Conserving large carnivores: dollars and fence

C. Packer,[1]* A. Loveridge,[2] S. Canney,[3] T. Caro,[4] S.T. Garnett,[5] M. Pfeifer,[6] K.K. Zander,[5] A. Swanson,[1] D. MacNulty,[7] G. Balme,[8,9] H. Bauer,[10] C.M. Begg,[11] K.S. Begg,[11] S. Bhalla,[12] C. Bissett,[13] T. Bodasing,[14] H. Brink,[15] A. Burger,[16] A.C. Burton,[17] B. Clegg,[18] S. Dell,[19] A. Delsink,[20] T. Dickerson,[21] S.M. Dloniak,[22] D. Druce,[14,20] L. Frank,[23] P. Funston,[24] N. Gichohi,[25] R. Groom,[26] C. Hanekom,[14] B. Heath,[27] L. Hunter,[8] H.H. DeIongh,[28,29] C.J. Joubert,[30] S.M. Kasiki,[31] B. Kissui,[32] W. Knocker,[33] B. Leathem,[34] P.A. Lindsey,[8,35] S.D. Maclennan,[10] J.W. McNutt,[36] S.M. Miller,[24] S. Naylor,[21] P. Nel,[19] C. Ng'weno,[25] K. Nicholls,[37] J.O. Ogutu,[38] E. Okot-Omoya,[39] B.D. Patterson,[40] A. Plumptre,[39] J. Salerno,[41] K. Skinner,[42] R. Slotow,[20] E.A. Sogbohossou,[43] K.J. Stratford,[44] C. Winterbach,[45] H. Winterbach[45] and S. Polasky[1,46]

Abstract

Conservationists often advocate for landscape approaches to wildlife management while others argue for physical separation between protected species and human communities, but direct empirical comparisons of these alternatives are scarce. We relate African lion population densities and population trends to contrasting management practices across 42 sites in 11 countries. Lion populations in fenced reserves are significantly closer to their estimated carrying capacities than unfenced populations. Whereas fenced reserves can maintain lions at 80% of their potential densities on annual management budgets of \$500 km^{-2}, unfenced populations require budgets in excess of \$2000 km^{-2} to attain half their potential densities. Lions in fenced reserves are primarily limited by density dependence, but lions in unfenced reserves are highly sensitive to human population densities in surrounding communities, and unfenced populations are frequently subjected to density-independent factors. Nearly half the unfenced lion populations may decline to near extinction over the next 20–40 years.

Keywords

Carnivores, carrying capacity, density dependence, exponential growth, landscape conservation, spatial separation.

[1]*Department of Ecology, Evolution and Behavior, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, 55408, USA*
[2]*Recanati-Kaplan Centre/WildCRU, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Tubney, OX13 5QL, UK*
[3]*Spatial Ecology & Epidemiology Group, Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 3PS, UK*
[4]*Department of Wildlife, Fish & Conservation Biology, University of California, Davis, CA, 95616, USA*
[5]*Research Institute for the Environment & Livelihoods, Charles Darwin University, Casuarina, NT, 0909, Australia*
[6]*Department of Ecology & Evolution, Imperial College London, London, UK*
[7]*Department of Wildland Resources & Ecology Center, Utah State University, Logan, UT, 84322, USA*
[8]*Panthera, New York, NY, 10018, USA*
[9]*Department of Zoology, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch, 7701, South Africa*
[10]*Wildlife Conservation Research Unit, University of Oxford, Tubney, OX13 5QL, UK*
[11]*Niassa Carnivore Project, Ratel Trust, Cape Town, South Africa*
[12]*Ewaso Lions Project, P.O. Box 14996, Nairobi, 00800, Kenya*
[13]*Wildlife & Reserve Management Research Group, Department of Zoology & Entomology, Rhodes University, Grahamstown, South Africa*
[14]*Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa*
[15]*Durrell Institute of Conservation and Ecology, University of Kent, Kent, CT2 7NR, UK*
[16]*Welgevonden Game Reserve, Bulge River, South Africa*
[17]*Alberta Biodiversity Monitoring Institute, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, T6G 2E9, Canada*
[18]*Malilangwe Wildlife Reserve, P. Bag 7085, Chiredzi, Zimbabwe*
[19]*NorthWest Parks and Tourism Board, Mafikeng, South Africa*
[20]*School of Life Sciences, University of KwaZulu-Natal, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa*
[21]*Phinda Private Game Reserve, Hluhluwe, South Africa*
[22]*Department of Zoology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, 48824, USA*
[23]*Living with Lions, Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, CA, 94720, USA*
[24]*Department of Nature Conservation, Tshwane University of Technology, Pretoria, 0002, South Africa*
[25]*Ol Pejeta Conservancy, Nanyuki, Kenya*
[26]*Department of Zoology, University of Johannesburg, Auckland Park 2006, South Africa*
[27]*Mara Conservancy, Nairobi, Kenya*
[28]*Institute of Environmental Sciences, Leiden University, POB 9518, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands*
[29]*Evolutionary Ecology Group, Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, Groenenborgerlaan 171, 2020 Antwerpen, Belgium*
[30]*Sango Ranch, Savé Valley Conservancy, Zimbabwe*
[31]*Kenya Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 40241 – 00100, Nairobi, Kenya*
[32]*African Wildlife Foundation, Arusha, Tanzania*

INTRODUCTION

Populations of large carnivores are declining around the globe, often with dramatic effects on lower trophic levels (Estes *et al.* 2011). These species typically range over such wide areas that it can be difficult to maintain viable populations without some individuals coming into close proximity to humans, posing serious threats to human safety and domestic livestock. Conservationists have therefore sought methods to promote human–carnivore co-existence outside the confines of national parks and wilderness areas (Woodroffe *et al.* 2005; Dickman *et al.* 2011). Given the potential conflicts with humans, however, separation of large carnivores from human communities may ultimately be preferable to a landscape-level conservation approach as has been demonstrated for forestry (Boscolo & Vincent 2003) and agriculture (Phalan *et al.* 2011).

Few species encapsulate these problems more dramatically than the African lion. Lion densities are directly dependent on prey biomass (Van Orsdol *et al.* 1985; Hayward *et al.* 2007), and annual range requirements for a single lion pride can exceed 1000 km^2 (Funston 2011). Habitat loss in the past 100 years has reduced the lion's range by 75% (Riggio *et al.* 2012), and human–lion conflicts have intensified because lions kill livestock (Woodroffe & Frank 2005; Kissui 2008) and people (Packer *et al.* 2005a, 2011a). In addition, poorly regulated sport hunting has resulted in over-harvesting in several countries (Packer *et al.* 2009, 2011b), the effects of which can extend into unhunted National Parks (Loveridge *et al.* 2007; Caro 2008; Kiffner *et al.* 2009). Finally, numerous lion populations are genetically isolated (Slotow & Hunter 2009), and inbreeding has caused measureable reductions in reproductive rates and disease resistance in several small populations (Kissui & Packer 2004; Trinkel *et al.* 2008, 2011; also see Johnson *et al.* 2010).

Yet, not all lion populations have declined. The Serengeti lions, for example, have steadily increased over the past half-century (Packer *et al.* 2005b), populations have remained stable in several large South African national parks (Ferreira & Funston 2010; Funston 2011), and numerous private reserves in South Africa and Zimbabwe have successfully restored lions to areas where they had previously been extirpated (Hunter *et al.* 2007; Lindsey *et al.* 2009a,b; Slotow & Hunter 2009). However, lions are considered so dangerous in South Africa that they can only be re-introduced after management authorities erect lion-proof fencing and agree to recapture or destroy any escaping lions (Hunter *et al.* 2007; Slotow & Hunter 2009).

