1 **Improving Decision-Making for Sustainable Hunting: Regulatory**
2 **Mechanisms of Hunting Pressure in Red-Legged Partridge**

3
4
5
6
7 4 Jesús Caro^{1*}, Miguel Delibes-Mateos¹, Javier Viñuela¹ Juan Francisco López-Lucero²
8
9 5 and Beatriz Arroyo¹

10
11
12
13
14 7 ¹Instituto de Investigación en Recursos Cinegéticos - IREC (CSIC-UCLM-JCCM),
15
16
17 8 Ronda de Toledo s/n. 13071. Ciudad Real, Spain.
18
19 9 ² Instituto de Investigaciones Oceanológicas, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California,
20
21
22 10 Km. 107 Carretera Tijuana-Ensenada. Ensenada, Baja California, México. 22862.
23

24
25
26 12 *Correspondence author. E-mail: jcaro@ugr.es. Telephone: +34926295300 ext 3360;
27
28 13 Fax: +34926295451.

29
30
31 14
32
33
34 15
35
36
37
38 16
39
40
41
42 17
43
44
45
46 18
47
48
49
50 19
51
52
53
54 20
55
56
57
58 21
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

22 **Abstract**

23
24 Knowledge about how hunting pressure is determined, and the relative efficacy of
25 different mechanisms to regulate harvest, may help to improve the managers' decision-
26 making process. We developed a general framework about the decision-making process
27 that regulates red-legged partridge (*Alectoris rufa*) hunting pressure in central Spain
28 based on information from a focus group and individual interviews with game
29 managers. We also used available information to compare the efficiency of different
30 tools potentially improving some decision steps. We evaluated the cost-effectiveness of
31 different population monitoring methods as a way to reduce uncertainty on partridge
32 availability to hunters. Additionally, we investigated the relationship between annual
33 harvest and various regulatory mechanisms of partridge hunting pressure used in the
34 study area, to identify the most potentially useful one to limit annual take-off. Game
35 managers usually set hunting pressure after a qualitative assessment of population
36 abundance prior to the hunting season, but this decision was frequently modified during
37 the course of the hunting season according to variations in catch or perceived abundance
38 at that time. Our results showed that Kilometric Abundance Indices (counting partridges
39 from cars along line transects) was a simple cost-efficient and reliable estimate of
40 partridge density (estimated by Distance Sampling). A variety of regulatory
41 mechanisms were used. The variables that most affected annual harvest (in addition to
42 partridge abundance) were the number of driven-shooting days, and hunter density in
43 walked-up hunting days, suggesting that their adjustment may be the most efficient
44 regulatory mechanisms. We conclude that adequate monitoring on population
45 abundance should be a critical step for managers' decision-making, and that a better
46 understanding of the relative value of regulatory mechanisms, combining social and

ecological approaches, would help improving our understanding of any human-mediated system, thus leading to better management recommendations.

Key-words: *Alectoris rufa*; *Distance Sampling*; *focus group*; *game management*; *harvest*; *renewable resource*.

Introduction

The sustainable use of natural resources has become an explicitly stated goal of governments, managers and stakeholders, particularly after the Earth Summit declaration (UN Conference on Environment and Development in 1992). Sustainable use of renewable natural resources is possible if rates of use do not exceed rates of regeneration (Daly 1991; Lande et al. 1997; Weinbaum et al. 2013). Management that includes regulatory mechanisms of resource use has therefore the potential to avoid overexploitation (Sutherland 2001; Aanes et al. 2002). However, in practice, management tactics have often focused on maximizing short-term yield and economic gain, rather than long-term ecological sustainability (Christensen et al. 1996). Ecological monitoring is essential in the context of sustainable use because it provides crucial information on the state of the resource and the effectiveness of management actions (Sinclair et al. 2000; Bunnefeld et al. 2011), but accurate monitoring is costly and unattainable at times (Kinahan and Bunnefeld 2012). Uncertainty and imperfect knowledge may lead to wrong decisions and ultimately inefficient management and a loss of both biodiversity and human welfare (Milner-Gulland 2011). Given that resources for management and ecological monitoring are often limited, prioritization

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

71 and evaluation of cost-efficiency of management and monitoring activities is
72 particularly important (Caughlan and Oakley 2001).
73
74 A good example of renewable resources is game species. Although humans have hunted
75 wildlife for millennia, increasing human populations, improved hunting technologies
76 and growing commercial interests have contributed to increase pressure on wildlife
77 populations. In fact, overhunting is currently considered one of the major threats to
78 wildlife (Keane et al. 2005; BirdLife International 2012; Weinbaum et al. 2013).
79 Sustained hunting demands despite declining trends in some game species will
80 undoubtedly require more intensive and wiser management to support hunters' needs in
81 a sustainable way. Indeed, game managers increasingly use different management
82 measures to boost wild game populations and harvest (Oldfield et al. 2003; Draycott et
83 al. 2007), as well as mechanisms to regulate harvest in an effort to make this practice
84 sustainable (Taylor and Dunston 1996; Sinclair et al. 2006).
85
86 As with other natural resources, game management decisions are most likely to achieve
87 their objectives if they are based on evidence and accurate information. They are,
88 however, sometimes based on factors other than objective facts, like perceptions or
89 attitudes (e.g. Delibes-Mateos et al. 2013), or taken facing uncertainty or incomplete
90 information (Bischof et al. 2012). For example, the level of uncertainty about true
91 population size is frequently high, even when considerable resources are invested
92 (Buckland et al. 1993; Norvell et al. 2003), and this uncertainty influences the
93 population outcomes of harvest levels in the long term (Brooke and Tschapka 2002;
94 Strand et al. 2012; Nuno et al. 2013). Additionally, and despite their potential
95 importance to allow sustainability of game hunting, the relative efficacy of different

mechanisms (e.g. adjusting the number of hunters per day or number of hunting days, variable hunting quotas, etc.) to regulate harvest has received less attention in the literature than other management activities (e.g. Baines et al. 2004; Bicknell et al. 2010; Broseth et al. 2012; Mustin et al. 2012), especially in Mediterranean countries. In this context, understanding the decision-making process in game managers could be useful to identify areas of uncertainty, as well as decision steps that need further attention.

