

BVA and BVZS position on the use and sale of snares for the control of free-ranging wildlife

Introduction

BVA and BVZS recognise that it may be necessary to control free-ranging wildlife in certain circumstances where there is a negative impact on human and animal health, food, agriculture, property, or the environment.¹ Any control should, however, follow recognised ethical principles², first apply prevention and deterrents, and where lethal control is shown to be necessary methods which are as humane as possible must be used.

The methods used for wildlife control, both lethal and non-lethal, can be controversial due to their impact on animal welfare, and this is especially so in the case of the use of snares. Snares significantly compromise the welfare of caught animals, in some cases over a considerable length of time. Some animals die in the snare whilst others may be killed by methods that also compromise welfare. Snares may also capture 'non-target' species, including domestic animals and protected wildlife, for which their use is not intended, resulting in death or significant injury to these animals. The UK is one of the few remaining European countries that permits the use of neck snares for mammals.

BVA and BVZS are therefore calling for:

- An outright ban on the use of snares, including homemade or adapted snares, by both the general public and trained operators.
- An outright ban on the sale of snares to both the general public and trained operators.
- Further research and development into alternative methods for the deterrence of free-ranging wildlife where it is considered necessary
- Further research and development into more humane methods of trapping and killing of free-ranging wildlife where it is considered necessary.

Types of snare

As used in the UK, a snare is usually a wire loop, although other materials can be used, designed to catch animals around the neck and 'hold' them until they can be killed by other means (usually shooting or a blow to the head). Neck snares are legally used, with landowner permission, to catch foxes, rabbits, and brown hares, and can also be used to catch other animals such as mink, grey squirrels or rats (although other methods are generally preferred in these species).

Modern snares are usually made of flexible steel cable for foxes or stranded brass cable for rabbits. They are relatively inexpensive and can be homemade. These wire loop devices are broadly classed as either self-locking or free-running, although this is not well-defined. Self-locking snares continue to tighten via a ratchet action as the caught animal struggles, often resulting in death by strangulation or by dislocation of the neck. Self-locking snares are illegal throughout the UK under section 11 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.

Free-running snares, which are currently legal throughout the UK, with some additional restrictions in Scotland, also restrain the animal by the neck, but are intended to relax when the animal stops struggling. A 'stop' is required on all snares, either by legislation (in Scotland) or in non-statutory codes, to be set at a specified

¹ BVZS Position statement on the control of free-ranging wildlife. Available at: <https://www.bvzs.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/BVZS-Position-Statement-on-the-control-of-Free-ranging-Wildlife-Final-Feb-2021.pdf>

² Dubois S, Fenwick N, Ryan E, Baker L, Baker S, Beausoleil N, Carter S, Cartwright B, Costa F, Draper C, Griffin J, Grogan A, Howald G, Jones B, Littin K, Lombard A, Mellor D, Ramp D, Schuppli C and Fraser D, 2017. International consensus principles for ethical wildlife control. *Conservation Biology* 31: 753-760.

distance to prevent the diameter of the wire loop from becoming smaller than the diameter of the neck of the target species.

Variation in the diameter of the necks of target species and the possible capture of non-target animals, with different body conformation, can make the stop ineffective³ and result in increased injury and death by strangulation. A free-running snare, if damaged such as when rusting or twisting occurs, can become self-locking in its operation, with the stop becoming ineffective. A 2009 study of injuries caused to badgers caught in stopped restraints (which would be illegal in the UK) found 62% of restraints had some degree of twisting, unravelling or fraying after use, and that damage was associated with an increased risk of injury.⁴ Although a swivel is thought to mitigate against the risk of locking, in practice swivels near the anchor can become tangled with vegetation. The Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust recommends the inclusion of another 'in-line' swivel fitted midway along the snare, thus ensuring the snare always includes at least one functional swivel and the cable does not unravel or become over-wound.⁵

Dual purpose, rocking eye, or snares with a 'V' shaped device through which the wire is threaded (also known as AB snares) are described as free-running but have the capacity to function as self-locking.