Wildlife-proof fences effectively prevent most potential conflicts between lions and humans in southern Africa (Ferguson & Hanks 2010), yet this strategy runs counter to a long-standing conservation ethic of keeping protected areas unfenced and contrasts with the wildlife policies of many range states (Hayward & Kerley 2009; Licht *et al.* 2010; Slotow 2012). Depending on the size of the enclosed population, fencing often also necessitates routine genetic and demographic management of smaller populations via translocations of breeding-aged individuals (Trinkel *et al.* 2008; Johnson *et al.* 2010). Thus, many conservationists have instead sought to encourage human–wildlife co-existence through conflict-mitigation programmes, compensation schemes, insurance plans or payments for tolerance (e.g. Dickman *et al.* 2011). However, the costs of managing dangerous wildlife are formidable. For example, effective elephant and tiger conservation has been estimated to cost $365–930 per km^2 per year (Leader-Williams & Albon 1988; Walston *et al.* 2010), and the overall costs of anti-poaching and compensation will only increase in range states with growing human populations (Wittemyer *et al.* 2008; Pfeifer *et al.* 2012), declining purchasing power of external funds (Garnett *et al.* 2011) or worsening corruption (Garnett *et al.* 2011).

African lions are among the most extensively studied carnivores in the world with population data available from a wide variety of protected areas in nearly a dozen different countries with divergent conservation practices. Several recently developed ecological models can accurately estimate lion carrying capacities across a wide range of ecological conditions (Hayward *et al.* 2007; Loveridge & Canney 2009), making it possible to estimate the effectiveness of lion conservation in a given reserve by measuring how closely the observed population density matches the expected density. The large number of long-term studies also provides measures of population trends across a wide variety of circumstances. Here, we explicitly test the effectiveness of fencing and management budgets on lion population size and growth rates, while including the impacts of human population density, governance, sport hunting, private management and protected area size.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Data come from repeated surveys in 38 sites (median span = 12 years; range: 3–46 years) and single surveys in an additional four sites. Population growth rates were estimated from the exponents of exponential regressions of population size over the most recent 10 years for each time series, using nonlinear models in Program R (R Development Core Team 2011), function *nls*. Because many long-term study sites were surveyed irregularly, data were sometimes only available up to 1995–2004, and the median time span was 9 years (range: 3–14 years) (Table S1); Figure S1 shows time series as densities (lions/100 km^2) except for Mole Park, Ghana, where data were collected as number of 'contacts per 100 ranger patrols'.

In an analysis of historical data from 49 undisturbed sites, Loveridge & Canney (2009) found a tight correlation ($r^2 = 0.9271$) between contemporaneous population sizes of lions and large- to

[33]Silole Sanctuary, PO Box 938, Karen, Kenya
[34]Bubye Valley Conservancy, Zimbabwe
[35]Mammal Research Institute, Department of Zoology & Entomology, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa
[36]Botswana Predator Conservation Trust, Maun, Botswana
[37]69 Comeragh Rd, London, W14 9HT, UK
[38]Bioinformatics Unit, University of Hohenheim, Stuttgart, 70599, Germany
[39]Wildlife Conservation Society, PO Box 7487, Kampala, Uganda
[40]Department of Zoology, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, IL, 60605, USA
[41]Graduate Group in Ecology, University of California, Davis, CA, 95616,
[42]Selous Lion Project, PO Box 34514, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
[43]Laboratory of Applied Ecology, University of Abomey-Calavi, Cotonou, Benin
[44]Ongava Research Centre, PO Box 58, Okaukeujo, Namibia
[45]Centre for Wildlife Management, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa
[46]Department of Applied Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN, 55408, USA
*Correspondence: E-mail: packer@umn.edu

medium-sized ungulates; the resultant equation between lion and prey biomass was $Y = 0.0109x^{0.8782}$. Where ungulate surveys were not available, Loveridge & Canney found a close fit for ungulate biomass by modeling habitats according to NOAA's Africa Data Dissemination Service Rainfall Estimate (ADDS-RFE) and cation exchange capacities taken from the ISRIC-WISE soil profile data set (www.isric.org/data/isric-wise-international-soil-profile-dataset) separated into high-, medium- and low-nutrient levels. In the current analysis, 'expected' lion densities were calculated from known prey biomass where possible (34 sites); otherwise, herbivore densities were predicted from rainfall and soils (8 sites); the method used for estimating 'lion carrying capacity' did not significantly affect any of our results.

Each site is classified as managed by public or private agencies, subjected to sport hunting, separated from surrounding communities by wildlife-proof fencing, country/geographical region, and method of estimating carrying capacity (prey biomass vs. rainfall/soils); we also tested effects of reserve size. Human population data were taken from the AfriPop Project (www.afripop.org) (Linard *et al.* 2012; measuring human densities within one kilometre of protected area boundaries extracted from the World Database of Protected Areas (IUCN & UNEP 2009)(see Pfeifer *et al.* 2012). Governance was based on UNDP's six indicators (Voice/Accountability, Political Stability, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law and Control of Corruption) (UNDP 2010). Principal Components Analysis showed that 87% of variation between indicators was captured by a single component ('Governance') (Table S2). In the statistical analyses, management budgets are US$ per km^2 per year while controlling for purchasing power and likely losses to corruption (Garnett *et al.* 2011). Budgets could not be partitioned according to anti-poaching, outreach, fence repairs, road maintenance, etc.

For 14 of 42 sites, wildlife surveys were restricted to the best-protected portion of each reserve, whereas budgets were only available for the entire reserve. Expenditures per km^2 were based on two alternative measures: first, total budget divided by the size of the overall protected area (a lower bound which assumes that management expenditures are spread evenly over the entire reserve); second, total budget divided by the size of the survey area (an upper bound which assumes that management expenditures are spent exclusively within the survey area). These alternative measures produced virtually identical results; statistical tests are based on the geometric mean of the two extremes.

Human population densities, protected area sizes, annual management budgets and the ratios of current-to-expected population size were all lognormal, so statistics on the two response variables (population growth rate and current-to-expected population density) were run on the log-transformed data. We used an information-theoretic approach (Burnham & Anderson 2002), with Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) to calculate statistical models, using simple linear models in Program R, function *lm*. We determined the magnitude and direction of the coefficients for each independent variable using multi-model averaging across all models with ΔAIC less than 4.0 (Grueber *et al.* 2011). These outputs were examined to determine which predictors were statistically significant and to measure the relative importance of each variable (Tables 1–3). 'Relative importance' refers to the sum of the Akaike weights over all of the models containing the parameter of interest.