Red-legged partridge (*Alectoris rufa*) hunting is an important economic activity in many areas of Western Europe (Beja et al. 2009; Bicknell et al. 2010; Díaz-Fernández et al. 2012). Its populations have declined markedly over recent decades (Birdlife International 2012). In Spain, which holds 77% of the world population, partridge decline has been attributed to changes in agricultural practices and overhunting (Blanco-Aguilar et al. 2004; Díaz-Fernández et al. 2013). Following this decline, the use of different game management tools (including regulatory mechanisms of hunting pressure) to increase partridge populations has become very frequent in Spain (Ríos-Saldaña 2010). However, a mismatch between abundance and take still happens in many estates, which leads to lower densities (Díaz-Fernández et al. 2013), suggesting that harvest decisions are not optimal.

The main aim of this study is to improve our understanding of managers' decision-making processes, and to evaluate the efficiency of different tools potentially improving some decision steps, in order to support sustainable use of red-legged partridges. Our partial objectives included: i) to develop a general framework to explore the decision-making process that regulates partridge hunting pressure in central Spain, one of the main regions for small-game hunting in the Iberian Peninsula (Ríos-Saldaña 2010); ii)

to evaluate the most cost-efficient monitoring method among those frequently used in the scientific literature to estimate partridge abundance, as a way to reduce uncertainty on partridge availability to hunters; and iii) to assess the relationship between some of the main regulatory mechanisms of partridge hunting pressure used in the study area and partridge harvest, thus their relative efficacy in regulating captures. We discuss the value of doing better monitoring and implementing more efficient regulatory mechanisms for the ecological and socio-economic sustainability of exploitation of renewable natural resources.

Material and methods

Study area and context

The study area is located in central Spain (latitudes ranging from 37.98N to 40.33N and longitudes from 6.48W to 2.11W), which encompasses Spain's most productive hunting lands both historically and currently (Macaulay et al. 2013). Landscapes are dominated by open areas with different proportions of cultivated land and natural vegetation (mainly Mediterranean scrub). Small game hunting is both socially and economically important here (Garrido 2012), where >80 % of the territory is covered by hunting estates (Ríos-Saldaña 2010). Red-legged partridges are the main game bird species (Arroyo et al. 2012). There have been a number of studies in this study area that provide useful information to explore aspects related to hunting decision-making process (e. g. Ríos-Saldaña 2010; Arroyo et al. 2012; Díaz-Fernández 2012; Díaz-Fernández et al. 2012).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

146 The general hunting season in the study area runs from early October to late February,
147 closing before the onset of the partridge breeding season. The main methods used to
148 hunt red-legged partridges are walked-up and driven shooting (Rios-Saldaña 2010). In
149 driven shooting, assistants beat the land to flush partridges and drive them towards a
150 strategically arranged line of hunters. In walked-up shooting, hunters (with or without
151 dogs) shoot the partridges as they encounter them (Barbosa et al. 2004).

152
153 *General framework of decision-making process and regulatory mechanisms of hunting*
154 *pressure*

155
156 We aimed to capture a general picture of the decision-making process of partridge
157 hunting pressure, rather than to present a complete and statistically representative
158 reflection of different management options within the study area. To do so, we collected
159 qualitative information through a focus group (including six people) and individual
160 semi-structured interviews (n=10) with small-game managers. Such exploratory
161 methodology is increasingly used to assess environmental phenomena in depth (e.g.
162 Fischer and Young 2007). Collection of these data took place in 2012. Managers were
163 selected from a database of hunting estates that had previously collaborated with our
164 institute (Delibes-Mateos et al. 2013).

165
166 The discussion group and unstructured interviews generally started with a broad
167 question about how partridge hunting pressure was decided, then focusing about when
168 decisions were made and how partridge abundance (i.e. availability) was estimated in
169 the case this was used. The last part of the discussion was usually dedicated to exploring
170 the regulatory mechanisms used to regulate hunting pressure. Interviews and focus

group were facilitated or carried out by JC and MDM. Discussions were transcribed, and we used a descriptive method frequently employed to interpret textual data (e.g. Schüttler et al. 2011). This consisted of an iterative process that started with the identification of the main issues such as when the decisions were made, which regulatory mechanisms were used or how population abundance was estimated. This provided the foundations to build the general framework. After that we identified different options (e.g. different regulatory mechanisms) within the main categories, which provided a picture of the diversity of management options. In order to reinforce the discursive nature of this part of the paper, we have included an S1 in Electronic Supplementary Material showing literal quotations from discussions (Oñate and Peco 2005; hereafter we refer to each quotation as *Q_{ni}* where *ni* is the specific number in the S1).