Target species - populations and impact

Snares are most commonly used to control fox and rabbit populations in the UK, with the justification that these species damage both livestock and crops. Three fox population studies during the nineties put the non-urban fox population of Great Britain between 200,000 and 240,000.^{6 7 8} Foxes are omnivores, and feed predominantly on small mammals, particularly rodents and lagomorphs (rabbits and hares), and in rural areas these groups together typically account for about 50% of the diet. Foxes also predate lambs, poultry, and other livestock.⁹ In a survey of Welsh farmers carried out in 2013, 96 per cent said that predation on lambs had an impact on their income.¹⁰ The IFAW report 'After the hunt: the future for foxes in Britain' however, concluded that "lamb losses to fox predation are small in relation to other causes of lamb mortality". The report goes on to state that "Fox predation has a direct economic cost to agriculture of approximately £12 million per annum. However, the bulk of fox diet is made up of rabbits, which cause in excess of £100 million damage to agriculture each year".¹¹

The same report suggested that there is no evidence that killing foxes has any effect on fox population size other than locally. The report pointed to two studies that quantified the impact of winter culling on the spring breeding population which found that, where more foxes were killed in the winter, spring numbers tended to be higher.^{12, 13}

³ Frey N, Conover M, Cook G, 2007. Successful Use of Neck Snares to Live-Capture Red Foxes

⁴ Murphy D, 2009. An assessment of injury to European badgers (meles meles) due to capture in stopped restraints.

<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19395757/>

⁵ <https://www.gwct.org.uk/advisory/guides/fox-snaring-guidelines/parts-of-the-snare/>

⁶ Harris, S., Morris, P., Wray, S. & Yalden, D. (1995) A review of British mammals: population estimates and conservation status of British mammals other than cetaceans. Joint Nature Conservation Committee, Peterborough.

⁷ Heydon, M.J., Reynolds, J.C. & Short, M.J. (2000) Variation in abundance of foxes (*Vulpes vulpes*) between three regions of rural Britain, in relation to landscape and other variables. *Journal of Zoology*, 251, 253-264

⁸ Webbon, C.C., Baker, P.J. & Harris, S. (2004) Faecal density counts for monitoring changes in red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) numbers in rural Britain. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 41, 768-779.

⁹ <https://www.wildlifeonline.me.uk/animals/article/red-fox-interaction-with-other-species-livestock>

¹⁰ <https://www.discoverwildlife.com/people/do-we-really-need-to-control-foxes-in-the-uk/>

¹¹ <http://mknhs.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/IFAW-after-the-hunt.pdf>

¹² Baker P, Harris S, 2006. Does culling reduce fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) density in commercial forests in Wales, UK?

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227303887 Does_culling_reduce_fox_Vulpes_vulpes_density_in_commercial_forests_in_Wales_UK](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/227303887_Does_culling_reduce_fox_Vulpes_vulpes_density_in_commercial_forests_in_Wales_UK)

¹³ Hewson R, 1986. Distribution and density of fox breeding dens and the effects of management. *Journal of Applied Ecology*, 23, 531-538

Historically, landowners in Great Britain have been obliged by legislation, including the Pests Act 1954, to clear rabbits from their land or stop them causing damage to adjoining crops by putting up rabbit proof fencing. Nowadays the decision to do so depends more on whether the rabbits are perceived as a nuisance or not.¹⁴

Legislation and codes of practice

The UK is one of the few European countries that permits the use of neck snares for mammals. Austria, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg and Malta, either prohibit the use of snares or have no tradition of using them in this way. Only Belgium, Ireland, Latvia and the UK use snares.¹⁵

The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 prohibits the use of any trap or snare for the purposes of killing or taking or restraining any wild animal listed at Schedule 6 or 6ZA (including badgers, wildcats, and red squirrels). It is also an offence to set in position a snare such that it is calculated to cause bodily injury to any wild animal included in the Schedules (England and Wales) or likely to cause bodily injury to any such wild animal (Scotland).¹⁶

The four UK administrations have separate legislation and non-statutory codes of practice covering snaring.

