

NATIONAL POLICY ON HUMAN-WILDLIFE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

2009



REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & TOURISM

Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management
Private Bag 13306
Windhoek
Phone: +264 61 2842111
Fax: +264 61 229936

FOREWORD

Namibia has adopted a number of innovative approaches to achieve biodiversity conservation within the framework of national development plans including Vision 2030 and poverty reduction strategies. Through the Communal Conservancy Programme rural Namibians have gained rights over wildlife and tourism and are generating income from the sustainable use of wildlife. Due to the commitment shown by Namibians, there has been a remarkable recovery and increase of wildlife populations, including key predator species and internationally threatened or endangered species such as elephant and black rhinoceros.

Despite these successes, the Government recognizes that living with wildlife often carries a cost, with increased wildlife populations and expanded ranges into communal and freehold farming areas resulting in more frequent conflicts between people and wild animals, particularly elephants and predators in many areas. This has resulted in livestock and crop losses, damage to water installations and, in some instances, loss of human lives. The impacts of livestock losses and damage to crops on rural farmers are compounded by the effects of unemployment, lack of cash and the impact of HIV/AIDS. There is therefore an urgent need to find practical approaches and methodologies to reduce the impacts of Human-Wildlife Conflict on our most vulnerable citizens.

The Government also recognizes that such conflicts have always existed where people and wildlife live together and will continue to do so in the future. This means that it will not be possible to eradicate all conflict, but that conflict has to be managed in the most effective and efficient ways possible. It has thus far been impossible for the Government to pursue a policy of direct compensation to individual farmers because of the estimated cost of damage caused by wildlife across the country, and more importantly, the administrative problems that a compensation scheme presents. It should also be recognized that people and wildlife live in an interconnected and dynamic environment, that land use patterns are changing and that wildlife distribution patterns equally are changing, as populations recover and recolonize former parts of their distribution areas.

It is for these purposes that a detailed policy has been developed to manage human wildlife conflict in a way that recognizes the rights and development needs of local communities while at the same time recognizing the need to promote biodiversity conservation.



NETUMBO NANDI-NDAITWAH, MP
MINISTER



PREFACE

Human Wildlife Conflict refers to conflict between wild animals and humans. This ranges from the destruction of crops and water installations to loss of livestock, homes and in some cases loss of human lives. Friction between park managers and neighbouring communities living on the perimeters of protected areas potentially weakens the effectiveness of projects and programmes, for example the Conservancy Programme.

This document sets out the Government policy on human-wildlife conflict management and control. The strategies to implement the policy provides the content for this document and include land use planning and integrated measures to avoid human wildlife conflict, community based natural resource management, devolution of decision-making authority to appropriate institutions, developing and implementing the best appropriate technical solutions for mitigating human wildlife conflict, monitoring, evaluation and research, building self-reliance, protected areas, removal of problem-causing animals, establishment of a system to assist affected families with funeral costs, and application of revenues from problem-causing animals to avoid future conflict and to address the losses of affected persons..

The scale and urgency of the problem require Government to develop an integrated, flexible and comprehensive policy towards dealing with wildlife conflict that can provide a framework for all stakeholders and can meet the country's national and international commitments to biodiversity conservation while taking into account the rights and development needs of its people.

This policy has been developed through a series of consultations with a broad range of stakeholders that includes traditional authorities, communal area farmers, freehold farmers, communal area conservancies, Government officials in various ministries, Non-Governmental Organizations and researchers. The policy is based on the ideas and experience of these stakeholders and of officials of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism over many years. The Ministry would therefore like to thank all these partners and stakeholders who participated in developing this Policy.


Dr. KALUMBI SHANGULA
PERMANENT SECRETARY



Abbreviations and Acronyms

CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
CCW	Chief Control Warden
DPWM	Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management
DSS	Directorate of Scientific Services
GPTF	Game Products Trust Fund
HWC	Human-wildlife conflict
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MLR	Ministry of Lands and Resettlement
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
PH	Professional hunter