Partridge abundance estimates

In order to evaluate the efficacy of different partridge abundance estimating methods, which could lead to recommendations about how to reduce uncertainty of partridge availability for harvest decisions, we used data from field surveys carried out in summer (between cereal harvesting and mid-August) 2004–2005 and 2008–2012. Therefore, our partridge abundance estimates related to annual maximum abundance, i.e. after the breeding season and before the hunting season. Surveys were based on both point count and line transect methods, as these are the main ones used in the scientific literature (e.g. Borralho et al. 1996; Buenestado et al. 2009; Díaz-Fernández et al. 2013). They were carried out from sunrise to about three hours later and the three last hours of the day, avoiding the hottest central hours, when activity is lowest (Ricci 1989), and adverse

weather conditions (Bibby et al. 1992). Using binoculars, observers counted partridges during 10 minutes in points situated along tracks and distant 700–750 m from each other. Distance between observer and each partridge observed was visually estimated. Intervals between points were driven at a constant speed (around 20 km/h), and all partridges observed from the car during these transects were noted. Partridges observed were categorised according to whether they were alone, in pairs or in ‘clusters’ (>2 partridges). From that information, we calculated the following abundance estimates:

a) Partridge density

We calculated partridge density estimated using Distance Sampling 6.0 software (Thomas et al. 2010) and observations obtained in point counts (where distance to partridges observed was noted). We used this value as the reference method, as it represents the most accurate scenario of true population abundance (Thomas et al. 2010; Fernandez de Simon et al. 2011). Multiple covariate distance sampling (MCDS) was used to examine the effect of habitat type and observer on the detectability of animals (Diefenbach et al. 2003; Marques et al. 2007). To create the detection function a minimum number of observations in each estate is required and abundance estimates of partridges showing a coefficient of variation higher than 40% were not considered (Gottschalk and Huettmann 2010). Sample size for comparisons thus was n=32. See S2 for more details.

b) Kilometric Abundance Indices (KAIs)

220 We estimated KAI as total number of partridges observed during transects divided by
221 total kilometres driven in an estate (Borrallho et al. 1996). Additionally, we calculated
222 the number of clusters observed during transects, divided by total km driven
223 (cluster/km). In three game estates KAIs were not assessed. On average, 58.3 ± 51.9 (SD)
224 km (range 13.0–276.5, n=30) of line transects were driven in each estate.

225

226 c) Indices from partridge observations in points

227

228 We assessed partridge/point as total partridges observed during point counts divided by
229 the total number of points monitored in an estate (Díaz-Fernández et al. 2012). On
230 average, 76.7 ± 72.5 SD (range 20–424, n=32) points were monitored per estate.

231 Additionally, we calculated the number of clusters observed in point counts, divided by
232 total number of points monitored (cluster/point) and percentage of points with at least
233 one contact (% positive points).

234

235 d) Average cluster size

236

237 We also calculated the average size of clusters observed during transects and for
238 clusters observed during transects, as this related to an estimate sometimes used by
239 managers (see results).

240

241 Finally, we estimated the relative cost of each method tested. In order to do this, we
242 implemented each method in five estates during summer 2013, and we calculated the
243 average time and fuel expenditure needed for censusing an area of 10 km².

244

245 *Effect of regulatory mechanisms on partridge harvest*

246

247 To assess the effect of different regulatory mechanisms on partridge harvest, we used
248 information from a database of 59 game estates in central Spain, gathered through face-
249 to-face interviews with game managers in 2005 and 2008–2010 within previous projects
250 (see for more details Arroyo et al. 2012; Delibes-Mateos et al. 2013). In this study, we
251 used information on estate size, the number of partridges harvested in the study season,
252 the number of walked-up and driven shooting days in that season (hunting days), as well
253 as average number of hunters participating each hunting day in both hunting methods.
254 We calculated harvest per area and hunter density by dividing annual harvest and
255 number of hunters per hunting day by the estate surface, to obtain comparable figures
256 among estates (Table S3.1). We also considered whether there were hunting quotas (a
257 binomial variable, yes or no, as we did not have information to identify the type of
258 quota), and whether there was any spatial limitation of hunting (either through hunt-free
259 reserves, or through dividing the estate in several sections and hunting each section in
260 different days, see results). This latter variable had five ordinal values, from 1 (no
261 spatial regulation) to 5 (at least 10% of the estate was hunt-free or there was higher
262 spatial division of hunting days). As harvest should be related to abundance (Willebrand
263 et al. 2011 and references therein), we also included in the analyses an estimate of
264 abundance in those estates based on field observations (see above). We used
265 partridges/point, as this estimate was the best fit in relation to density (see results). We
266 did not use partridge density because we could not calculate this variable for several of
267 the study estates with management information (see S2). We obtained information on
268 all of these variables (regulatory mechanisms as well as abundance) for a total of 39
269 estates.

270

271 *Statistical analyses*

272

273 Relationships between partridge density (Distance Sampling estimates from point count
274 data) and other abundance indices were examined with linear regressions with the R-
275 function `lm` (library `stats`; R development Core Team 2013). We used non-linear
276 distributions when higher r^2 were obtained (Sokal and Rohlf 1995).

277

278 The relationship between harvest and the different regulatory mechanisms used in
279 hunting estates was modelled with General Linear Models, with the R-function `glm`
280 (library `car`). We used harvest per area as response variable (normal distribution and
281 identity link), and partridge abundance, number of walked-up hunting days, number of
282 driven-shooting days, hunter density in walked-up shooting days, hunter density in
283 driven-shooting days, existence of quotas, and spatial limitation of hunting as
284 explanatory variables. Additionally, we considered the interaction between number of
285 hunting days and hunter density for each hunting method, and the existence of quotas
286 and number of walked-up hunting days (no quotas exist for driven-shooting). We
287 performed all possible combinations of these explanatory variables, as all of those
288 models were plausible and we were interested in whether each regulatory mechanism
289 alone or in combination with others could better explain annual harvest variation among
290 estates. We did this with the function `dredge` (library `MuMIn`), selected the models with
291 $\Delta AIC_c < 2$ (Burham and Anderson 2002), and calculated model-averaged parameter
292 estimates for the variables included in those models, as well as their relative importance
293 (RVI), calculated as sum of Akaike weights across all the models in the set where that
294 variable occurred (Burham and Anderson 2002).