England

For England and Wales, the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981¹⁷ prohibits the use of self-locking snares and any snare calculated to cause bodily injury to a wild animal, and also requires that snares are inspected at least once every day. Most operators inspect to a set timetable but, in theory, this could allow an animal to be held in a snare for almost 48 hours. Primary legislation is supplemented by a voluntary code of best practice on the use of snares for fox control in England, developed in 2016 by the National Gamekeepers Organisation, the Tenant Farmers' Association, the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust, the Moorland Association, the Country Land and Business Association, the British Association for Shooting and Conservation, the Countryside Alliance, the National Farmers Union, and endorsed by DEFRA.¹⁸ The code summarises the legislation and recommends the use of a non-moveable anchor (ie not a drag), two swivels, a free running eye that moves easily, a fixed stop set at 26 cm for foxes, and a breakaway to allow the self-release of stronger non-target animals.

Wales

Wales is subject to the same provisions in the 1981 Act as England. A code of best practice on the use of snares in fox control was published in 2015, developed in partnership with the National Gamekeepers Organisation, the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust, the British Association for Shooting and Conservation, the Countryside Alliance, the National Farmers Union Cymru, the Farmers Union Wales, and endorsed by Welsh Government.¹⁹ This code provided a model for the subsequent Defra code, and is very similar.

Scotland

The Wildlife and Natural Environment (Scotland) Act 2011 amended the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to include requirements for snare users to undertake training and register with Police Scotland in order to receive a unique identification number, which must be displayed on a tag attached to every snare set. The purpose of the training and the bodies approved to deliver it are set out in the Snares (Training) (Scotland) Order 2015.²⁰ The amended 1981 Act also prohibits the use of drag snares and any snare set where it might cause an animal to become suspended or drown. Stops must be affixed to all snares: the diameters currently set are 13 cm for a rabbit and 23 cm for a fox, although there have been recommendations to increase this to 15 and 26 cm respectively²¹. There is no diameter specified for any other species.

¹⁴ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/rabbits-how-to-control-numbers>

¹⁵ <https://onekind.scot.archived.website/uploads/publications/OneKind-and-LACS-report-on-snaring.pdf>

¹⁶ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69>

¹⁷ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/69/contents>

¹⁸ <https://www.gwct.org.uk/media/680075/Snaring-Best-Practice-Booklet.pdf>

¹⁹ <https://gov.wales/sites/default/files/publications/2019-05/code-of-best-practice-use-snares-fox-control.pdf>

²⁰ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2015/377/made>

²¹ Review of snaring for Scottish Government 2015, Annex 3 Technical Assessment Group

<https://www.gov.scot/publications/review-snaring-scottish-government-prepared-snh/pages/10/>

Snares must be inspected at intervals of no more than 24 hours: any animal, whether alive or dead, must be removed and the snare must be checked to ensure that it is free-running. The Scottish legislation specifically prohibits the possession or use of a snare on land without the permission of the landowner or occupier. Operators must keep records detailing the location of every snare set, the date it was set or removed, and the animals captured: these records must be produced if requested by a police constable. The provisions are subject to review every five years.

A practitioners' guide to snaring in Scotland, produced in 2012 by wildlife management organisations, sets out the requirements of the legislation.²²

Northern Ireland

The Wildlife Order (Northern Ireland) 1985 was amended by the Wildlife and Natural Environment Act (NI) 2011, which introduced new controls over the use of snares in Northern Ireland.²³ Article 12 of the amended 1985 Act prohibits self-locking snares and other types of snares used in a manner calculated to cause injury or unnecessary suffering to a wild animal, as in England and Wales. In other respects, the Order reflects Scottish approach in requiring operators to inspect snares at least once every 24 hours and to remove any animal found, and to have landowner permission for carrying or setting snares. The Humane Trapping Standards Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2019 restate the existing prohibitions in Article 12 of the Order (animals which may not be killed or taken by certain methods) and introduces a prohibition on using or setting in position any trap or snare for the purpose of killing or taking stoat.²⁴

The subsequent Snares Order (Northern Ireland) 2015, which required snares to be fitted with a stop and an anchor and was to be accompanied by an industry code, was delayed due to pressure from welfare groups to ban snaring.²⁵ Although subsequently approved by the NI Assembly Environment Committee the Order did not reach debate in the Assembly and consequently is yet to pass into legislation.