Given the nested nature of the geographical data, we evaluated a mixed-effects model with nested random intercepts for Region and Country. Log-likelihood ratio tests provided no support for including random effects: the fixed-effects model outperformed all random-effects models (testing Region only, as well as Country nested within

Table 1 Multi-model averages across all reserves for A. ratio of current-to-expected population densities (n = 40) and B. exponential growth rates over the past 10 years (n = 33). See Table S3 for the full list of models with ΔAIC less than 4.0

Variable	Estimate	SE	Adj. SE	*z* value	*P*-value	Relative importance
A. Multi-model averages for Current vs. Expected in all reserves:						
(Intercept)	−0.990	0.177	0.182	5.435	0.000***	1.00
Fence	0.478	0.112	0.115	4.153	0.000***	1.00
Management Budget	0.102	0.029	0.030	3.427	0.001***	1.00
Namibia + South Africa	0.212	0.138	0.142	1.493	0.136	0.50
Human Pop. Density	−0.109	0.068	0.071	1.548	0.122	0.46
Governance	0.003	0.040	0.041	0.077	0.939	0.16
Method	0.089	0.121	0.126	0.706	0.480	0.15
Size of PA	0.044	0.073	0.076	0.578	0.563	0.12
Hunted	0.040	0.117	0.121	0.328	0.743	0.08
State run	0.013	0.091	0.094	0.141	0.888	0.07
B. Multi-model averages for exponential growth rates in all reserves:						
(Intercept)	0.040	0.070	0.072	0.565	0.572	1.00
Fence	0.094	0.043	0.045	2.098	0.036*	0.78
State Run	−0.096	0.044	0.045	2.113	0.035*	0.69
Initial Pop. Size	−0.096	0.051	0.053	1.830	0.067	0.52
Namibia + South Africa	0.079	0.055	0.057	1.386	0.166	0.44
Size of PA	0.026	0.026	0.027	0.965	0.335	0.17
Method	0.058	0.061	0.064	0.901	0.368	0.15
Governance	0.006	0.014	0.015	0.385	0.700	0.14
Human Pop. Density	0.006	0.030	0.031	0.198	0.843	0.08
Hunted	0.010	0.048	0.050	0.201	0.841	0.07
Management Budget	0.001	0.012	0.013	0.086	0.932	0.07

*$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, ***$P < 0.001$

Table 2 Multi-model averages of the fenced reserves for A. ratio of current-to-expected population densities (n = 17) and B. exponential growth rates over the past 10 years (n = 16). See Table S4 for the full list of models with ΔAIC less than 4.0

Variable	Estimate	SE	Adj. SE	z value	P-value	Relative importance
A. Multi-model averages for Current vs. Expected in fenced reserves:						
(Intercept)	0.297	0.411	0.421	0.706	0.480	1.00
Size of PA	−0.169	0.095	0.100	1.691	0.091	0.60
Namibia + South Africa	0.238	0.137	0.148	1.604	0.109	0.45
State Run	0.233	0.133	0.142	1.634	0.102	0.38
Governance	−0.036	0.030	0.032	1.132	0.258	0.38
Human Pop. Density	−0.008	0.106	0.109	0.073	0.942	0.15
Hunted	−0.089	0.314	0.325	0.274	0.784	0.14
Management Budget	−0.063	0.073	0.076	0.827	0.408	0.13
Method	0.005	0.145	0.159	0.034	0.973	0.02
B. Multi-model averages for exponential growth rates in fenced reserves:						
(Intercept)	0.225	0.081	0.084	2.688	0.007**	1.00
Initial Pop. Size	−0.108	0.037	0.040	2.706	0.007**	0.83
State Run	−0.091	0.041	0.044	2.063	0.039*	0.37
Size of PA	−0.039	0.018	0.020	1.924	0.054	0.37
Human Pop. Density	0.025	0.019	0.022	1.165	0.244	0.08
Management Budget	−0.013	0.012	0.014	0.985	0.325	0.06

*$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, ***$P < 0.001$

Table 3 Multi-model averages of the unfenced reserves for A. ratio of current-to-expected population densities (n = 22) and B. exponential growth rates over the past 10 years (n = 17). See Table S4 for the full list of models with ΔAIC less than 4.0

Variable	Estimate	SE	Adj. SE	z value	P-value	Relative importance
A. Multi-model averages for Current vs. Expected in unfenced reserves:						
(Intercept)	−1.186	0.332	0.344	3.443	0.001***	1.00
Management Budget	0.159	0.034	0.036	4.365	0.000***	1.00
Human Pop. Density	−0.326	0.127	0.136	2.405	0.016*	0.93
Hunted	−0.420	0.282	0.295	1.423	0.155	0.35
Namibia + South Africa	0.517	0.388	0.405	1.278	0.201	0.25
Size of PA	0.149	0.124	0.131	1.141	0.254	0.18
State Run	0.169	0.157	0.167	1.011	0.312	0.14
Method	0.078	0.150	0.161	0.486	0.627	0.06
Governance	−0.012	0.044	0.047	0.265	0.791	0.05
B. Multi-model averages for exponential growth rates in unfenced reserves:						
(Intercept)	−0.046	0.073	0.077	0.592	0.554	1.00
Namibia + South Africa	0.422	0.100	0.109	3.865	0.000***	1.00
Hunted	−0.258	0.085	0.094	2.752	0.006**	1.00
Method	0.113	0.082	0.091	1.239	0.215	0.16
State Run	0.069	0.062	0.069	1.006	0.314	0.11
Initial Pop. Size	−0.060	0.061	0.068	0.886	0.376	0.09
Governance	−0.015	0.016	0.017	0.836	0.403	0.09
Size of PA	0.026	0.033	0.036	0.717	0.474	0.08
Management Budget	0.004	0.012	0.013	0.313	0.755	0.06

*$P < 0.05$, **$P < 0.01$, ***$P < 0.001$

Region). However, South Africa and Namibia deviated most strikingly from other countries and geographical configurations, so we ran all AIC models using 'Namibia + South Africa vs. Other' as a fixed effect to minimise the number of coefficients. Note that because many of the fenced reserves were smaller than the overall average, 'fenced/non-fenced' showed a moderate degree of co-linearity with protected area size (Spearman rank-order correlation, $r_s = -0.516$); however, protected area size was not strongly correlated with either of the dependent outcome variables in a univariate analysis, and the effects of fencing remained robust in all AIC models that included protected area size. Finally, we extrapolated population sizes at 5-year intervals for 100 years into the future by combining current population size with the exponential growth rate over the past 10 years. Populations were considered likely to persist if their extrapolated population sizes exceed 10% of their potential carrying capacities at particular time points in the future.

RESULTS

Table 1 summarises the variables with the strongest effects on lion population status and population growth rates across Africa. Current population densities are highest compared to their expected values in reserves that (1) are fenced and (2) have the highest management budgets per km^2 (Fig. 1, Tables 1a and S3a). Over the past 10 yrs, population growth rates have been highest in (1) fenced reserves (Fig. 2) and (2) privately managed reserves (Tables 1b and S3b). Because fences have such a profound impact on lion management, we performed separate analyses for fenced and unfenced reserves. For fenced reserves, none of the tested variables had a significant effect on current population status (Tables 2a and S4a), whereas recent population growth has been highest in populations that had been farthest below their potential densities 10 years earlier (Fig. 2) with additional positive effects from private management (Tables 2b and S4b). For unfenced populations, current status is highest in reserves with the largest management budgets (Fig. 1) and lowest when surrounded by high human population densities (Tables 3a and S5a); growth rates were highest in Namibia + South Africa and in populations that were not subjected to trophy hunting (Tables 3b and S5b). Given current population sizes and recent trends, all of the fenced populations are expected to remain at or above their full potential for the next 100 years, whereas less than half of the unfenced reserves are likely to persist above 10% of their carrying capacities for the next 20–40 years (Fig. 3), including unfenced sites in Botswana, Kenya, Cameroon, Ghana, Tanzania and Uganda.

