

[REDACTED] (Defra)

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 12 April 2012 09:58  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** GWCT snares paper  
**Attachments:** Defra and GWCT snare studies compared by results.docx

Hi [REDACTED]

I gave a hard copy of the attached to [REDACTED] when we saw him yesterday, and it occurs to me that you might find it helpful too, in drawing up your commentary on our paper. I have included a very few titbits that are not in the paper, such as the numbers of target and non-target animals captured by participants during the full year of Trial 1. However, most of it is either a straight lift out of our paper, or rendered into some common currency for comparison with the Defra report. If you prefer not to be influenced by me, don't open it!

I have marked this comparison Confidential only because of the journal's embargo policy. I have received the page-proofs today to check, so it should appear on-line within a few weeks.

All the best,

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
  
[REDACTED]  
[www.gwct.org.uk](http://www.gwct.org.uk)  
[REDACTED]  
+44 (0)1425 652381 (switchboard)

Publications: <http://scholar.google.co.uk/citations?user=CPLe7WAAAAAJ&hl=en>

This communication from the Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust contains information which is confidential and may also be privileged. It is for the exclusive use of the addressee. If you are not the addressee please note that any distribution, copying or use of this communication or the information in it is prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please telephone us immediately to arrange for its return.

The Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust is a charitable company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales under number 05579632, registered charity number 1112023 (England and Wales) and SC038868 (Scotland). VAT Reg 665 2959 92. Registered Office: Burgate Manor, Fordingbridge, Hampshire SP6 1EF Tel: +44(0)1425 652381. Email: [info@gwct.org.uk](mailto:info@gwct.org.uk) Web: [www.gwct.org.uk](http://www.gwct.org.uk)  
Registered Office: Burgate Manor, Fordingbridge, Hampshire SP6 1EF

Game & Wildlife Conservation Trading is a company limited by guarantee (registered no 1503620, VAT Reg No 323 7013 94.) which carries out trading and advisory activities and some fundraising events for the Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust. Registered in England and Wales. Registered Office: Burgate Manor, Fordingbridge, Hampshire SP6 1EF



## Defra study (contract WM0315)

[NB - Defra study included rabbit snares, but only fox snares considered in this comparison.]

### Chronology

- Competitive tender 2007
- Awarded 2008
- Work 2009-2010

### Aims

- Determine extent of use of snares in England and Wales, the circumstances in which the snares are used, and the extent of awareness of statutory requirements and of the Defra Code of Practice (CoP).
- Determine the extent of compliance with statutory requirements and voluntary uptake of the CoP.
- Determine humaneness of snare use in best practice conditions, especially by reference to the AIHTS (international standard).
- Make recommendations about CoP.

### Approach

- Telephone survey of 2,908 randomly-selected landholdings (stratified by land-class) to estimate without bias the extent of use of snares in England and Wales; and to interview a representative sample of snare users about their snaring practices and knowledge of the CoP. Included a limited amount of ground-truthing as a check on telephone answers.

## GWCT breakaway snare study (Wildlife Society Bulletin paper)

- Development 2006-2006
- Field trials 2007-2009
- Determine whether experimental snare had the intended improved selectivity compared with other kinds of fox snare typically in use.
- Determine the effect of capture circumstances (which are strongly influenced by operating practices) on external condition and mortality of animals held in the snare.
- Make recommendations about snare hardware and operating practices.
- Involved 34 gamekeepers from different sites around England and Scotland who agreed to incorporate the new snare among those they normally used in fox control, creating a randomised comparative trial. Participants were not a random or representative sample of all snare-users, but illustrated 34 sets of working practices and skills, a range of fox and non-target densities, and differences in land-use.

- Humaneness of fox snares assessed through field trials in which one skilled technician set snares following CoP recommendations, in one area of England. Captured animals were dispatched and examined post mortem, by veterinary pathologists, for snare-related injuries. The condition of captured animals was compared against an international standard for testing traps (AIHTS).
- Humaneness assessment based on 1 operator; 1,704 snare-nights; PM examination of 14 fox captures, 9 non-target captures.

#### Extent of use

- Snares used on 6% of landholdings.
- Snare users are roughly 50% gamekeepers, 50% farmers. Gamekeeper operators use more snares.
- Fox control took place on 43% of landholdings. Among these, reasons for not using snares (82% of holdings where fox control took place) included avoidance of non-targets, public access, personal preferences. Main reason for using snares in the other 18% was that practical circumstances impaired the success of alternative methods.

#### Training and awareness of the CoP

- Gamekeepers more likely than farmers to have had some form of training and to be familiar with CoP.
- 70% of gamekeepers had received training of some kind (including informal coaching); 40% had been a formal course. For farmers, 30% had training, 4% been on a course.
- 95% of gamekeepers, but only 64% of farmers, were aware of the CoP.
- 66% of gamekeepers, and 47% of farmers, had read the CoP.
- [NB – responses obtained in 2009.]