Extent and use of snares

Between 2008 and 2010 a Defra-funded research project 'Determining the Extent of Use and Humaneness of Snares in England and Wales' took place, aiming to quantify the scale of use and associated welfare impacts.

Following 2,861 telephone surveys with landowners/tenants, further detailed discussions with snare users for 130 landholdings, and 16 field visits, extrapolation on the basis of country, landholding size class and user suggested that, at any one time and depending on the season, between 62,800 and 188,300 fox snares were in use in England, and between 17,200 and 51,600 fox snares in Wales. In both countries, the maximum occurred in March.²⁶

In Scotland, snare use is reported anecdotally to have declined since the implementation of the new legislation in 2013. However, a report from OneKind and the League Against Cruel Sports 'Cruel and Indiscriminate: Why Scotland must become snare-free' cited fieldwork carried out in spring and summer 2016 which found snares on 10 out of 13 estates visited. On five of these estates, snaring was extensive, and in one example there were 60 active snares in one locality.²⁷

The Defra-funded study found that a significantly higher percentage of gamekeeper users were aware of the code of practice²⁸ (95%) and had formal training in the use of fox snares (38%), compared to farmers (64% and 3%, respectively). Although no fox snare operator visited was fully compliant with the code of practice, it should be recognised that at the time of the study operators were unable to buy code of practice design compliant snares off the shelf.²⁹

²² Snaring in Scotland: A Practitioners' Guide 2012 https://www.gwct.org.uk/media/208730/snaring_in_scotland.pdf

²³ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ni/2011/15/section/10>

²⁴ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/nisr/2019/68/made#f00005>

²⁵ <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/nisr/2015/352/made>

²⁶

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

²⁷ <https://www.onekind.scot/wp-content/uploads/Cruel-Indiscriminate-OneKind-and-LACS-report-on-snaring.pdf>

²⁸ Defra code of practice on the use of snares in fox and rabbit control October 2005

<http://adlib.eversite.co.uk/resources/000/125/893/snares-cop.pdf>

²⁹

Animal welfare

The lack of data on snares makes it difficult to accurately assess their impact on the welfare of target and non-target species. The International Organisation for Standardization (ISO) developed the International Standard ISO 10990-5 Animal (mammal) trap to provide test methods for performance evaluation of traps in the areas of animal welfare, capture efficiency, selectivity, and user safety.³⁰ As the OneKind report 'The impact of snares on animal welfare' observes, although the standards have many merits including examination of all body areas, and examination of injuries by veterinary pathologists they also have a number of shortfalls including no consideration of: behavioural or physiological responses as measures of welfare; the compounding effect of multiple lesser injuries; the duration of the injury prior to killing; or the long-term impact of some injuries in animals that escape or are released. The standards also fail to require testing with non-target species, nor do they provide guidelines avoiding the capture of non-target species, or the killing of trapped animals.³¹ Snares were also excluded from consideration when the final standards were developed, and although other models for assessing relative humaneness of pest control methods have been developed, they have not yet been widely applied.³²

The Defra study 'Determining the Extent of Use and Humaneness of Snares in England and Wales' included a number of pen and field trials with the aim of assessing welfare when foxes and rabbits were snared. The pen trials were found to have limited utility as a substitute for field trials, as entry into the snare and the presence of predators could not be assessed. The field trials found that most snares in use were not Code of Practice-compliant and snares were frequently set at sites where entanglement leading to poor welfare was a risk. The study concluded that while it was conceptually possible to combine the survey and field trial results to predict the overall impact of fox and rabbit snaring on the welfare and conservation status of target and non-target species throughout England and Wales, confidence intervals would be very large, and predictions misleading.³³ A 2007 review of the animal welfare standards of killing and restraining traps concluded that existing legislation failed to ensure an acceptable level of welfare for a large number of captured animals and that new welfare standards were needed to guarantee a minimum level of welfare for all trapped individuals.³⁴

The lack of data on the welfare aspects of snaring makes it challenging to accurately assess the cost/benefit of the use of snares for wildlife management. However, when considered in the context of the Five Domains model for animal welfare assessment³⁵, it is evident that the use of snares compromises several of the domains used to inform the overall picture of animal welfare, including Domains 3 (Health), 4 (Behaviour) and 5 (Mental state) and often including Domains 1 (Nutrition) and 2 (Environment). The use of a snare on an animal protected under domestic animal welfare legislation would in most cases be an offence.