DISCUSSION

Negative conservation impacts of human land use can often be minimised by restricting conflicting activities to separate areas rather than by encouraging their co-existence. For example, concentrating crop production in areas of intensive agriculture and sparing land as nature reserves can improve species conservation and crop production more effectively than land-sharing strategies that integrate conservation and low-intensity agricultural production (Phalan *et al.* 2011). Establishing separate areas of intensive timber production while maintaining well-defined forest reserves is also preferable to low-intensity harvests over a greater proportion of forest (Boscolo & Vincent 2003). Similarly, physical separation is highly effective for conserving African lions: all of the fenced lion populations were close to their estimated carrying capacities (Fig. 1), growth rates of the fenced populations were density dependent (Fig. 2), and every



Figure 1 Percentage ratio of current population density to predicted carrying capacity of African lions in fenced (black squares) and unfenced (red circles) reserves according to management budget per square kilometre of lion survey area. The red regression line is for unfenced reserves; the effect of management budget in the fenced reserves is not statistically significant.



Figure 2 Effect of population density on population growth rate over the following 10 years for fenced (black) and unfenced (red) reserves. 'Initial population status' refers to the observed population density at the start of each time series compared to the expected density. The black regression line is for fenced reserves.



Figure 3 Percentage of populations expected to persist at densities > 10% of their potential in the future. Differences between fenced (black squares, n = 16) and unfenced (red circles, n = 21) reserves each year are all significant by Fisher test.

fenced population is expected to remain close to its carrying capacity for the next century. Indeed, managers in many of the smaller fenced reserves currently remove 'excess' lions in attempts to stabilise ungulate numbers (see Fig. S1). Fenced lion populations were less sensitive to human densities in adjacent areas than were unfenced populations, presumably because fences reduce poaching, minimise habitat loss, curtail illegal grazing and prevent direct human–lion conflict (Kiffner *et al.* 2012). Such density-independent 'edge effects' likely prevented recovery of numerous unfenced lion populations that had fallen substantially below their respective carrying capacities 10 years earlier.

Conservationists have long recognised that large carnivores should be kept apart from humans. However, fencing has so far only been widely employed in a few African countries because of aesthetic objections, financial costs and the impracticality of enclosing large-scale migratory ungulate populations. Thus, recent conservation efforts have increasingly promoted human–wildlife co-existence, either by initiating conflict-mitigation projects in buffer zones or by providing economic incentives for local people to tolerate the costs of living with wildlife (Woodroffe *et al.* 2005; Dickman *et al.* 2011). However, our analysis suggests that human–lion co-existence should only be considered in areas where large-scale megafaunal (and pastoralist) migration precludes any form of fencing. In some cases, human-occupied zones within larger wildlife-dominated ecosystems may even need to be fenced as enclaves (e.g. 30,000 people live in 40 villages inside Mozambique's Niassa National Reserve), as has been recommended for reducing conflicts between wolves and ranchers in livestock-production areas around Yellowstone National Park (Stone *et al.* 2008).

Whether or not more lion populations are eventually fenced, large-scale lion conservation will be expensive. Currently, many of the best-financed reserves are too small to sustain long-term ecosystem processes without frequent and costly management interventions (e.g. Hunter *et al.* 2007), and a 10- to 100-fold increase in management budget will be required to sustain many of the reserves that are not yet fenced (Fig. 1). Although fenced reserves can typically achieve considerable management success on annual budgets as low as \$500 km^{-2} (Fig. 1), fences cost ca. \$3000 per km to install (Vercauteren *et al.* 2006). Long-term costs of successfully managing unfenced lion populations are even higher: \$2000 per km^2 per year is only sufficient to maintain an unfenced lion population at 50% of its potential density (Fig. 1). By comparison, the 2010 management budget in Yellowstone was \$4100 per km^2 – enough to maintain an average unfenced lion population at about two-thirds of its potential. Under current financial practices in Africa, only a small proportion of tourism revenues are directly available to park managers (Bushell & Eagles 2007) and trophy hunting rarely raises more than \$1000 per km^2 (Lindsey *et al.* 2012).

Although our focus on a single species may seem narrow, top predators can only flourish in healthy ecosystems: many components of lower trophic levels must also thrive for lion populations to remain close to their potential limits, thus the price of successful lion management provides an important gauge for the true costs of sustaining *intact* savannah ecosystems. Finding financial solutions to long-term conservation of Africa's largest remaining intact ecosystems such as Niassa, Okavango, Selous, Serengeti and the W-Arly-Pendjari Complex will present an enormous challenge to African governments and conservationists.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Research funded by Adrian Gardiner/Mantis Collection (AL), African Wildlife Foundation (SB,LF), Wendy Arnold (LF), Arthur Blank Family Foundation (LF), Australian Research Council - DP0987528 (KZ), Australian Research Council – LP0990395 (SG), Banovich Wildscapes Foundation (LF), Bateleurs (RS), Boesak Kruger Fund (LF,AL), Born Free (SB,SC), Michael Calvin (LF), Charles Darwin University (STG, KKZ), Cheryl Grunbock & Martin King Foundation (LF), Chicago Board of Trade for Endangered Species (RG), Columbus Zoo (SB, TC,RG,LF), Conservation Force (LF,PF), Dallas Ecological Foundation (LF), Dallas Safari Club (LF), Darwin Initiative for Biodiversity (AL), Paul Davies (SMD), Denver Zoo (LF), Directors of Ongava Game Reserve (KJS), Disney Worldwide Conservation Fund (CMB, KSB,CP,RS), Dominion Oil (EOO, AP), Earthwatch Institute #5123 (SMK,BP), Fairplay Foundation (CMB,KSB), Fauna & Flora International (CMB,KSB), Flora Family Foundation (LF), Frankenberg Foundation (AL), Stephen Gold (LF), Green Trust WWF-SA (RS), GTZ/Pendjari Project (EAS), Hluhluwe Tourism Assoc. (RS), Houston Zoo (CMB,KSB,JWMcN), Idea Wild (HBr), Kenya Wildlife Service (SK), Lakeside Foundation (SMD), Lee & Juliet Folger Foundation (JWMcN), Lillian Jean Kaplan Foundation (AL), Lion Ore (KN), Bruce Ludwig (LF), Malilangwe Trust (BC), Mara Conservancy (BH), MGM Grand Hotel (CP,RS), Mohamed Bin Zayed Species Fund (HHdeI), N. & R. Myhrvold (JWMcN), National Geographic Big Cat Initiative (HHdeI,JWMcN), National Geographic Society (SB,HBr,TC,LF,RG,CP), National Research Foundation (RS), Netherlands Committee for IUCN (HHdeI), Netherlands Support Program for the Garoua Wildlife School (HBa), NSF (LF,JS), NSF DEB-0 613 730(DMacN), NSF DEB-1 020 479(CP), Okavango Wildlife Society (KN), Ol Pejeta Ranch Ltd. (NG,CN), Panthera (GB, CMB,KSB,HBr,LF, LH,BK, PL,AL,CP,EOO,AP,EAS), Panthera Kaplan Awards Program (ACB,LF), PG Allen Family Foundation (JWMcN), Philadelphia Zoological Society (LF,KN,KS), Porini Camp Amboseli (LF), Potrero Nuevo Fund (LF), Predator Conservation Trust (CMB,KSB), Rann Safaris (CW,HW), Rufford Foundation (CMB,KSB,LF,KN), Rufford-Maurice-Laing Foundation (AL), Kathy Ruttenberg (AP), Safari South (C&HW), San Francisco Zoo (LF), SCI Foundation (LF), Seaworld/Busch Gardens Conservation Foundation (SB,LF), Technology and Human Resources for Industry Programme, SA (RS), Thandiza Foundation and the Rotterdam Zoo (KN), Tshwane University of Technology – Faculty Research Committee (PF), Tshwane University of Technology – Postgraduate Scholarship Programme (SMM), Tusk Trust (JWMcN), University of KwaZulu-Natal (RS), US Forest Service (AP), US National Cancer Institute (LF), Van Tienhoven Foundation (HBa), Jonathan Vannini (LF), Vectronic Aerospace (LF), West Midlands Safari Park (KS), Debby Wettlaufer (LF), Wild about Cats (RS), Wild Entrust International (JWMcN), Wildlife Conservation Network (CMB,KSB,LF), Wildlife Conservation Society (CMB,KSB,LF,BK,EOO,AP), Wildlife Conservation Trust KZN (RS), Wildlife Direct (LF), Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission of Ghana (ACB), Woodland Park Zoo (JWMcN) and World Wide Fund for Nature (HHdeI).