Table of Contents

Section	Page
Foreword	i
Preface	ii
Abbreviations and Acronyms	iii
Chapter 1	1
Introduction	1
Chapter 2	1
Policy framework	1
2.1 Aim	1
2.2 Objectives	1
2.3 Principles	1
2.4 Strategies	2
2.4.1 Land-use planning and integrated measures to avoid HWC	2
2.4.2 Community-based Natural Resource Management	3
2.4.3 Delegation of decision-making authority	4
2.4.4 Developing and implementing the best appropriate technical solutions for mitigating HWC	6
2.4.5 Research and monitoring	6
2.4.6 Building self-reliance	8
2.4.7 Protected Areas	10
2.4.8 Removal of problem-causing animals	10
2.4.9 Establishment of a system to assist affected families with funeral costs	11
2.4.10 Application of revenues from problem-causing animals to avoid future conflict and to address the losses of affected persons	12
Chapter 3	
Institutional framework for Policy implementation	12
Chapter 4	
Monitoring and evaluation for Policy implementation	13
Bibliography	13
Glossary	14
Annex 1: Guidelines concerning the delegation of authority to regional offices of MET and other designated institutions to determine when to destroy a problem-causing animal	17
Annex 2: Guidelines for the destruction of a problem-causing animal by a conservancy to which authority has been delegated by the MET	19
Annex 3: Example of a framework for deciding when a problem-causing animal should be destroyed	21
Annex 4: Procedures for providing funeral expenses to the deceased's family in the case of death caused by a wild animal	22
Annex 5: Procedures for providing payment for Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme	23

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Addressing human-wildlife conflict requires striking a balance between conservation priorities and the needs of people who live with wildlife. Most Namibians depend on the land for their subsistence. But the presence of many species of large mammals, combined with settlement patterns of people, leads to conflict between people and wildlife. It is therefore necessary that mechanisms are created for rural communities and farmers to manage and benefit from wildlife and other natural resources.

The Nature Conservation Ordinance (Ordinance 4 of 1975) as amended by the Nature Conservation Amendment Act (Act 5 of 1996) provides a legislative basis for the control of problem causing animals, hunting and rights on the utilisation of wildlife.

Provision will accordingly be made in any legislation which shall repeal the Nature Conservation Ordinance, as amended, for a proper administrative, legal and procedural framework for human-wildlife conflict management.

CHAPTER 2

POLICY FRAMEWORK

The policy of the Government of Namibia is to manage human-wildlife conflict in a way that recognises the rights and development needs of local communities, recognises the need to promote biodiversity conservation, promotes self-reliance and ensures that decision-making is quick, efficient and based on the best available information. In order to achieve this, Government will delegate decision-making to the lowest appropriate institutional levels, develop appropriate mitigation and monitoring methods and develop the capacity of all stakeholders to manage human-wildlife conflict.

2.1 Aim

The aim of human-wildlife conflict management is to provide a framework for addressing human-wildlife

conflict efficiently and effectively in order to promote both biodiversity conservation as well as human development.

2.2 Objectives

The objectives of the Policy are:

- 2.2.1 To develop future human-wildlife conflict management legislative framework.
- 2.2.2 To develop a standardised monitoring system for human-wildlife conflict management.
- 2.2.3 To establish best practice mitigation measures for human-wildlife conflict management.
- 2.2.4 To develop innovative mechanisms to reduce the level of human-wildlife conflict.
- 2.2.5 To provide clarity on the question of compensation with regard to damages caused by wildlife.

2.3 Principles

The Policy on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management is based on a number of fundamental principles:

- 2.3.1 Wildlife is part of the natural environment that people depend on, and based on Article 95 (l) of the Constitution, must be maintained throughout the country as part of the sustainable development that the Government of Namibia is committed to pursue.
- 2.3.2 Human-wildlife conflict is bound to occur where people and wildlife co-exist. Therefore the conflict needs to be managed.
- 2.3.3 The needs of the people and the aims of biodiversity conservation must be balanced.
- 2.3.4 The Government shall strive to maintain viable populations of all species throughout the country.
- 2.3.5 Government shall not establish a compensation scheme for losses caused by wildlife.
- 2.3.6 It is the responsibility of all citizens and State agencies to manage human-wildlife

- conflict wherever it occurs.
- 2.3.7 The Policy on Human-Wildlife Conflict Management must promote self-reliance by farmers and other affected parties in managing conflict.
- 2.3.8 The Government shall provide technical assistance, where appropriate, to individuals and State agencies to develop appropriate plans to manage human-wildlife conflict efficiently and effectively.
- 2.3.9 The economic value of wildlife should be used to offset the losses caused by them.

2.4 Strategies

Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) is a multi-faceted problem. In order to address its impacts, a number of different strategies are required to address the following key issues:

- The economic impacts of HWC on local communities.
- The appropriate level of decision-making power for managing HWC, particularly in a case where an animal that persistently causes problems needs to be destroyed.
- Accurate information on the scale, the costs and impacts of conflict, and the success of mitigation methods and approaches.
- The skills of all stakeholders to manage HWC efficiently and effectively.
- HWC management and mitigation plans are included in regional and national development plans and activities and are addressed in associated environmental assessments.
- Incidences of wildlife that leaves protected areas and causes problems in neighbouring areas.

In order to address these key issues, Government has developed the following strategies:

2.4.1 Land-use planning and integrated measures to avoid HWC

It must be the responsibility of all citizens,

organisations and State agencies that engage in land uses that can be affected by HWC to take measures to avoid such conflict. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) will assist individuals, organisations and State agencies to take such measures but is not responsible for damage to property caused by wild animals.

