

23<sup>rd</sup> January 2013

Dear Mr Foster

Further to my email of 18<sup>th</sup> December I am now in a position to address your points more specifically. We have also reviewed our entry and judging processes for our annual Game and Conservation Awards, and I can comment as follows:-

## 1. Eligibility Rules for entering Purdey Awards

Our Rules and Objectives (the "Rules"), a copy of which is supplied with all entry form applications, state that the Awards are open to any size or type of shoot within the United Kingdom, but that entrants must comply with The Code of Good Shooting Practice (the "Code"), a copy of which is also supplied with all entry forms. The Code specifically states that it is an offence to intentionally kill, damage or destroy birds of prey, their nests or eggs. We expect all entrants to abide by all laws of the land, and in particular those which are concerned with the protection of all types of birds, raptors, wildlife, endangered species, etc.

## 2. Vetting process

Since taking on the Purdey Awards in 1999, we have endeavoured to vet the honesty and integrity of all entries, by asking our professional advisers, the Game and Wildlife Conservation Trust Advisory Service, to look at each new entry and immediately inform us if they have reason to know or suspect the entrant, i.e. shoot owners, shoot managers, or their employees, to be breaking the law, or to have a record of doing so. Our judging panel, the 16 members of which all have experience, qualifications and connections with either shoot management, game keeping, game conservation or environmental protection, and who live throughout the UK, remain vigilant for entries which may previously have been involved with illegal activity.

You will appreciate that, despite our best intentions, it is extremely difficult for us to identify illegal activity until it comes into the public domain. However we believe there is scope to further strengthen our vetting procedures and we shall be introducing a new protocol in this regard as from this year.

JAMES PURDEY & SONS LTD
Incorporating James Woodward & Sons

## 3. Past winners and convictions of employees

As regards the employer who won the Highly Commended Award in 2012, two of our judges have recently spoken with him and were assured that immediate and appropriate action was taken at the time against the relevant gamekeeper. Our judges were also assured that this employer continues to impress a requirement to observe and abide by all relevant wildlife protection laws at all times upon his current gamekeeper, both in his contract, his annual assessment, and training programme held in conjunction with the GWCT. In our view the employer acted entirely correctly under the particular circumstances as far as we understand them. Thus we feel his entry was rightly accepted and shortlisted and the Award well deserved.

You also mentioned other past winners of the Awards. In reviewing this, we can conclude that there do appear to be offences which have taken place, however all are some years after the relevant Awards were made. Although we were unaware of any malpractice at the time these Awards were made, we are naturally uncomfortable with this fact. However, we are not in full possession of the individual facts of each case and consequently I regret that we are unable to comment further.

Please be assured that James Purdey & Sons takes matters of wildlife conservation and protection extremely seriously. We consider that the proposal to reinforce the Purdey Awards entry eligibility processes further addresses the issues you raised with us in your email of 14th December and we thank you for drawing these matters to our attention.

Yours Sincerely

Richard Purdey

Richard Lan