AUTHORSHIP

CP, AL, GB, TC, AS, HBa, CMB, KSB, SB, CB, TB, HBr, AB, ACB, BC, SD, AD, TD, SMD, DD, LF, PF, NG, RG, CH, LH, HHdeI, CJJ, SMK, BK, WK, BL, PAL, SDM, JWMcN, SMM, SN, PN, CN, KN, JOO, EOO, BDP, AP, JS, EAS, KJS, CW and HW performed field research. SC and AL developed the ecological model. CP, SC, AL, STG, DMacN, MP, AS and KKZ analysed data. CP, TC, AS, STG and SP wrote the manuscript. All authors discussed the results and commented on the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Boscolo, M. & Vincent, J.R. (2003). Nonconvexities in the production of timber, biodiversity, and carbon sequestration. *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.*, 46, 251–268.

Burnham, K.P. & Anderson, D.R. (2002). *Model Selection and Multimodel Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*, 2nd edn. Springer-Verlag, Basel.

Bushell, R. & Eagles, B.F.J. (2007). *Tourism And Protected Areas: Benefits Beyond Boundaries*. CABI, Cambridge, MA.

Caro, T. (2008). Decline of large mammals in the Katavi-Rukwa ecosystem of western Tanzania. *Afr. Zool.*, 43, 99–116.

Dickman, A.J., Macdonald, E.A. & Macdonald, D.W. (2011). A review of financial instruments to pay for predator conservation and encourage human–carnivore coexistence. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA*, 108, 13937–13944.

Estes, J.A., Terborgh, J., Brashares, J.S., Power, M.E., Berger, J., Bond, W.J. *et al.* (2011). Trophic downgrading of planet earth. *Science*, 333, 301–306.

Ferguson, K. & Hanks, J., eds (2010). Fencing impacts: A review of the environmental, social and economic impacts of game and veterinary fencing in Africa with particular reference to the Great Limpopo and Kavango-Zambezi Transfrontier Conservation Areas. (Mammal Research Institute, Pretoria. Available at: www.wcs-ahead.org/gltfca_grants/grants.html).

Ferreira, S.M. & Funston, P.J. (2010). Estimating lion population variables: prey and disease effects in Kruger National Park, South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res.*, 37, 194–206.

Funston, P.J. (2011). Population characteristics of lions (*Panthera leo*) in the Kgalagadi Transfrontier Park. *S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res.*, 41, 1–10.

Garnett, S.T., Joseph, L.N., Watson, J.E.M. & Zander, K.K. (2011). Investing in threatened species conservation: Does corruption outweigh purchasing power? *PLoS ONE*, 6, e22749. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022749.

Grueber, C.E., Nakagawa, S., Laws, R.J. & Jamieson, I.G. (2011). Multimodel inference in ecology and evolution: challenges and solution. *J. Evol. Biol.*, 24, 699–711.

Hayward, M.W. & Kerley, G.I.H. (2009). Fencing for conservation: Restriction of evolutionary potential or a riposte to threatening processes? *Biol. Conserv.*, 142, 1–13.

Hayward, M., O'Brien, J. & Kerley, G.I.H. (2007). Carrying capacity of large African predators: predictions and tests. *Biol. Conserv.*, 139, 219–229.

Hunter, L.T.B. *et al.* (2007). Restoring lions (*Panthera leo*) to northern KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa: short-term biological & technical success but equivocal long-term conservation. *Oryx*, 41, 196–204.

IUCN & UNEP (2009) *The World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) UNEP-WCMC.* WCMC, Cambridge, UK. Version 2010. Available at: http://www.wdpa.org/AnnualRelease.aspx.

Johnson, W.E. *et al.* (2010). Genetic restoration of the Florida panther. *Science*, 329, 1641–1645.

Kiffner, C., Meyer, B., Mühlenberg, M. & Waltert, M. (2009). Plenty of prey, few predators: what limits lions in Katavi National Park, Western Tanzania? *Oryx*, 43, 52–59.

Kiffner, C., Stoner, C. & Caro, T. (2012). Edge effects and large mammal distributions in a national park. *Anim. Conserv.*, 16, 97–107.

Kissui, B.M. (2008). Livestock predation by lions, leopards, spotted hyenas, and their vulnerability to retaliatory killing in the Maasai steppe, Tanzania. *Anim. Conserv.*, 11, 422–432.

Kissui, B.M. & Packer, C. (2004). Top-down regulation of a top predator: lions in the Ngorongoro Crater. *Proc. R. Soc. Series B.*, 271, 1867–1874.

Leader-Williams, N. & Albon, S.D. (1988). Allocation of resources for conservation. *Nature*, 336, 533–535.

Licht, D.S., Millspaugh, J.J., Kunkel, K.E., Kochanny, C.O. & Peterson, R.O. (2010). Using small populations of wolves for ecosystem restoration and stewardship. *Bioscience*, 60, 147–153.

Linard, C., Gilbert, M., Snow, R.W., Noor, A.M. & Tatem, A.J. (2012). Population Distribution, Settlement Patterns and Accessibility across Africa in 2010. *PLoS ONE*, 7, e31743.

Lindsey, P.A., Romañach, S.S. & Davies-Mostert, H.T. (2009a). The importance of conservancies for enhancing the conservation value of game ranch land in southern Africa. *J. Zool.*, 277, 99–105.

Lindsey, P.A., Romañach, S.S. & Davies-Mostert, H.T. (2009b). Moving beyond the descriptive: predicting the responses of top-order predators to reintroduction. In: *The Reintroduction of Top-order Predators* (eds. Hayward, M.W. & Somers, M.J.). Wiley-Blackwell, London, pp. 21–344.

Lindsey, P.A., Balme, G.A., Booth, V.R. & Midlane, N. (2012). The significance of African lions for the financial viability of trophy hunting and the maintenance of wild land. *PLoS-One*, 7, e29332.

Loveridge, A.J. & Canney, S. (2009). *African Lion Distribution Modeling Project, Final Report.* Born Free Foundation, Horsham, UK.

Loveridge, A.J., Searle, A.W., Murindagomo, F. & Macdonald, D.W. (2007). The impact of sport hunting on the population dynamics of an African lion population in a protected area. *Biol. Conserv.*, 134, 548–558.

Packer, C., Ikanda, D., Kissui, B.M. & Kushnir, H. (2005a). Lion attacks on humans in Tanzania. *Nature*, 436, 927–928.

Packer, C. *et al.* (2005b). Ecological change, group territoriality and non-linear population dynamics in Serengeti lions. *Science*, 307, 390–393.

Packer, C. *et al.* (2009). Sport hunting, predator control and conservation of large carnivores. *PLoS ONE*, 4, e5941.

Packer, C., Swanson, A., Ikanda, D. & Kushnir, H. (2011a). Fear of darkness, the full moon and the lunar ecology of African lions. *PLoS ONE*, 6, e22285.

Packer, C. *et al.* (2011b). The effects of trophy hunting on lion and leopard populations in Tanzania. *Conserv. Biol.*, 25, 142–153.