The specific objective of this strategy is:

To ensure that all individuals, organisations and State agencies take responsibility for carrying out appropriate land-use planning and developing integrated measures that are aimed at avoiding and/or reducing HWC.

Strategic approach

Organisations, companies, State agencies including regional councils and parastatals and development partners engaged in, planning or supporting land uses that might be affected by HWC must carry out appropriate measures to assess the likely extent of such conflict and to put in place appropriate mitigating measures. Environmental assessments carried out under national policy and legislation governing such assessments should include HWC where appropriate. Particular attention should be given to assessing and mitigating HWC in the planning and development of new water points, agricultural schemes, aquaculture schemes, resettlement schemes, the development of new settlements and the expansion of existing settlements. Measures to mitigate HWC should include appropriate land-use planning and the development of integrated HWC management plans. Such plans must involve specific mechanisms to deal with HWC problems prevalent in a particular area, including the application of appropriate technical solutions and monitoring. These plans need to be based on information about the local HWC context (i.e. which species, which methods) and need to include a combination of approaches to deal with different species and different problems at different times of the year.

The MET will support local communities, relevant local authorities, regional councils and private entities to develop and implement appropriate HWC management and mitigation plans. The implementation of these plans should be carried out through Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which should be signed by all relevant parties and

should spell out the roles and responsibilities of each party. The MET will provide support by:

- Providing assistance and advice on developing HWC management and mitigation plans
- Providing technical guidelines for management and monitoring of HWC based on best practice and experience in Namibia and elsewhere
- Working with relevant ministries, development agencies and private organisations to ensure that HWC is incorporated in environmental assessments for development projects such as agricultural schemes, aquaculture etc.
- Encouraging individual management units (e.g. a conservancy) to work with other such units and appropriate stakeholders to develop area-based and regional HWC management and mitigation plans.

Under legislation governing wildlife, the MET will declare areas with chronic problems as HWC zones. Specific regulations will be developed for such zones providing for appropriate assessments to be carried out and management plans to be in place before new developments may take place, e.g. new water points must be sufficiently protected against elephants, or agricultural schemes must have an adequate fence. Such zones will receive priority assistance from the Ministry in terms of technical assistance and advice and the development of local HWC management plans.

2.4.2 Community-Based Natural Resource Management

The Government's Community-based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) Programme provides local communities with a number of incentives to manage natural resources such as wildlife sustainably. Through forming conservancies, local communities gain rights over wildlife that enables them to generate income from a number of different use options.

The adoption of wildlife and tourism as additional forms of land use by rural people and the recovery of wildlife in many conservancies indicates the success of the Government's CBNRM Programme.

With regard to HWC, Government has encouraged the commercial use of the larger and more valuable species that impact negatively on people through activities such as trophy hunting to offset the losses that these species cause.

However, many of the economic benefits that come from the use of wildlife in conservancies accrue at the community level and do not necessarily offset the costs of losses to individual households caused by wildlife. Furthermore, some of the individuals who suffer losses may not be members of the conservancy and eligible to benefit. Households in areas where conservancies have not been formed do not receive any benefit from wildlife that can offset costs of crop or livestock losses.

There is therefore a need to increase the direct benefits from wildlife and tourism to households and to explore ways in which losses caused by wildlife can be offset for non-conservancy members and people living outside conservancies.

The specific objective of this strategy with regard to addressing HWC is:

- To create sufficient economic and other benefits from the use of wildlife so that rural communities will view wildlife as an asset rather than a liability.

Strategic Approach

The Government will work with conservancies and other stakeholders to increase the direct benefits to households in conservancies as a means of offsetting livestock and/or crop losses caused by wildlife. The Government will do this by:

- Assisting conservancies to develop their full economic potential
- Increasing delegation of authority over wildlife to conservancies in order to make wildlife more attractive as a land use
- Encouraging conservancies to invest in activities that provide the maximum benefit to households affected by HWC.

Government views conservancy benefits that offset losses to HWC as one of the incentives for individuals to become conservancy members and commit themselves to conservancy objectives.

Government will seek ways to offset losses caused by HWC in communal areas where conservancies have not been established. However, in doing this, Government will take care not to reduce the incentive for people to form conservancies. The main focus of this strategic approach will be in areas that may not be appropriate for conservancy formation and operation, but where HWC is present. In order to do this Government will assist the appropriate local authorities (e.g. traditional authorities, village development committees) to develop local HWC management and mitigation plans. Government will provide limited funds from the Game Products Trust Fund (GPTF) to assist in implementation of such plans (e.g. to help pay for small infrastructure developments, but not wages).