295

296 **Results**

297

298 *General framework of decision-making process and regulatory mechanisms of hunting*
299 *pressure*

300

301 According to the interviewed managers or participants in our focus group, the decision-
302 making process that regulates partridge hunting pressure in central Spain includes three
303 important steps. First, managers agreed that partridge abundance is usually assessed in
304 summer (Fig. 1a), after partridge reproduction. According to their comments, this
305 assessment is rarely based on systematic surveys, rather usually made through personal
306 observations (see Q1-2 in S1), or through qualitative information provided by other
307 people (i.e. game-keepers, farmers, shepherds). Some managers mentioned that they
308 based their harvest decision according to relative number of partridge chicks or cluster
309 size observed in summer (Q3).

310

311 Second, there was a consensus among managers about the fact that hunting pressure
312 should be regulated to make this activity sustainable (Q4). Most managers agreed that
313 decision-making about hunting pressure takes place before the official start of the
314 hunting season (around mid-October; Fig. 1a; see an example in Q5). Options vary from
315 hunting without any self-regulation to banning hunting in low partridge abundance
316 years (Fig. 1a). This latest is an extreme option that, according to the managers, rarely
317 occurs.

318

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

319 Finally, participants declared that a second decision regarding hunting pressure
320 regulation is frequently made during the course of the hunting season (Fig. 1b).
321 According to statements, this decision may be based on the number of partridges
322 harvested during the hunting season, the number of partridges flushed during the hunt,
323 or even on the mood (degree of satisfaction) of the hunters at the end of the day (Fig. 1b
324 and Q6–7). Thus, further hunting regulations can be imposed along the hunting season
325 (Fig. 1b), for example shortening the season or even stopping it (see below). One
326 manager also mentioned that hunting pressure can be exceptionally increased during the
327 hunting season (Fig. 1b; e.g. organizing an extra driven shooting day) if partridges are
328 extremely abundant one given year.

329
330 With regard to regulatory mechanisms of hunting pressure, managers declared that
331 limiting hunter numbers is commonly used. Nevertheless, it was acknowledged that this
332 is a difficult task in some estates (Q8). Participants also commented that limitation of
333 the number of hunting days is very common (Q9). This limitation can be done by
334 starting hunting after the official date of opening the season (Q10), or finishing it before
335 the official end of the season (Q11). Game managers declared that the number of
336 hunting days is generally set before the start of the hunting season (decision 1; Fig. 1a),
337 although it is frequently modified (e.g. shortening the season; see above) according to
338 the evolution of harvesting (decision 2; Fig. 1b). In addition, some managers said a
339 limitation of duration of hunting in a given day is usually self-imposed (Q12). An
340 alternative frequent way of regulating pressure is limiting hunting spatially through
341 establishing hunting-free reserves. However, most managers acknowledged that free-
342 hunting reserves are established just because these are imposed by law (Q13).
343 Furthermore, managers mentioned that setting hunting quotas (limiting the number of

partridges to be shot per hunter and day) is also frequently used. Managers also pointed out that quotas are usually fixed before the start of the hunting season (decision 1; Fig. 1a), but can be adjusted during the season (decision 2; Fig. 1b). Game managers also commented that quotas are very variable among estates, and actively discussed about their usefulness (see examples of opposing views in Q14–15). Finally, it was briefly stated in the focus group that another potential way of regulating hunting pressure is through modulating the use of different methods to hunt partridges; for example, organizing an extra driven shooting day those years in which partridge abundance is higher.

Partridge abundance estimates

All our abundance estimates except average cluster size were significantly and positively correlated with partridge density (Table 1 and Fig. 2). Among estimates, the number of partridges per observation point showed the best fit in relation to the reference method, although the relationship with KAI and cluster/km was also very high (Table 1). Time needed to census 10 km² was around half as low in line transect methods than observation point methods (65.33±13.29 SD and 129±8.88 SD min, respectively). Similarly, line transect methods had lower fuel costs (4.87±1.51 SD L) than observation point methods (5.89±2.84 SD L). Presence/point had time cost of 102±22.31 (SD) min (22.31 SD) and fuel cost of 5.89±2.84 (SD) L. Line transects were thus more cost-efficient.

Relationship between harvest and regulatory mechanisms

The variables that best explained variation in harvest per area among hunting estates were number of driven-shooting days over the season, density of hunters in walked-up hunting days, partridge abundance and density of hunters in driven-shooting days (Table 2 and Table S3.2). Of these, the first three were the ones with highest relative importance and harvest per area was positively related to all of them (Table 2). Additionally, harvest per area was lower in those estates where the density of hunters in driven-shooting days was higher (Table 2). Only nine studied estates offered driven-shooting days (between 2 and 13 days per hunting season). Analyses carried out excluding these estates showed that the best variables explaining variation in harvest per area were density of hunters in walked-up shooting days ($RVI=0.77$) and partridge abundance ($RVI=0.72$). No detectable effect of hunting quotas and spatial limitation of hunting were detected.

Discussion

Better monitoring for sustainable harvest

Game managers in our study acknowledged that harvest regulations are essential to mitigate current red-legged partridge population decline, and thus maintain sustainable hunting bags. In this regard, a critical premise for efficient regulation mechanisms is to acquire reliable data on population size, based on adequate monitoring (Sutherland 2001; Freckleton et al. 2006; Msoffe et al. 2009; Jakob et al. 2014). Managers and scientists often rely on indices of population size (e.g. indirect information) that may be more or less tightly correlated with true population size (Solberg and Sæther 1999; Fernandez de Simon et al. 2011; Strand et al. 2012). According to our findings,

managers in our study estimate relative partridge abundance using qualitative information, instead of any repeatable (and comparable) methodology, which is likely associated with a higher degree of error and uncertainty about true population size. An increasing number of studies highlight the effects of uncertainty of wildlife survey monitoring data on the predicted consequences of different harvest scenarios (Bunnefeld et al. 2009; Holland 2010; Nuno et al. 2013). This means that current red-legged partridge harvest decisions might lead to under-harvesting or over-harvesting, both of which have potential negative consequences (economically and ecologically, respectively; see also Díaz-Fernández et al. 2012; 2013).