Pfeifer, M., Burgess, N.D., Swetnam, R.D., Platts, P.J., Willcock, S. & Marchant, R. (2012). Protected areas: Mixed success in conserving East Africa's evergreen forests. *PLoS ONE*, 7(6), e39337. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0039337.

Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A. & Green, R.E. (2011). Reconciling food production and biodiversity conservation: Land sharing and land sparing compared. *Science*, 333, 1289–1291.

R Development Core Team (2011). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing.* R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.

Riggio, J., Jacobson, A., Dollar, L., Bauer, H., Becker, M., Dickman, A. *et al.* (2012). The size of savannah Africa: A lion's (Panthera leo) view. *Biodivers. Conserv.*, 22, 17–35.

Slotow, R. (2012). Fencing for purpose: A case study of elephants in South Africa. In: *Fencing for Conservation: Restriction of Evolutionary Potential or a Riposte to Threatening Processes?* (eds Somers, M.J. & Hayward, M.W.). Springer, Basel, 91–104.

Slotow, R. & Hunter, L.T.B. (2009). Reintroduction decisions taken at the incorrect social scale devalue their conservation contribution: The African lion in South Africa. In: *The Reintroduction of Top-order Predators* (eds Hayward, M.W. & Somers, M.J.) Wiley-Blackwell, London, pp. 43–71.

Stone, S.A. *et al.* (2008). *Livestock and Wolves: A Guide to Nonlethal Tools and Methods to Reduce Conflicts.* Defenders of Wildlife, Washington, DC.

Trinkel, M. *et al.* (2008). Translocating lions into an inbred lion population in the Hluhluwe-iMfolozi Park, South Africa. *Anim. Conserv.*, 11, 138–143.

Trinkel, M., Cooper, D., Packer, C. & Slotow, R. (2011). Inbreeding depression increases susceptibility to bovine tuberculosis in lions: An experimental test using and inbred-outbred contrast through translocation. *J. Wildl. Dis.*, 43, 494–500.

UNDP International Human Development Indicators (2010). (UNDP, New York. Available at: www.hdr.undp.org/en/data/trends).

Van Orsdol, K.G., Hanby, J.P. & Bygott, J.D. (1985). Ecological correlates of lion social organization. *J. Zool.*, 206, 97–112.

Vercauteren, K.C., Lavelle, M.J. & Hyngstrom, S. (2006). Fences and deer-damage management: A review of designs and efficacy. *Wildl Soc Bull.*, 34, 191–200.

Walston, J. *et al.* (2010). Bringing the tiger back from the brink—The six percent solution. *PLoS Biol.*, 8(9), e1000485. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1000485.

Wittemyer, G., Elsen, P., Bean, W.T., Burton, A.C. & Brashares, J.S. (2008). Accelerated human population growth at protected area edges. *Science*, 321, 123–126.

Woodroffe, R. & Frank, L.G. (2005). Lethal control of African lions (*Panthera leo*): Local and regional population impacts. *Anim. Conserv.*, 8, 91–98.

Woodroffe, R., Thirgood, S. & Rabinowitz, A. (2005). *People and Wildlife: Conflict or Coexistence.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Supporting information

"Conserving large carnivores: dollars and fence."

Fig S1
Table S1
Table S2
Table S3
Table S4
Table S5


Lion density per 100 km²
Pendjari National Park, Benin
Moremi, Botswana
Tau/Xudum, Botswana
Waza National Park, Cameroon
Mole National Park, Ghana
Lions per 100 patrols
Maasai Mara Reserve, Kenya
Mbirikani, Kenya
Nairobi National Park, Kenya
0.1
1
10
1960
1970
1980
1990
2000
2010



Lion density per 100 km^2
Ol Pejeta, Kenya
Samburu National Park, Kenya
Taita, Kenya
Niassa Reserve, Mozambique
Kunene, Namibia
Ongava, Namibia
Hluhluwe iMfolozi Park, South Africa
Kgalagadi Transfrontier, S. Africa
Central District, Kruger, South Africa
1960
1970
1980
1990
2000
2010
0.01
0.1
1
10



Lion density per 100 km2
Lower Sabie, Kruger Park, South Africa
Kwandwe, South Africa
Madikwe Game Reserve, South Africa
Makalali, South Africa
Phinda, South Africa
Pilanesberg National Park, South Africa
Tembe, South Africa
Welgevonden, South Africa
Katavi National Park, Tanzania



Fig. S1. Lion population sizes. Chart titles are RED for unfenced reserves; BLACK for fenced reserves. Light blue: total population; dark blue: adult population; black: total counts where age structure has not been reported. Markerless lines: monthly totals based on individual recognition. Diamonds: annual counts. Red lines: estimated carrying capacities. Crosses: removals. Open triangles: introductions. Dark green: riparian habitat in Niassa; light green: watershed habitat in Niassa. Vertical green arrow highlights the year when Ol Pejeta was tripled in size. Open circles and dotted line indicate total number of lions encountered per 100 patrols in Mole NP; no carrying capacity is provided since encounter rates cannot be converted to densities. Note that no lions have been encountered during road counts in Katavi NP, Tanzania, in five of the past eight surveys; recent densities in Katavi are arbitrarily set at 0.10 to indicate continued search effort.