2.4.3 Delegation of decision-making authority

Destruction of individual wild animals will not permanently remove HWC, but in some cases it becomes necessary to destroy a specific animal which persistently causes problems or threatens human life. In such cases it is crucial for decisions to be taken quickly so that the identified problem-causing animal can be speedily dealt with. At the same time, safeguards need to be in place to ensure that wildlife is destroyed for good reason. As in the past, people should have the right to defend themselves or their property against a wild animal if attacked and this policy does not aim to remove that right. However, there are also cases when a decision needs to be taken to destroy an animal as a preventive measure. For example, if an animal has attacked a human and then escaped, or has persistently killed livestock and escaped and there is the fear in the community or there is good reason to believe that the animal will strike again. In such circumstances action might be needed to prevent such attacks being repeated. In these cases there is a need to streamline the process of identifying such an animal and giving permission for its destruction.

It is crucial to avoid policies and procedures that lead to long delays in giving permission for a problem-causing animal to be destroyed. Long delays often result in the animal moving away or the wrong animal being shot simply to placate angry villagers. There is therefore a need to deal with local conflict at the local level. This means that decision-making authority needs to be delegated to the lowest level appropriate for a quick decision to be

taken so that the identified problem-causing animal can be speedily destroyed, therefore providing as much protection for people or property as possible.

The specific objectives of this strategy are:

2.4.3.1 To delegate decision-making authority over the destruction of identified problem-causing wild animals to staff members of the Ministry and communal area conservancies so that the correct individual animal can be speedily destroyed, providing protection to people and their property.

2.4.3.2 To provide sufficient safeguards to ensure that specific animals are destroyed for good reason.

Strategic Approach

The Minister will authorise staff members of the Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management to determine when to destroy a problem-causing animal under the guidelines provided in Annex 1. The authorised staff member will be responsible for deciding whether a problem-causing animal should be destroyed and whether it should be destroyed by MET personnel or by a conservancy to which authority has been delegated by the MET. The authorised staff member will also be responsible for ensuring that conservancies that have received delegated authority comply with this Policy and all relevant legislation as well as the reporting requirements contained in Annex 2. Each region should have an established decision-making framework that provides reasons for when a particular animal may be destroyed. An example of such a framework is provided in Annex 3. In such cases where an animal is destroyed, the authorised staff member must provide a written report to the Director: Parks and Wildlife Management in terms of the guidelines provided in Annex 1. The Director will furnish a report on the incident to the Permanent Secretary.

Communal area conservancies are local wildlife management units that have received rights over wildlife from Government and are committed to sustainable use of wildlife and other natural resources. Government may delegate authority to specific conservancies to destroy problem-causing animals when the region to which the specific

conservancy falls has an approved framework for determining when a problem-causing animal can be destroyed and to use the products derived from that animal, except elephants, rhinoceros and hippopotamus, provided that:

- The conservancy has an integrated HWC management plan that includes measures for the prevention and/or reduction of HWC, the mitigation of problems caused by HWC and for gathering data on HWC incidents, and the region to which the specific conservancy falls must have a framework for destroying problem-causing animals approved by the Minister.
- The conservancy must have one or more designated persons who will be responsible for the destruction of problem-causing animals. Such persons must receive appropriate training from the Ministry or from a person approved by the Ministry before they will be allowed to destroy problem-causing animals. The authorised staff member will be responsible for determining whether such persons have been adequately trained and must inform the conservancy in writing that he/she has provided such a determination and approved the designation of such persons. If the authorised staff member finds the designated person/s to be inadequately trained he/she must provide reasons in writing. In the latter case the conservancy must take steps to see that these reasons are addressed through further training. If a designated person is no longer able or available to carry out these duties, the conservancy must inform the Ministry in writing and arrangements must be made for the training and designation of a replacement.

A conservancy to which authority to destroy a problem-causing animal has been delegated may only take such action if it is given written permission by the authorised staff member.

Once a problem-causing animal has been destroyed, the conservancy must inform the authorised staff member in writing within 10 days according to the guidelines provided in Section 14 of

Annex 1.

The use of products derived from problem-causing animals must be done so with a permit and conditions issued by the Ministry.

The authorised staff member will be responsible for determining that the animal was destroyed for good reason i.e. according to the reasons provided in the decision-making framework contained in the conservancy's wildlife management plan. He/she should also determine that the animal was destroyed by a designated and approved person in terms of the guidelines provided in Section 4 of Annex 1 and send reports to the Director: Parks and Wildlife Management in terms of the guidelines provided in Section 14 of Annex 1.