Unfortunately, it was not possible in our study to assess the exact magnitude of the error associated with managers' estimates, since we did not have manager's estimates for the studied localities while we executed field surveys. Studies evaluating this would be critical to assess whether and when managers under- or overestimate partridge population size, and thus predict the population consequences of management decisions. In any case, some of the indices used by managers to estimate abundance (e.g. cluster size) were not related to density, so errors could be high. The fact that decisions about hunting pressure are frequently modified during the hunting season (according to temporal variations in harvest), even in estates where abundance have been previously estimated, also suggests that initial abundance estimates could be insufficiently accurate to allow appropriate regulation decisions. In any case, other factors like high mortality rate after initial abundance estimates due, for example, to disease outbreaks (Gamino et al. 2012), could be also play an important role in the modification of initial hunting pressure.

Our results also showed that counting partridges or clusters in car-driven line transects is a cost-effective reliable method to estimate population size, as previously suggested by other authors (Ricci 1989; Borralho et al. 1996). Implementing this simple population assessment may thus enable to improve the decision-making on hunting pressure for a sustainable harvest of red-legged partridges. Further studies should however evaluate whether accuracy of population estimates based on KAI holds at lower partridge densities. This is important as partridge densities observed in a few of our study estates (Fig. 2) were very high as compared with other areas in the Iberian Peninsula (e.g. Borralho et al. 1996; Duarte and Vargas 2001; Buenestado et al. 2009), probably because they may have released farm-bred partridges in early summer (see Díaz-Fernández et al. 2013).

430

Improving regulatory mechanisms

432

In our study, we observed that hunting pressure had higher relative importance explaining variations in annual harvest in hunting estates than variations in partridge abundance. Similar results have been reported for willow grouse (*Lagopus lagopus*) in northern Europe (Willebrand et al. 2011). These results highlight the potential of appropriate regulatory mechanisms to avoid overharvesting, thus leading to sustainable (or even increasing) game species populations (Willebrand and Hörnell 2001; Aanes et al. 2002; Willebrand et al. 2011).

440

Regulatory mechanisms identified in this study included limiting the number of hunting days or hunter density, setting hunting quotas (as a limit to the number of animals shot per hunter and hunting day), and other mechanisms like limiting hunting spatially or

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

444 regulating the frequency of different hunting methods. Regulatory mechanisms in
445 central Spain are thus similar to those used for other game species in other areas (Taylor
446 and Dunstone 1996; Calvert and Gauthier 2005; Broseth et al. 2012; Wam et al. 2013).
447 Assessments of different regulatory mechanisms allow determining the optimal
448 implementation of harvest regulations (Conroy et al. 2002; Willebrand et al. 2011; Wam
449 et al. 2013). Our results indicate that for red-legged partridge estates, modifying the
450 number of driven-shooting days or hunter density in walked-up shooting days has the
451 highest likelihood of modifying total take-off in the estate over the hunting season, and
452 would thus be the most effective tools to be used to regulate harvest. The negative
453 relationship found between partridge harvest and driven-shooting hunter density after
454 taking into account number of driven-shooting days probably reflects that driven-
455 shooting days offered in non-commercial hunting estates are attended by a large number
456 of hunters, but lead to smaller harvest, whereas commercial estates offering driven-
457 shooting days usually limit the number of hunters to obtain higher prices. In any case,
458 this variable had a low relative importance explaining harvest per area.
459
460 Interestingly, harvest was unrelated to number of walked-up hunting days (even in
461 interaction with hunter density), although modifying number of hunting days over the
462 season is frequently applied according to manager's comments. Similarly, variables like
463 the existence of daily quotas or spatial limiting of hunting did not have a significant
464 relation to annual harvest. The latter may be related to the coarseness of the variables as
465 used in our analyses, but this suggests that managers may be using tools for regulating
466 hunting that are inefficient, as they do not necessarily lead to lower harvest. In fact,
467 hunting daily quotas were applied in 62 % of estates sampled, while average spatial

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

468 limitation affected <10 % of estate area (Table S3.2), thus in many estates these
469 regulatory mechanisms seem to be poor.

470

471 *Conclusions*

472

473 In contrast to the view that mortality through hunting is mostly compensatory
474 (Andersen 2008), it is now widely recognized that harvesting may alter the abundance
475 and population dynamics of game species (Solberg et al. 1999; Weinbaum et al. 2013).
476 Game species thus require a dynamic and adaptive harvest management strategy
477 (Broseth et al. 2012), due to large interannual variation in demographic rates, such as
478 recruitment and survival (Watson and Moss 2008; Delibes-Mateos et al. 2009;
479 Martínez-Padilla et al. 2014). Our work supports the notion that improving monitoring
480 (leading to better knowledge of population abundance before the hunting season) would
481 in turn lead to better management decisions (i.e. better adjustment of hunting pressure to
482 abundance; Aanes et al. 2002). Additionally, it highlights that a high proportion of
483 managers may currently be using inadequate tools to regulate harvest, as they do not
484 necessarily lead to overall lower catches, which may have unwanted population
485 consequences and may contribute to explain the decline this species is suffering
486 (Blanco-Aguilar et al. 2004; BirdLife International 2012). On the other hand, it is
487 important to remember that the discrepancy between harvest intentions by managers and
488 how harvest is realized can be substantial (Bischof et al. 2012 and reference therein).
489 Further studies should therefore also investigate hunters' preferences for different
490 regulatory mechanisms (Andersen 2008), so long-term consequences of these on
491 populations and estate sustainability can be fully evaluated.