Potential welfare harms

Due to the nature of snares and the duration of time animals may legally be held in snares (see Legislation section above), even when best practice is followed, checking snares at least once every 24 hours, the potential negative animal welfare impacts are significant and may include:

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

³⁰ <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:10990:-5:ed-1:v1:en>

³¹ https://onekindplanet.org/uploads/publications/onekind_report_on_snaring_chapter_1.pdf

³²

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281276751_A_model_for_assessing_the_relative_humaneness_of_pest_animal_control_methods

³³

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

³⁴ Iossa G, Soulsbury CD, Harris S, 2007. Mammal trapping: a review of animal welfare standards of killing and restraining traps

³⁵ Mellor DJ (2017). Operational Details of the Five Domains Model and Its Key Applications to the Assessment and Management of Animal Welfare. *Animals*, 7, 60

BVA and BVZS position on the use and sale of snares for the control of free-ranging wildlife

- dehydration and hunger / starvation (of caught animal and any dependent young)
- exposure to the elements
- fear and distress³⁶ (manifesting as escape behaviour which may include self-mutilation and, in rabbits, tonic immobility³⁷)
- external and internal injuries³⁸
- asphyxiation from strangulation³⁹
- exhaustion
- predation⁴⁰
- exertional or capture myopathy⁴¹

Sites where animals have been caught in snares may show signs of extreme disturbance to the surrounding ground and vegetation – known as a “doughnut” – where the animal has tried to run, jump or scabble its way out of the trap, often for several hours or more.⁴² Some animals attempt to gnaw through the wire, causing it to fray so that it cannot run freely enough to slacken and release the pressure - this can cause very painful damage to the teeth and jaw.

Neck snares may trap a part of the body other than the neck, and this may be more frequent in non-target species. The behaviour of different non-target species in the snare can also influence the injuries sustained.

The speed at which welfare begins to be impacted is rapid (seconds from the moment of restraint) and suffering can be prolonged even in instances where legal requirements to check at least every 24 hours are adhered to. Although the Code of best practice for the use of snares for fox control in England recommends that snares are inspected twice daily, the law only requires inspection once every day. Both intervals leave potential for considerable suffering. As snares are not intended to kill, in many instances animals remain alive until the snare is inspected, at which point they should be humanely killed or released if a non-target species. Release of animals from snares is, however, not without welfare concerns as snared animals may suffer from muscle damage (exertional rhabdomyolysis) and/or pressure damage (ischaemic necrosis) of tissue, which may not be obvious and require medical care.

Further, accompanying instructions for snares frequently fail to explain the need to kill the caught animals or how to do this humanely. This means the caught animal may just be left, or killed in a manner that is not humane, for example blunt force trauma may be attempted by those who are neither confident nor competent in such methods.

Snares can also be indiscriminate and may result in the capture and suffering of non-target species. The proportion of non-target species caught in snares set for foxes ranges from 21% to 69%.^{43 44} The non-target

³⁶

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

³⁷ McBride, E.A., Day, S., McAdie, T., Meredith, A., Barley, J., Hickman, J. and Lawes, L. (2006) Trancing rabbits: Relaxed hypnosis or a state of fear? <https://eprints.soton.ac.uk/54860/>

³⁸

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

³⁹

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

⁴⁰

<http://sciencesearch.defra.gov.uk/Default.aspx?Menu=Menu&Module=More&Location=None&Completed=0&ProjectID=14689>

⁴¹ <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18957653/>

⁴² <https://onekind.scot.archived.website/uploads/publications/OneKind-and-LACS-report-on-snaring.pdf>