Site	Country	Size of PA (km^2)	Hum. Pop. Dens.	Fence	State run	Hunt	Mgmt budget per km^2	Start of 10 yrs	Initial Dens.	Yr of latest survey	Current Density	Predicted Density	Initial/ Predicted	Current/ Predicted	Exp growth rate	Sources
Pendjari NP	Benin	4711	18.08	0	1	0	$130	2001	0.70	2009	1.60	13.0	5.38%	12.31%	0.140	EAS
Moremi GR	Botswana	5000	0.357	0	0	1	-	1999	21.33	2009	6.67	13.2	161.59%	50.53%	-0.086	KN, JWMcN
Tau - Xudum area	Botswana	5000	0.201	0	0	1	-	1999	6.09	2008	2.86	10.0	60.90%	28.60%	-0.102	C&HW
Benoue NP	Cameroon	1980	1.354	0	1	0	$7	-	-	2010	0.36	3.2	-	11.25%	n/a	HHdeI
Bouba Ndjida NP	Cameroon	2114	1.317	0	1	0	$6	-	-	2010	0.63	3.6	-	17.50%	n/a	HHdeI, HBa
Faro NP	Cameroon	3486	1.407	0	1	0	$4	-	-	2010	1.15	13.0	-	8.85%	n/a	HHdeI
Waza NP	Cameroon	1700	4.454	0	1	0	$11	2000	1.83	2008	0.53	4.4	41.59%	12.05%	-0.154	HHdeI, HBa
Mole NP	Ghana	4600	1.445	0	1	0	$43	1995	-	2004	-	7.9	-	-	-0.100*	ACB, Burton *et al.* 2011
Laikipia Dist. (private land)	Kenya	3100	20.68	0	0	0	$1,950	1999	-	2003	6.47	14.8	-	45.63%	-	LF
Maasai Mara NR	Kenya	1530	2.445	0	1	0	$10,131	1991	31.56	2005	18.69	36.6	86.23%	51.07%	-0.037	SMD, BH; Ogutu *et al.* 2011
Mbirikani Group Ranch	Kenya	1230	5.538	0	0	0	$285	2004	0.98	2009	0.89	5.9	16.61%	15.08%	-0.032	LF, SDM
Nairobi NP	Kenya	117	50.71	0	1	0	$7,414	1998	25.64	2009	23.93	25.6	100.02%	93.35%	0.012	WK
Nakuru NP	Kenya	188	492.1	1	1	0	$4,910	2001	-	2011	29.78	26.9	-	110.71%	0.124^	JO
Ol Pejeta Conservancy	Kenya	303	5.694	1	0	0	$1,426	2007@	15.51	2012	22.77	28.5	54.43%	79.90%	0.099	NG, CN
Samburu/BuffaloSprings NR	Kenya	296	3.765	0	1	0	$2,027	2003	7.09	2011	7.77	9.1	77.91%	85.38%	-0.015	SB
Taita Conservancy	Kenya	690	4.140	0	0	0	$290	2002	6.18	2008	2.25	13.5	45.78%	16.67%	-0.123	SMK,BP
Niassa - Riparian	Mozambique	42000	0.363	0	1	1	$123	2005	2.00	2008	2.00	3.6	55.56%	55.56%	0	CMB,KSB
Niassa - Watershed	Mozambique	42000	0.363	0	1	1	$116	2005	0.50	2008	1.00	3.6	13.89%	27.78%	0.231	CMB,KSB
Kunene Conservancy	Namibia	40381	0.297	0	0	1	$90	1999	0.03	2009	0.30	0.60	5.00%	50.00%	0.211	www.desertlion.org
Ongava GR	Namibia	300	0.113	1	0	0	$967	2000	2.15	2009	6.77	3.5	61.43%	193.43%	0.133	KJS
Central district - KNP	South Africa	19485	0.177	1	1	0	$446	-	-	2006	11.45	11.4	-	100.44%	n/a	PF
Hluhluwe iMfolozi Park	South Africa	960	15.91	1	1	0	$3,764	2000	9.79	2010	20.83	13.2	74.18%	157.80%	0.059	DD, RS; Grange *et al.* 2012
Kgalagadi TP	South Africa	36000	0.030	1	1	0	$510	1996	1.16	2001	1.23	15.0	77.33%	82.00%	0.016	PF
Kwandwe PWR	South Africa	185	2.406	1	0	0	$2,567	2001#	2.53	2009	13.51	12.0	21.10%	112.61%	0.165	CB
Lower Sabie - KNP	South Africa	19485	1.798	1	1	0	$6,346	1986	11.30	1995	13.48	14.3	79.02%	94.27%	0.014	PF
Madikwe - GR	South Africa	620	2.004	1	1	0	$4,839	2000#	7.74	2010	17.74	6.0	129.03%	295.70%	0.070	PN, SD
Makalali PWR	South Africa	203	5.120	1	0	0	$938	2000#	10.83	2010	13.81	15.0	72.20%	92.06%	0.062	AD
Phinda PWR	South Africa	246	4.578	1	0	0	$6,543	1999#	12.03	2009	12.28	13.1	91.80%	93.70%	0.155	GB, LH, SN, TD
Pilanesberg NP	South Africa	572	14.87	1	1	0	$3,715	2001#	10.66	2011	11.36	5.8	183.86%	195.90%	0.005	PN, SD
Tembe PWR	South Africa	300	5.337	1	0	0	$690	2002#	1.33	2010	14.67	5.0	26.67%	293.30%	0.244	CH, TB
Welgevonden PWR	South Africa	370	0.625	1	0	0	$4,215	1997#	1.25	2007	7.00	5.8	21.55%	120.69%	0.148	AB
Katavi NP	Tanzania	4471	1.903	0	1	1	$251	2000	10.00	2011	2.53	25.3	39.53%	10.00%	-0.271	TC, JS
Matambwe (Selous GR)	Tanzania	44800	1.035	0	1	0	$242	1999	15.69	2009	14.00	14.3	109.72%	97.90%	-0.015	HBr
Ngorongoro Crater	Tanzania	8288	2.546	0	1	0	$3,621	2002	24.78	2012	22.60	43.1	57.50%	52.50%	0.029	CP
Serengeti NP	Tanzania	14763	1.771	0	1	0	$780	2002	15.64	2012	15.3	18.2	85.98%	84.13%	-0.003	CP
Tarangire NP	Tanzania	2850	3.156	0	1	0	$586	2003	8.55	2010	8.2	9.5	90.00%	86.32%	-0.027	BK, JS
Murchison Falls NP	Uganda	3480	8.293	0	1	0	$318	-	-	2009	3.79	9.0	-	42.11%	n/a	EOO,AP
Ishasha –Q Elizabeth NP	Uganda	1978	37.16	0	1	0	$383	1998	5.18	2008	3.39	31.6	16.39%	10.73%	-0.043	EOO,AP
Bubye Conservancy	Zimbabwe	3440	1.647	1	0	1	$465	1998	0.41	2012	4.94	9.8	4.15%	50.43%	0.180	BL
Hwange NP	Zimbabwe	14600	0.460	0	1	1	$6	2000	1.00	2011	1.70	9.0	11.11%	18.89%	0.020	AL
Malilangwe PWR	Zimbabwe	399	2.475	1	0	1	$1,900	2005#	6.33	2011	9.76	9.8	64.59%	99.59%	0.072	BC
Savé Valley Conservancy	Zimbabwe	2439	4.802	1	0	1	$410	1998	0.24	2011	6.88	8.7	2.76%	79.17%	0.241	RG, CJJ

Table S1. Summary data. GR=Game Reserve, NP=National Park, NR=National Reserve, PWR=Private Wildlife Reserve, TP=Transfrontier Park, KNP=Kruger National Park, PA=Protected Area, SA=Survey Area. Hunt = trophy hunting allowed or known to affect population. Densities are lions per 100 km^2. * densities not available; trend based on decline from initial encounter rate. ^ current density based on total count; population trend based on recurrent transects. # trend calculated between large-scale removals by management. @Reserve size tripled in 2007; trend calculated thereafter. Sources = Initials of authors who monitored each population.

A.C. Burton, E.B. Buedi, C. Balangtaa, D.G. Kpelle, M.K. Sam & J.S. Brashares (2011). The decline of lions in Ghana's Mole National Park. African J. of Ecology, 49: 122-126.

S. Grange, N. Owen-Smith, J.-M. Gaillard, D.J. Druce, M. Moleón & M. Mgobozi (2012). Changes of population trends and mortality patterns in response to the reintroduction of large predators: The case study of African ungulates. Acta Oecologica 42, 16-29.

J.O. Ogutu, N. Owen-Smith, H.P. Piepho & M.Y. Said (2011). Continuing wildlife population declines and range contraction in the Mara region of Kenya during 1977–2009. J. Zool. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00818.x

Country	Purchasing Power Parity[1]	Corruption Index[2]	Governance measure (Principal Component 1)[3]	Political Stability[4]	Government Effectiveness[4]	Regulatory Quality[4]	Rule of Law[4]	Control of Corruption[4]	Voice and Accountability[4]
Benin	2.15	0.95	-0.13	0.44	-0.48	-0.36	-0.69	-0.65	0.31
Botswana	1.63	0.99	-3.49	0.91	0.64	0.58	0.64	0.86	0.41
Cameroon	2.15	0.94	1.93	-0.41	-0.81	-0.69	-1.07	-0.92	-1.03
Ghana	1.69	0.98	-1.57	0.16	0.06	0.12	-0.11	0.06	0.50
Kenya	2.18	0.92	1.64	-1.30	-0.66	-0.17	-1.07	-1.11	-0.32
Mozambique	1.73	0.96	-0.24	0.48	-0.34	-0.32	-0.58	-0.41	-0.07
Namibia	1.53	0.98	-2.16	0.80	0.19	0.08	0.26	0.23	0.30
South Africa	1.61	0.98	-2.14	0.02	0.51	0.42	0.06	0.10	0.56
Tanzania	1.88	0.96	-0.01	0.08	-0.42	-0.38	-0.44	-0.42	-0.14
Uganda	2.16	0.94	1.06	-1.06	-0.63	-0.17	-0.43	-0.87	-0.49
Zimbabwe	1.06	0.89	5.12	-1.44	-1.67	-2.29	-1.91	-1.49	-1.55

Table S2. Country scores for purchasing power parity, corruption index and governance measures.