If the authorised staff member finds that an animal was destroyed without permission and in contravention of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (No. 4 of 1975) or any subsequent legislation that replaces the Ordinance, or that an animal was not destroyed by a designated and approved person, then he/she must conduct an investigation into the circumstances of the destruction of the animal. The MET may withdraw the delegation of authority given to a conservancy if that conservancy carries out the destruction of an animal in contravention of the provisions of this Policy or in contravention of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (No. 4 of 1975), as amended.

Conservancies will have the right to inform the professional hunter (PH) with whom they have an existing contract or any other hunter if the contracted PH is not available, of the opportunity to hunt a problem-causing animal for which they have been given permission to destroy by the authorised staff member. The conservancy will have the right to charge the PH a fee in terms of Section 13 (ii) of Annex 2. If an animal is hunted in this way then the conservancy is responsible for the reporting requirements contained in Section 14 of Annex 2.

The delegation of authority by the authorised staff member to a conservancy to destroy a problem causing animal shall also include directions as to how the products derived from that animal may be used by the conservancy or retained to the Ministry as State property in terms of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (No. 4 of 1975), as amended.

Appropriate monitoring of numbers of animals removed by MET or by conservancies must take place to ensure biological sustainability is maintained.

2.4.4 Developing and implementing the best appropriate technical solutions for mitigating HWC

One of the methods for managing HWC efficiently and effectively is to implement measures to prevent or reduce conflict. There are a number of technical solutions to preventing conflict that have been tried and tested. However, some species, such as elephants, become habituated to certain solutions and there is a need for ongoing experimentation with new methodologies. Furthermore, there are different problems in different parts of the country even with the same species. Thus elephants in the north and north east cause damage to crops, whereas in the arid north-west the main problem caused by elephants is damage to water installations. In some cases, management and mitigation approaches are relatively simple. Livestock losses can be reduced by ensuring that animals are put in a strong kraal at night. In other cases, there might be a need to look at more sophisticated approaches such as the use of electric fences.

The specific objective of this strategy is:

To promote the development and application by all relevant stakeholders of appropriate and effective plans and measures to prevent or reduce HWC

Strategic approach

Work with relevant stakeholders to develop, implement, test and disseminate the best possible methodologies for preventing or reducing HWC. The Government will do this by:

- Dissemination of information about the effectiveness of specific methodologies
- Training stakeholders in the use of specific methodologies
- Assisting stakeholders in the implementation of specific methodologies, through technical advice and support (e.g. promotion of applied livestock management, consolidation of gardens and crop

fields, siting and operation of electric fencing, information regarding the behaviour of certain species, etc)

- Provide funding through the GPTF to stakeholders in need of financial assistance to test and/or implement mitigation measures.

Such financial assistance will be dependent upon the existence of an HWC management and mitigation plan that has been approved by the Ministry, or in the case of a conservancy, is included in its management plan.

A written agreement must be concluded between the Ministry and a funding recipient that should include the responsibilities and obligations of each party (e.g. that the appropriate authority such as a conservancy, village development committee or traditional authority will ensure that residents do not settle at a water point funded for wildlife only). Such written agreement should include an obligation by the funding recipient to gather and report data on HWC incidents. Where appropriate the agreement should provide for co-financing by funding recipients for infrastructure and/or contributions in kind such as labour.

2.4.5 Research and monitoring

In order to manage HWC effectively and efficiently it is crucial to have adequate data that is available in a usable form for key decision-makers. There is a need for more comprehensive data that enables the Government and other stakeholders to understand better the nature and scale of the problems, to develop solutions and monitor the success of the solutions. Data-gathering needs to be standardised so that results can be compared from area to area and over time. Data needs to be stored in a central data-base that all stakeholders can have access to.

A key requirement is methodologies that can accurately measure the impact of damage to crops and livestock losses on households so a realistic picture is obtained of the true scale of the problem. The Government recognises that many claims of losses or damage are exaggerated by local people because they wish to emphasise the importance of the problem. Yet there are clearly cases where there is real hardship caused by stock or crop losses. These cases need to be identified so that assistance can be provided.

The specific objectives of this strategy are:

- 2.4.5.1 To develop a standardised monitoring and reporting system on HWC that captures the most relevant data for use by all stakeholders
- 2.4.5.2 To monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of different HWC mitigation methods and to disseminate findings to all stakeholders
- 2.4.5.3 Determine the social carrying capacity for certain species that can cause problems

Strategic approach

Establish a national database in the Ministry. This database should include historical data and data from existing systems such as the MET Permit Office.

Record data from each reported HWC incident capturing:

- Species involved and number
- Location of incident
- When incident occurred
- Damage caused
- Who was affected
- Action taken
- Was any mitigation in place (e.g. were animals in a kraal? Were crops protected? etc.)
- Who recorded the data
- Sex and age structure of the animal
- Any other information which may be appropriate.

Provide aggregate data for regions and nationally.