⁴³ Iossa G, Soulsbury CD, Harris S, 2007. Mammal trapping: a review of animal welfare standards of killing and restraining traps

⁴⁴ <http://www.snarewatch.org/>

species include cats, dogs, sheep and protected wildlife such as badgers, mountain hare, pine marten, hedgehog, birds, otters and deer.⁴⁵

Responsible use of the most humane methods of pest control available

We recognise that it may be necessary to control wildlife where there is a negative impact on human and animal health, food, agriculture, property or the environment. If a problem is identified, we support the responsible use of the most humane control methods available, which first requires consideration of whether it is necessary to control pests at all. Before lethal control is considered, prevention methods or deterrents should be implemented, and finally, if lethal control of pests is considered necessary, methods that minimise suffering, fear and pain should be used.⁴⁶ [Read the BVZS Position statement on the control of free-ranging wildlife in full.](#)

Recommendation 1: Pest control should apply responsible use of the most humane methods available, with a focus on prevention and deterrents before lethal control

Alternatives to snares

Alternatives to using snares for fox control include good management techniques to prevent access to livestock, including removing fallen stock promptly to avoid attracting foxes, baited live cage traps (followed by shooting), or free-shooting (known as lamping if carried out at night⁴⁷).⁴⁸ Guard animals such as llamas, alpacas, and dogs are also used in Europe, South Africa and the US to protect livestock from predation.⁴⁹

For rabbits, Government suggested alternatives to snaring include prevention methods such as fencing. Alternative lethal methods including gassing, trapping, ferreting, and shooting.⁵⁰ all of which have potential welfare harms.

Organisations such as the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust consider that for effective fox control in a variety of situations it is desirable to have a range of methods available, giving options according to cost, time, safety, landscape and seasonal constraints.⁵¹ The Trust is clear that there are no functional replacements yet that match the advantages of a snare, and the British Association for Shooting and Conservation advises members that a strategically set snare will catch foxes when other methods of control either won't work or are impractical.⁵²

We recognise that cost and practicality are necessary considerations for those organisations representing the interest of land managers. However, as an animal welfare focused profession we cannot support the selection of lethal control methods based primarily on resource availability or convenience where prevention and deterrents have not been either considered or used and there are more humane alternative lethal methods (such as accurate shooting) available.

While the welfare concerns associated with snares are significant, it is important to recognise that other methods of wildlife control may also compromise welfare. With this in mind, it is paramount that additional research is carried out into the development of alternative methods for the exclusion and deterrence of wildlife, and more humane methods of killing.

⁴⁵ <http://www.snarewatch.org/>

⁴⁶ Dubois S, Fenwick N, Ryan E, Baker L, Baker S, Beausoleil N, Carter S, Cartwright B, Costa F, Draper C, Griffin J, Grogan A, Howald G, Jones B, Littin K, Lombard A, Mellor D, Ramp D, Schuppli C and Fraser D, 2017. International consensus principles for ethical wildlife control. *Conservation Biology* 31: 753-760.

⁴⁷ <https://basc.org.uk/codes-of-practice/night-shooting/>

⁴⁸ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/foxes-moles-and-mink-how-to-protect-your-property-from-damage#foxes>

⁴⁹ <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1002&context=icwdmsheepgoat>

⁵⁰ <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/rabbits-how-to-control-numbers>

⁵¹ <https://www.gwct.org.uk/media/672318/Snaring-fact-sheet.pdf>

⁵² <https://basc.org.uk/advice/fox-snaring/>

Recommendation 2: Further research should be carried out into the development into alternative methods for the exclusion and deterrence of wildlife, and more humane methods of killing.

In light of the above evidence, we call for an outright ban on the use and sale of snares. We consider that there are sufficient alternative means of prevention and deterrence and lethal control available, including cage-trapping and shooting, such that there is no justification for the use of snares even under a licensing regime. A ban should encompass the use of homemade snares.

Recommendation 3: The UK Governments should introduce an outright ban on the use and sale of snares to both the general public and trained operators.