age), given three prey-profiles.....	78
Table 3.3 Observed home range areas of wild dogs in three ecosystems, versus estimated minimum areas required to provide sufficient prey to support equivalent pack sizes.....	81

Table 3.4 Observed density of wild dogs in three ecosystems, versus estimated maximum density (dogs / 1000 km ²) at which wild dogs would occur if they were regulated by density dependent resource limitation across three ecosystems.....	81
Table 4.1 The percentage of ranches with various fencing characteristics (number of ranches in parentheses).....	103
Table 4.2 The percentage of ranches with various land uses (number of ranches in parentheses).....	104
Table 4.3 The percentage of ranches on which various predator species are 'regularly sighted'.....	106
Table 4.4 The ten most common reasons for negative and positive attitudes towards six carnivore species.....	109
Table 5.1 Percent biomass made up by each prey species, sex and age class in two wild dog prey-profiles.....	139
Table 5.2 The costs in 2002 US\$ of conserving a viable population of wild dogs (ZAR in parentheses).....	146

Table 5.3 Present values of the US\$ costs of conserving a pack of wild dogs in perpetuity under three scenarios (ZAR in parentheses).....	147
Table 5.4 Estimated 2002 US\$ costs of the initial reintroduction of a pack of wild dogs into a private reserve (ZAR in parentheses).....	148
Table 5.5 Estimated 2002 US\$ costs of maintaining a pack of wild dogs in a private reserve (ZAR in parentheses).....	149
Table 5.6 The predicted NPV in 2002 US\$ of conserving a wild dog pack in perpetuity, within a viable population (Kruger), through reintroduction into a private reserve, and <i>in situ</i> on ranchland, under various scenarios of costs and benefits (ZAR in parentheses).....	153
Table 6.1 Stakeholders contacted for the collation of records of expenditure made on wild dog conservation during 1997 – 2001.....	175
Table 6.2 Expenditure on the conservation of the three sub units of the South African wild dog population during 1997 – 2001, in 2002 US\$ (ZAR in parentheses).....	183
Table 6.3 Cost estimates used for the calculation of cost efficiency indices, in 2002 US\$ (ZAR in parentheses).....	187

Table 6.4 Cost efficiency indices (dogs / \$100,000) of conserving wild dogs
under three conservation programmes in perpetuity.....188

List of Figures

Figure 2.1 Relationship between the distribution of wild dogs outside protected areas and suitable habitat.....	46
Figure 2.2 The percentage of sightings of resident and dispersing groups of wild dogs made in each of six land use categories.....	53
Figure 3.1 Minimum areas required to support predation by varying pack sizes, based upon the dominant prey species in three different prey profiles (ESA, eastern South Africa - nyala; NESA, northeastern South Africa - impala; NSA, northern South Africa - kudu).....	80
Figure 4.1 Percentage of ranchers who gave negative (scores 0-1), neutral (scores 2-3) and positive (scores 4-5) towards various carnivore species (in response to question 12, Appendix B).....	107
Figure 4.2 General conditions under which wild dog conservation on private land is most likely to succeed.....	113
Figure 5.1 Potential annual revenue from wild dog ecotourism under willingness to pay estimates from Kruger, Pilanesberg, Djuma and Ngala.....	152

Figure 6.1 Source of expenditure (STATE - state agencies, NGOs and PVT - private companies) for each sub unit of the South African wild dog population during 1997 - 2001.....185

Figure 6.2 Breakdown of expenditure on the wild dog meta-population by activity (1997 -2001).....186