492

More broadly, our study example reminds that a good understanding of any human-mediated ecological system needs a combination of both ecological and social approaches, including studies on factors influencing management or market decisions, on the relative efficacy of different management options and also, as mentioned above, on uncertainty when implementing rules and regulations (i.e., factors affecting behavior of the end-user, in this case hunters). This broader approach will likely lead to better management recommendations, ecologically efficient and more likely to be implemented as appropriate.

Electronic Supplementary Material

Supplementary data related to this article can be found online at... XXX

Acknowledgments

We are very grateful to the many people who aided with fieldwork and game managers for their collaboration and cooperation. S. Díaz-Fernández carried out all face-to-face questionnaires to game managers. J. Vicente helped with the Distance Sampling analysis. N. Bunnefeld and E. Newton provided helpful suggestions on a previous draft. J.C. had a postdoctoral contract jointly financed by the European Social Fund and JCCM (Operational Programme FSE 2007-2013); M.D.M. was supported by a JAE-doc contract, funded by CSIC and the ESF. Work was supported by the European Commission (7th Framework Programme for R&D through project HUNT, 212160, FP7-ENV-2007-1); Consejería de Agricultura of JCCM; by the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología (CGL2008-04282/BOS), and by CSIC (PIE 201330E105).

518 **References**

- 519 Aanes S, Engen S, Sæther B-E, Willebrand T, Marcström V (2002) Sustainable
520 harvesting strategies of willow ptarmigan in a fluctuating environment. *Ecol*
521 *Appl* 12:281–290.
- 522 Andersen O (2008) Attitudes of hunters and managers toward harvest regulations of
523 willow ptarmigan in Norway [Master thesis] Hedmark University College,
524 Hamar.
- 525 Arroyo B, Delibes-Mateos M, Díaz-Fernández S, Viñuela J (2012) Hunting
526 management in relation to profitability aims: red-legged partridge hunting in
527 central Spain. *Eur J Wildlife Res* 58:847–855.
- 528 Baines D, Moss R, Dugan D (2004) Capercaillie breeding success in relation to forest
529 habitat and predator abundance. *J Appl Ecol* 41:59–71.
- 530 Barbosa AM, Vargas J, Farfán MA, Real R, Guerrero JC (2004) Caracterización del
531 aprovechamiento cinegético de los mamíferos en Andalucía. *Galemys* 16:41–59.
- 532 Beja P, Gordinho L, Reino L, Loureiro F, Santos-Reis M, Borralho R (2009) Predator
533 abundance in relation to small game management in southern Portugal:
534 conservation implications. *Eur J Wildlife Res* 55:227–238.
- 535 Bibby CJ, Burgess ND, Hill DA (2000) Bird census techniques. BTO-RSPB Academic
536 Press, London.
- 537 Bicknell J, Smart J, Hoccom D, Amar A, Evans A et al. (2010) Impacts of non-native
538 gamebird release in the UK: a review. RSPB Research Report no. 40.
539 Bedfordshire: RPSB.

- 540 BirdLife International (2012) *Alectoris rufa*. In: IUCN 2013. IUCN Red List of
541 Threatened Species. Version 2013.2. Available: www.iucnredlist.org. Accessed
542 4 April 2014.
- 543 Bischof R, Nilsen EB, Brøseth H, Männil P, Ozoliņš J et al. (2012) Implementation
544 uncertainty when using recreational hunting to manage carnivores. *J Appl Ecol*
545 49:824–832.
- 546 Blanco-Aguilar JA, Virgós E, Villafuerte R (2004) Perdiz Roja (*Alectoris rufa*). In:
547 Madroño A, González C, Atienza JC (eds). Libro rojo de las aves de España.
548 Madrid, Dirección General para la Biodiversidad-SEO/BirdLife, pp 182–185.
- 549 Borralho R, Rego F, Vaz Pinto P (1996) Is driven transect sampling suitable for
550 estimating red-legged partridge *Alectoris rufa* densities? *Wildlife Biol* 2:259–
551 268.
- 552 Brooke AP, Tschapka M (2002) Threats from overhunting to the flying fox, *Pteropus*
553 *tonganus*, (Chiroptera: Pteropodidae) on Niue Island, South Pacific Ocean. *Biol*
554 *Conserv* 103:343–348.
- 555 Brøseth H, Nilsen NB, Pedersen HC (2012) Temporal quota corrections based on
556 timing of harvest in a small game species. *Eur J Wildlife Res* 58:797–802.
- 557 Buckland ST, Ahmadi S, Staines W, Gordon IJ, Youngson RW (1993) Estimating the
558 minimum population size that allows a given annual number of mature red deer
559 stags to be culled sustainably. *J Appl Ecol* 33:118–130.
- 560 Buenestado FJ, Ferreras P, Blanco-Aguilar JA, Tortosa F, Villafuerte R (2009) Survival
561 and causes of mortality among wild Red-legged Partridges *Alectoris rufa* in
562 southern Spain: implications for conservation. *Ibis* 151:720–730.