- Participants filled in detailed daily pro-forma record sheets; this included describing the external condition of captured animals and the circumstances of capture. Because of the pest control context, sample sizes were large, giving plenty of statistical power. Cost and logistics prevented animals being collected and examined post mortem.
- Humaneness predictions based on 34 operators; 119,424 snare-nights; and condition data for 315 fox captures, 63 badger and 457 hare captures.
- 47% of the 34 participants had received formal training (i.e. dedicated course on snares).
- 47% of the 34 participants had read the CoP.
- [NB – responses obtained in 2007.]

#### Legality

- No evidence of illegal practices.
- All snares examined were legal (i.e. not self-locking).

#### Code of Practice

- At the time of study, no CoP-compliant snares were available to buy. (A few operators possessed CoP-compliant snares because they were involved in the GWCT breakaway snare study.)
- Operators selective in adoption of CoP operating practices. Field visits to a small and non-random sub-sample of users found that most operators set at least some snares in sites where entanglement was likely.

#### Selectivity (non-target captures)

- 14 fox captures, plus 27 non-target "captures"<sup>1</sup> (2 nts per fox)  
14 foxes held, plus 9 non-targets held (0.6 nts per fox)  
(5 badgers, 2 hares, 1 pheasant, 1 dog.)

- Animals caught per 1,000 snare nights:  
fox 8.2, badger 7.0, hare, 3.5

- Animals held per 1,000 snare nights:  
fox 8.2, badger 3.0, hare, 1.1

- No evidence of illegal practices.
- Time at which captures discovered confirmed that daily inspections were carried out as required by law.
- All 34 operators already used non-compliant snares. CoP-compliant experimental snares were supplied to mix in with these at random.
- 15% of foxes and badgers held in snares became entangled. 80% of operators had at least one case of entanglement. Conclude that use of locations with high risk of entanglement was a frequent deviation from CoP-recommended practice.
- Highly variable capture ratios:  
0 to 2 badgers per fox (median 0.3)  
0 to 11 hares per fox (median 1.0)
- Captures per operator per year:  
1 to 55 foxes (median 7)  
0 to 17 badgers (median 1.5)  
0 to 315 hares (median 5.0)
- Animals caught per 1,000 snare nights, experimental + other snares:  
fox 6.6, badger 0.7, hare 8.5.  
Experimental snare substantially improved selectivity by allowing high proportions of non-target captures (43% badgers and 70% hares) to self-release, without compromising effectiveness of the snare to catch and hold foxes. This was the result of (a) stop position set to 26 cm; (b) breakaway link.
- Animals held per 1,000 snare nights (experimental snare only):  
fox 6.0, badger 1.7, hare, 2.1

<sup>1</sup> NB – 'capture' defined to include all animals detained by the snare for any period, even momentarily.

#### Humaneness / condition of captured animals

- No evidence from PMs of internal injury that would not be expected from external examination.
- Anecdotal evidence (from field visits to operators) that entanglement caused poor welfare.
- Non-compliant snare operated according to best practice by an experienced technician failed AIHTS requirements, mainly because of mechanical shortcomings that were predictable from CoP recommendations.
- Anecdotal evidence that poor snare design/construction caused poor welfare.
- CoP-compliant snare with CoP working practices passed AIHTS requirements for target species (fox). Non-target sample size too small for assessment, but no significant injuries found. All non-targets judged to be in a fit condition for release.
- A CoP-compliant snare operated according to best practice by an experienced technician passed AIHTS requirements for foxes (non-target species not assessed).

#### CONCLUSIONS

- Suggest Defra consider implementing regulatory system similar to that already in place in Scotland (compulsory training, licensing, etc).
- Evidence strongly supports CoP recommendations, and should be incorporated into training material.

- Condition assessed by external inspection only.
- Among animals held in snares, the probability of injury or death was unequivocally and substantially greater where snares had become entangled with fixed obstacles (for foxes and badgers 40%, compared with 1-5% where entanglement did not occur). This upholds the CoP recommendation to avoid setting snares in cluttered locations where entanglement could occur.
- Non-compliant snares were much less selective than experimental snare. In combination with non-CoP working practices, this led to a level of injury/death that would probably not meet AIHTS requirements.
- A combination of the experimental snare with observed working practices (15% of held animals entangled) was predicted to surpass AIHTS requirements for foxes, but be marginal fail for non-targets.
- A combination of the experimental snare with CoP working practices (no entanglement) was predicted to surpass AIHTS requirements for both foxes and non-targets.
- Well-designed snare hardware and CoP operating practices greatly reduce the problems of poor selectivity and poor humaneness associated with use of snares.
- Evidence strongly supports CoP recommendations, and should be incorporated into training material. Training should be considered essential.