Provide data on the economic impact of HWC on households this provides a better indication of the costs to citizens than simply recording the cost of damage as it takes into account the economic status of the household bearing the loss and other factors. For example, the impact of losing five cows to a predator is much higher on a household owning eight cows compared to a household owning 50 cows. Similarly the loss will be greater to a female-headed household with few other assets and little or no cash income.

Provide data on the effectiveness of HWC mitigation methods including type of method (e.g. alternative water points for elephants), features of the method (e.g. detailed description of the infrastructure, components, ingredients, position in relation to other important features such as other water points, houses, etc), aim of the method (e.g. deter elephants from entering crop fields, provide alternative water to keep elephants away from settlements, etc.), extent to which the method has achieved its aims, reasons for success or failure, length of time over which monitoring has taken place, description of monitoring methodology, provide comparative data to determine why problems occur at specific locations and not others (e.g. why livestock is killed at one kraal but not another neighbouring one) and designed to detect possible duplication of data.

Work with all other stakeholders to develop standardised data gathering and monitoring systems that are simple and cost-effective to implement.

Disseminate data in appropriate forms to all stakeholders.

Build capacity of stakeholders in collecting, recording and using data and ensure that there is systematic and consistent data recording in terms of level of effort and across temporal, spatial and numerical scales.

Develop a standardised method of evaluating crop losses.

Carry out research on the social carrying capacity for certain species that can cause problems as determined by the conflicts they cause and the degree of tolerance shown by local residents. In some cases there may be too many animals of a certain species for the amount of habitat available, or the scale of conflict may be intolerable for residents.

In such cases, the Ministry will establish target population levels that would aim at maintaining healthy and viable populations of wildlife but also a more manageable size of the wildlife population. Many of the problem-causing species are valuable financially and the potential exists to offset any costs they may cause by their careful management for sustainable income generation. This economic

potential is unlikely to be fully unlocked unless through a well-conceived longer-term and integrated management programme.

It is not always the case that problem-causing animal species are over-abundant, e.g. lions in the Caprivi Region, elephants in the Kunene, Erongo and Kavango regions, and these situations bring special challenges if the Ministry is to continue to promote their recovery and increases while there is already a scenario of conflict. However, even in such cases, it is better to manage such populations against clear longer-term targets than on an *ad hoc* basis.

In all cases, establishing a target population for certain species will facilitate the setting of quotas and making other management decisions where clear long-term targets are established, as well as the implementation of adaptive management.

The Ministry will identify priority populations responsible for the most persistent conflicts or with the potential to create the greatest conflicts in future. Initiate a process in collaboration with other stakeholders to determine an appropriate population size (or in the case of the less abundant species, other measures) that would both result in a long-term viable wildlife population but reduced levels of conflict. Thereafter, develop a management programme for a trial case(s) where the Ministry would actively manage such a population(s) within those targets, using all the means available to it to achieve its conservation and development objectives.

2.4.6 Building Self-Reliance

2.4.6.1 Capacity building

It is crucial for effective and efficient management of HWC that organisations and individuals take responsibility for implementing measures to prevent or reduce the likelihood of conflict. Prevention can considerably reduce the impacts of HWC, but cannot be the sole responsibility of Government or of the Ministry alone. It has to be undertaken by the landowners or occupiers themselves. Government can assist land owners and occupiers to use the most appropriate methods and provide the necessary information and training to enable farmers and other stakeholders to carry out their own preventive measures.

There is a need for a framework that enables the systematic provision of such advice and support. For example, Government extension personnel need access to information about methodologies that work the best in particular circumstances so they can pass on this knowledge to farmers and others. Information needs to be collated in practical guides that can be distributed to farmers by field staff. Furthermore, farmers and other stakeholders need support in developing local HWC management and mitigation plans that apply specific methodologies relevant to the circumstances of that locality.

HWC needs to be taken into account in land-use planning, resettlement schemes and the planning and implementation of rural development programmes and projects. This will be the responsibility of line ministries and Government departments concerned with the technical assistance of the Ministry.

The specific objectives of this strategy are to:

2.4.6.1.1 Build the capacity of all stakeholders to develop HWC management and mitigation plans and to implement appropriate mitigation methods.

2.4.6.1.2 Ensure that HWC management is built into land-use planning and the planning and implementation of agricultural and other development schemes.

Strategic approach

Collate information about HWC mitigation methods that work in different circumstances relevant to Namibia and produce information for farmers and other stakeholders in appropriate forms (e.g. what works for different species and for different types of conflict). Provide extension to farmers using this information.

Support stakeholders to develop local management and mitigation plans that include appropriate measures that farmers can take themselves to reduce conflict.