1. The number of units of a country's currency required to buy the same amount of goods and services in the domestic market as a $US would buy in the United States [UNDP (2008) 2007/2008 Human Development Report: 01 Human development index - GDP index. United Nations Development Programme. New York: USA. Available: http://unstats.un.org/unsd/mdg. Accessed 2010 July 15.]) and the real exchange rate between each country's currency and the $US (as at 14 April 2010), providing the cost of the bundle of goods that make up gross domestic product (GDP) across countries (i.e. dollars needed to buy a dollar's worth of goods in the country as compared to the United States)
2. Estimates of the money lost to corruption based on World Bank estimates of the percentage of revenues firms pay in unofficial payments per annum to public officials. As the relevant information was only available for 58 countries, the percentage of revenue scores were correlated with governance measures for the same countries using the Control of Corruption Index of the World Bank The World Bank Group (2010) Worldwide Governance Indicators. The World Bank Group. Berlin: Germany. Available: http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc_countries.asp. Accessed 2010 July 15.]. See Garnett et al. (PLoS One paper) for details.
3. Principal component score from Principal Component Analysis of scores for Political Stability, Government Effectiveness, Regulatory Quality, Rule of Law, Control of Corruption, Voice and Accountability
4. UNDP (2010) International Human Development Indicators. UNDP, New York: USA Available: http://hdr.undp.org/en/data/trends. Accessed 2010 July 15.

Table S3. A. AIC Models of the ratio of observed to predicted lion densities in all reserves (N=38). B. AIC Models for exponential growth rates of all populations (N=33). Adj. r^2 = adjusted r^2; df = degrees of freedom; AICc = Akaike's corrected information criterion; Δi = difference from best model; Weight = relative Akaike weight. PA size = protected area size. NA/SA = Namibia + South Africa

Current vs Expected population densities across all reserves

	Adj. r^2	df	**AICc**	**Δ_i**	**Weight**
Fence+Budget+Human density	0.643	5	11.88	0	0.20
Fence+Budget+NA/SA	0.630	5	13.24	1.35	0.10
Fence+Budget	0.612	4	13.53	1.65	0.09
Fence+Budget+Human density+Method	0.641	6	13.78	1.90	0.08
Fence+Budget+Human density+NA/SA	0.640	6	13.85	1.96	0.07
Fence+Budget+Governance	0.620	5	14.26	2.38	0.06
Fence+Budget+Human density+Governance	0.635	6	14.38	2.50	0.06
Fence+Budget+PA size	0.618	5	14.55	2.67	0.05
Fence+Budget+Human density+Hunted	0.633	6	14.58	2.70	0.05
Fence+Budget+Human density+PA size	0.633	6	14.64	2.76	0.05

Exponential growth rates across all reserves

	Adj. r^2	**df**	**AICc**	**Δ_i**	**Weight**
Fence+State run	0.376	4	-55.10	0	0.08
Fence+State run+Initial density	0.398	5	-54.56	0.54	0.06
Fence+Initial density	0.364	4	-54.51	0.59	0.06
State run+NA/SA	0.362	4	-54.38	0.72	0.05
Fence+State run+PA size	0.393	5	-54.28	0.81	0.05
Fence+State run+Method	0.384	5	-53.80	1.29	0.04
State run+Initial density+NA/SA	0.375	5	-53.33	1.77	0.03
Fence+State run+Initial density+Method	0.281	6	-53.16	1.94	0.03
Fence+State run+NA/SA	0.365	5	-52.85	2.24	0.02
State run	0.297	3	-52.83	2.27	0.02

Table S4. A. AIC Models of the ratio of observed to predicted lion densities in fenced reserves (N=17). B. AIC Models for exponential growth rates of fenced populations (N=16). Adj. r^2 = adjusted r^2; df = degrees of freedom; AICc = Akaike's corrected information criterion; Δi = difference from best model; Weight = relative Akaike weight. PA size = protected area size. NA/SA = Namibia + South Africa

Current vs Expected population densities in fenced reserves

	Adj. r^2	df	AICc	Δ_i	Weight
PA size+NA/SA	0.355	4	-4.66	0	0.11
PA size+NA/SA+State run	0.449	5	-4.46	0.19	0.10
Governance	0.243	3	-4.25	0.41	0.09
PA size+Governance	0.329	4	-3.98	0.68	0.08
NA/SA	0.223	3	-3.80	0.86	0.07
PA size+State run+Human Density	0.413	5	-3.38	1.27	0.06
NA/SA+Human Density	0.288	4	-2.98	1.68	0.05
PA size+State run+Governance+Budget	0.506	6	-2.74	1.92	0.04
Hunted	0.171	3	-2.70	1.96	0.04
PA size+NA/SA+State run+Budget	0.499	6	-2.50	2.16	0.04

Exponential growth rates in fenced reserves

	Adj. r^2	df	AICc	Δ_i	Weight
Initial density+PA size	0.617	4	-39.87	0	0.30
Initial density+State run	0.594	4	-39.00	0.87	0.20
Initial density	0.515	3	-38.95	0.92	0.19
State run	0.508	3	-38.74	1.13	0.17
Initial density+Human density	0.539	4	-37.09	2.78	0.08
Initial density+PA size+Budget	0.624	5	-36.79	3.08	0.06

Table S5. A. AIC Models of the ratio of observed to predicted lion densities in unfenced reserves (N=21). B. AIC Models for exponential growth rates of unfenced populations (N=17). Adj. r^2 = adjusted r^2; df = degrees of freedom; AICc = Akaike's corrected information criterion; Δi = difference from best model; Weight = relative Akaike weight. PA size = protected area size. NA/SA = Namibia + South Africa

Current vs Expected population densities in unfenced reserves

	Adj. r^2	df	AICc	Δ_i	Weight
Budget+Human density	0.503	4	10.34	0	0.36
Budget+Human density+Hunted	0.511	5	12.15	1.82	0.14
Budget+Human density+State run	0.492	5	13.02	2.68	0.09
Budget+Human density+PA size	0.491	5	13.04	2.71	0.09
Budget+PA size	0.436	4	13.09	2.75	0.09
Budget+Human density+NA/SA	0.484	5	13.35	3.01	0.08
Budget+Human density+Method	0.483	5	13.41	3.07	0.08
Budget+Human density+Governance	0.477	5	13.65	3.32	0.07

Exponential growth rates in unfenced reserves

	Adj. r^2	df	AICc	Δ_i	Weight
Hunted+NA/SA	0.549	4	-28.91	0	0.41
Hunted+NA/SA+Method	0.575	5	-27.07	1.84	0.16
Hunted+NA/SA+State Run	0.556	5	-26.33	2.58	0.11
Hunted+NA/SA+Init.Density	0.547	5	-25.99	2.92	0.09
Hunted+NA/SA+Governance	0.544	5	-25.87	3.05	0.09
Hunted+NA/SA+PA Size	0.536	5	-25.59	3.32	0.08
Hunted+NA/SA+Budget	0.518	5	-24.95	3.97	0.06