563 Bunnefeld N, Baines D, Newborn D, Milner-Gulland EJ (2009) Factors affecting
 564 unintentional harvesting selectivity in a monomorphic species. *J Anim Ecol*
 565 78:485–492.
 566 Bunnefeld N, Hoshino E, Milner-Gulland EJ (2011) Management strategy evaluation: a
 567 powerful tool for conservation? *Trends Ecol Evol* 26:441–447.
 568 Burnham KP, Anderson DR (2002) Model selection and multimodel inference: a
 569 practical information-theoretic approach, 2nd edn. Springer-Verlag, New York.
 570 Calvert AM, Gauthier G (2005) Effects of exceptional conservation measures on
 571 survival and seasonal hunting mortality in greater snow geese. *J Appl Ecol*
 572 42:442–452.
 573 Caughlan L, Oakley KL (2001) Cost considerations for long-term ecological
 574 monitoring. *Ecol Indic* 1:123–134.
 575 Christensen NL, Bartuska AM, Brown JH, Carpenter S, Antonio CD et al. (1996) The
 576 report of the ecological society of America committee on the scientific basis for
 577 ecosystem management. *Ecol Appl* 6:665–691.
 578 Conroy MJ, Miller MW, Hines JE (2002) Identification and synthetic modeling of
 579 factors affecting American black duck populations. *Wildlife Monogr* 150:1–64.
 580 Daly HE (1991) *Steady State Economics*. Island Press, Washington.
 581 Delibes-Mateos M, Díaz-Fernández S, Ferreras P, Viñuela J, Arroyo B (2013) The role
 582 of economic and social factors driving predator control in small-game estates in
 583 central Spain. *Ecol Soc* 18 (2):28.
 584 Delibes-Mateos M, Ferreras P, Villafuerte R (2009) European rabbit population trends
 585 and associated factors: a review of the situation in the Iberian Peninsula.
 586 *Mammal Rev* 39:124–140.

587 Díaz-Fernández S (2012) Relationships between red-legged partridge hunting
588 management, red-legged partridge populations, and human populations (PhD
589 Thesis) University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real.

590 Díaz-Fernández S, Arroyo B, Casas F, Martínez-Haro M, Viñuela J (2013) Effect of
591 game management on wild red-legged partridge abundance. Plos One 8:e66671.

592 Díaz-Fernández S, Viñuela J, Arroyo B (2012) Harvest of red-legged partridge in
593 central Spain. J Wildlife Manage 76:1354–1363.

594 Diefenbach DR, Brauning DW, Mattice JA (2003) Variability in grassland bird counts
595 related to observer differences and species detection rates. Auk 120:1168–1179.

596 Draycott RAH, Hoodless AN, Sage RB (2007) Effects of pheasant management on
597 vegetation and birds in lowland woodlands. J Appl Ecol 45:334–341.

598 Duarte J, Vargas JM (2001) Survey methods for red-legged partridge (*Alectoris rufa*) in
599 olive groves in Southern Spain. Game & Wildlife Science 18:141–156.

600 Fernandez de Simon J, Díaz-Ruiz F, Cirilli F, Sánchez Tortosa F, Villafuerte R et al.
601 (2011) Towards a standardized index of European rabbit abundance in Iberian
602 Mediterranean habitats. Eur J Wildlife Res 57:1091–1100.

603 Fischer A, Young J (2007) Understanding mental constructs of biodiversity:
604 implications for biodiversity management and conservation. Biol Conserv
605 136:271–282.

606 Freckleton RP, Watkinson AR, Green RE, Sutherland WJ (2006) Census error and the
607 detection of density dependence. J Anim Ecol 75:837–851.

608 Gamino V, Gutiérrez-Guzmán AV, Fernández de Mera IG, Ortiz JA, Durán-Martín M
609 et al. (2012) Natural Bagaza virus infection in game birds in southern Spain. Vet
610 Res 43:65.

- 611 Garrido JL (2012) La caza. Sector económico: valoración por subsectores. FEDENCA-
612 EEC, Madrid.
- 613 Gottschalk TK, Huettmann F (2010) Comparison of distance sampling and territory
614 mapping methods for birds in four different habitats. *J Ornithol* 152: 421–429.
- 615 Holland DS (2010) Management strategy evaluation and management procedures: tools
616 for rebuilding and sustaining fisheries. OECD Food, Agriculture and Fisheries
617 Working Papers, No. 25. OECD Publishing, Portland Maine.
- 618 Jakob C, Ponce-Boutin F, Besnard A (2014) Coping with heterogeneity to detect
619 species on a large scale: N-mixture modeling applied to red-legged partridge
620 abundance. *J Wildlife Manage* 78:540–549.
- 621 Keane A, Brooke M de L, McGowan PJK (2005) Correlates of extinction risk and
622 hunting pressure in gamebirds (Galliformes). *Biol Conserv* 126:216–233.
- 623 Kinahan A, Bunnefeld N (2012) Effectiveness and cost efficiency of monitoring
624 mountain nyala in Bale Mountains National Park, Ethiopia. *Endang Species Res*
625 18: 105–114.
- 626 Lande R, Sæther B-E, Enger S (1997) Threshold harvesting for sustainability of
627 fluctuating resources. *Ecology* 78:1341–1350.
- 628 Macaulay LT, Starrs PF, Carranza J (2013) Hunting in managed oak woodlands:
629 contrasts among similarities. In: Campos P, Huntsinger L, Oviedo JL, Diaz M,
630 Starrs P et al. (eds). *Mediterranean oak woodland working landscapes: dehesas*
631 *of Spain and ranchlands of California*. Springer, New York, pp 311–350.
- 632 Marques TA, Thomas L, Fancy SG, Buckland ST (2007) Improving estimates of bird
633 density using multiple-covariate distance sampling. *Auk* 124:1229–1243.