The Government will prioritise for assistance those farmers or organisations that are willing to take action themselves to reduce HWC (e.g. the kraaling of livestock at night).

Actions to prevent and/or mitigate conflict must be included in the planning and implementation of development projects such as agricultural or aquaculture activities and the establishment of new water points. It is the responsibility of the Government department or development agency concerned to ensure that HWC is included in the planning and implementation of such developments and in any environmental assessment carried out. The Ministry will assist Government agencies and other organisations to develop HWC management and mitigation plans.

It is the responsibility of the Ministry of Lands and Resettlement (MLR) to ensure that the planning of resettlement schemes and land-use planning at local, regional and national levels should take account of HWC. The MET will advise and assist the MLR in this regard. Land-use planning should, for example, consider the siting of agricultural schemes and the distribution of crop fields in a manner that leaves corridors for wildlife movements.

2.4.6.2 Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme

It is not Government policy to provide compensation to farmers for losses due to wild animals. Furthermore, compensation schemes implemented elsewhere have proved to be very problematic and open to abuse. There is a need to find other means to offset the losses caused by wildlife and at the same time build the self-reliance of farmers.

A number of conservancies supported by the Ministry and NGOs have experimented with self-insurance schemes for stock and crop losses that provide the means to directly offset the losses to an individual farmer and reduce the socio-economic impact of HWC. This has been one of the few options emerging in several decades. The system may have some weaknesses at present, but also holds high promise, and with full support from Government, it could be improved and expanded.

The specific objectives of this strategy are:

- 2.4.6.2.1 To provide the means to directly offset the losses of communities and individual farmers caused to livestock and crops.
- 2.4.6.2.2 Promote the equitable distribution of benefits so that individuals who suffer losses can benefit from wildlife income.

Strategic approach

Payments under the Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme are made to cover livestock losses at rates that do not cover the full value of the animal concerned but aim to partially off-set the loss to the farmer. A payment at a determined rate would also be made to cover for damages caused to crops.

The Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme shall apply to both conservancy and non-conservancy areas on State land and resettlement farms, but not on private land.

In terms of this Policy, livestock includes cattle, goat, sheep, donkey, horse and sheep. This Policy will apply to incidents of livestock death caused by wild animals, provided that:

- No payments will be made for livestock killed in a national park or conservancy exclusive wildlife zone. Payment will be made in a multiple use area of a zoned national park.
- Livestock death must be reported within 24 hours of the incident occurring, unless a valid reason for not doing so as stipulated is provided and the evidence thereof is still visible.
- The cause of death must be verified by a Ministry staff member or a community game guard where such structure exists.
- No payment will be made if the livestock was killed without reasonable precautions being put in place.
- Ministry staff members together with conservancy staff (where it is inside the conservancy) and traditional authority leaders will inspect livestock enclosures and advise where strengthening is required.

Payments to crops will be made for damages caused only by elephants and hippopotamus. Damages by other animals except for elephants and hippopotamus are difficult to verify and can be misused. Such damages by other animals can also be controlled by farmers. Crops will include maize, millet, sorghum and vegetables.

The Ministry will when issuing quotas for trophy hunting in conservancies make provision that the quota allows for funds to pay for the livestock and

crop damages to members of such conservancies. Where there are no registered conservancies, the source of funding for the Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme shall be a contribution from trophy hunting concessions on State land outside registered conservancies, trophy hunting of problem-causing animals, tourism concessions and permit fees from trophy hunting through the GPTF.

Contribution to the Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme will also be through donors as approved by the Government.

The Ministry will explore possibilities of transferring the management of funds and payments to farmers and communities who suffer losses from wild animals to the regional councils. However, the Ministry will still carry the functions of the allocation of funds as well as the assessment and investigations of damages thereof.

The Minister, or any person delegated by him/her, will appoint a Ministerial Review Panel of not less than three staff members to assess the application for payments in non-conservancy areas and make recommendations for his/her approval.

In gazetted conservancy areas, each conservancy will have a review panel for the scheme consisting of representatives each from the Ministry, the support NGO, the conservancy committee and the traditional authority. Review panels for conservancies will be appointed by the Minister.

The procedure for making payments for livestock and crop damage is provided in Annex 5.

2.4.7 Protected Areas

Many of the conflicts between people and wildlife occur when wildlife leaves protected areas and enters neighbouring farm land. A situation where wildlife from protected areas amounts to the export of economic and social costs to neighbours undermines the conservation objectives of parks by creating negative and sometimes hostile responses from neighbours. The Ministry's aim is that parks should be net exporters of valuable resources and economic benefits to neighbouring communities. There is therefore a strong obligation on the Ministry to assist farmers in addressing HWC which results from wildlife leaving protected areas.