- 634 Martínez-Padilla J, Redpath SM, Zeineddine M, Mougeot F (2014) Insights into
635 population ecology from long-term studies of red grouse *Lagopus lagopus*
636 *scoticus*. J Anim Ecol 83:85–98.
- 637 Milner-Gulland EJ (2011) Integrating fisheries approaches and household utility models
638 for improved resource management. P Roy Soc B-Biol Sci 108:1741–1746.
- 639 Msoffe FU, Ogutu JO, Kaaya J, Bedelian C, Said MY et al. (2009) Participatory
640 wildlife surveys in communal lands: a case study from Simanjiro, Tanzania. Afr
641 J Ecol 48:727–735.
- 642 Mustin K, Newey S, Irvine J, Arroyo B, Redpath S (2012) Biodiversity impacts of game
643 bird hunting and associated management practices in Europe and North
644 America. Report to RSPB. The James Hutton Institute, Aberdeen.
- 645 Norvell RE, Howe FP, Parrish JR (2003) A seven-year comparison of relative-
646 abundance and distance-sampling methods. Auk 120:1013–1028.
- 647 Nuno A, Bunnefeld N, Milner-Gulland EJ (2013) Matching observations and reality:
648 using simulation models to improve monitoring under uncertainty in the
649 Serengeti. J Appl Ecol 50:488–498.
- 650 Oldfield TEE, Smith RJ, Harrop SR, Leader-Williams N (2003) Field sports and
651 conservation in the United Kingdom. Nature 423:531–533.
- 652 Oñate JJ, Peco B (2005) Policy impact of desertification: stakeholders' perceptions in
653 southern Spain. Land Use Policy 22:103–114.
- 654 R development Core Team (2013) R: a language and environment for statistical
655 computing. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 656 Ricci JC (1989) Une méthode de recensement des perdrix rouges (*Alectoris rufa* L.) au
657 printemps par indice kilométrique d'abondance (IKAPRV) dans le Midi-
658 Méditerranéen. Gibier, faune sauvage 6:145–158.

- 659 Ríos-Saldaña C.A. 2010. Los planes técnicos de caza de Castilla-La Mancha y su
660 aplicación en la gestión y conservación de las especies cinegéticas (PhD Thesis).
661 University of Castilla-La Mancha, Ciudad Real.
- 662 Schüttler E, Rozzi R, Jax K (2011) Towards a societal discourse on invasive species
663 management: a case study of public perceptions of mink and beavers in Cape
664 Horn. J Nat Conserv 19:175–184.
- 665 Sinclair ARE, Fryxell JM, Caughley G (2006) Wildlife ecology, conservation, and
666 management. Blackwell, Malden.
- 667 Sinclair ARE, Ludwig D, Clark CW (2000) Conservation in the real world. Science
668 289:1875.
- 669 Sokal R, Rohlf F (2012) Biometry, 4th edn. WH Freeman and Co, New York.
- 670 Solberg EJ, Sæther B-E (1999) Hunter observations of moose *Alces alces* as a
671 management tool. Wildlife Biol 5:107–118.
- 672 Solberg EJ, Sæther B-E, Strand O, Loison A (1999) Dynamics of a harvested moose
673 population in a variable environment. J Anim Ecol 68:186–204.
- 674 Strand O, Nilsen EB, Solberg EJ, Linnell JCD (2012) Can management regulate the
675 population size of wild reindeer (*Rangifer tarandus*) through harvest? Can J
676 Zoolog 90:163–171.
- 677 Sutherland WJ (2001) Sustainable exploitation: a review of principles and methods.
678 Wildlife Biol 7:131–140.
- 679 Taylor VJ, Dunstone N (1996) The exploitation of mammal populations. Chapman &
680 Hall, London.
- 681 Thomas L, Buckland ST, Rexstad EA, Laake JL, Strindberg S et al. (2010) Distance
682 software: design and analysis of distance sampling surveys for estimating
683 population size. J Appl Ecol 47:5–14.

Wam HK, Andersen O, Pedersen HC (2013) Grouse hunting regulations and hunter typologies in Norway. *Human Dimensions of Wildlife* 18:45–57.

Watson A, Moss R (2008) Grouse. Collins, London.

Weinbaum KZ, Brashares JS, Golden CD, Getz WM (2013) Searching for sustainability: are assessments of wildlife harvests behind the times? *Ecol Lett* 16:99–111.

Willebrand T, Hörnell M (2001) Understanding the effects of harvesting willow ptarmigan *Lagopus lagopus* in Sweden. *Wildlife Biol* 7:205–212.

Willebrand T, Hörnell-Willebrand M, Asmyhr L (2011) Willow grouse bag size is more sensitive to variation in hunter effort than to variation in willow grouse density. *Oikos* 120:1667–1673.

Table 1. Regression analyses between partridge density, obtained by Distance Sampling, and the abundance obtained by different methods to estimate partridge abundance.

Abundance estimates	n	R^2	P-value	Adjusted regression
Partridges/point	32	0.959	< 0.0001	Linear
KAI	29	0.924	< 0.0001	Linear
Clusters/point	32	0.941	< 0.0001	Linear
Clusters/km	29	0.923	< 0.0001	Linear
Average cluster size/point	32	0.263	0.004	Exponential
Average cluster size/km	29	0.012	0.56	Logarithmic
Presence/point	32	0.758	< 0.0001	Exponential

Table 2. Model-averaged estimates and relative variable importance (RVI) of the variables included in the best ($< 2 \Delta AIC_c$) models explaining variations in harvest per area (partridges hunted yearly per km²). Models are shown in Table S3.2.

Variables	Parameter estimates $\pm$ SE	RVI
Walked-up shooting hunter density	8.43 $\pm$ 3.32	1.00
Driven-shooting days	7.31 $\pm$ 2.11	1.00
Partridge abundance	3.58 $\pm$ 1.77	0.78
Driven-shooting hunter density	-4.16 $\pm$ 3.03	0.48

Figure Legends

Figure 1. General framework of the decision-making process of red-legged partridge hunting pressure. A) first decision taken before the beginning of the hunting season; b) second decision taken during the hunting season.

Figure 2. Relationships between partridge density estimates by Distance Sampling (reference method) and other estimating methods of abundance (a–f). Trend line is presented (see also Table 1).

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

Supplementary Material

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: Electronical supplementary material_sustainability science.docx](#)