The specific objectives of this strategy are to:

- 2.4.7.1 Reduce the impact on park residents and neighbours of wildlife that leaves protected areas and causes problems.
- 2.4.7.2 Provide economic and other benefits from protected areas to park neighbours.

Strategic Approach

The Ministry, in accordance with the Policy on Tourism and Wildlife Concessions on State Land, will give preference to allocating concessions to protected area residents and neighbours such as conservancies, to help offset livestock and crop losses as a result of HWC and to promote positive relationships with park neighbours and residents.

The Ministry will promote the adoption of compatible land uses such as wildlife and tourism on land adjoining protected areas in order to reduce HWC.

The Ministry will support park neighbours and residents to develop and implement joint HWC management and mitigation plans and provide advice and technical support in applying mitigation methods.

The Ministry will enter into collaborative management arrangements (e.g. specific agreements or MoUs) with protected area neighbours and residents in order to carry out joint HWC management and support the implementation of local HWC management plans.

The Ministry will work with neighbouring countries to develop protocols for dealing with HWC where communal lands in Namibia border on protected areas and wildlife management areas in those countries.

2.4.8 Removal of problem-causing animals

The Ministry recognises that the removal of problem-causing animals either by lethal removal or by translocation does not always solve the problem and there are conservation reasons for limiting lethal removal to those instances where it is absolutely necessary. However there are times when removal will be necessary in particular where life and property are threatened, where animals persistently cause problems or where the numbers of wild animals are so high that conflict becomes an intolerable burden on resident people.

Strategic approach

In order to address the need for removal of individual animals from populations the Ministry will delegate conditional authority to staff members and conservancies for the destruction of identified problem-causing animals in terms of Section 2.5.3 above, of this policy document.

From time to time and as become necessary, increase hunting quotas in the short term.

Where conservancies have quotas, consideration can be given to increase such quotas to provide additional short-term relief. The merits of doing so will vary from case to case and should be considered as such.

Where previously some traditional authorities had quotas for certain species, and this is now not possible with other species outside conservancies due to populations still recovering, but can be considered for e.g. elephants. The Ministry may therefore consider the option of creating additional quotas in such cases.

Where, in certain cases, the occurrence of problems is predictable, also the number of wild animals that would be killed per year. The best example is that of the lions of Etosha National Park, where over a 20-year period, on average about 60 lions per year are killed outside the park, almost always by farmers (communal and commercial) in such a way that no economic value is recovered in the process. In such a case it is preferable to issue a trophy hunting quota for lions outside Etosha National Park, to enable planned trophy hunting and thus recovery of revenue, and with conditions regarding the reduction of other killing.

Live capture and sale of problem-causing animals can be a means of relieving some pressure in areas where HWC incidents are high and at the same time generating some revenue which can be channelled to the affected community. As it is almost impossible to guarantee that the specific problem-causing animals can be captured, it should be accepted that this option may include the capturing of animals of the same species or group or from the same area rather than the specific individuals. However the end result may often be the same.

The Ministry will, should the situation arise, make use of the option of live capture and sale if such action will have the likely result of reducing pressure and problems, and with Treasury approval apply the resulting revenue to conflict prevention in the community concerned.

Culling to reduce problem-causing populations can be used in situations where the numbers of potential problem-causing species are too high in relationship to the human population and in relationship to human livelihood activities such as farming. The Ministry needs to have the full range of management options available including culling, in order to effectively address HWC.

Culling, unless at a very large scale, normally only provides a temporary solution, as animal populations usually recover within a few years. However, the revenue earned from culling and the sale of animal products from culling can be used to invest in conflict prevention measures and furthermore, if small-scale culling has to be repeated over a few years, such culling would also provide valuable research and training opportunities. Like any management technique, it will be essential to apply culling within a monitoring framework.

This option may be required in protected areas or parts of protected areas to reduce a population that would cause problems on neighbouring land, or on other State land, or commercial farm land for species that belong to the State, and where the State is requested for assistance.

If this option is considered necessary, it should be based on an assessment by the Ministry that such culling would not compromise the long-term conservation of that species nationally or regionally, and on land outside protected areas, consultation with local and regional stakeholders would be essential.

The Ministry will consider small-scale culling as an option to reduce conflicts, based on a scientific assessment of the impacts of such culling within a monitoring framework. Any income from culling will be used for conflict prevention and culling should be used as opportunities for research and training.

2.4.9 Establishment of a system to assist affected families with funeral costs

A number of people are killed by wild animals every year in Namibia. Legally the State owns all wildlife except where legislation specifically provides otherwise. Although the Government cannot be held legally responsible for the death of a person killed by a wild animal, there are moral obligations on the Government to support the family of such a person. The Government has therefore decided to adopt the policy of providing funeral expenses for such a family. The objectives of this strategy are to meet the moral obligation of Government to support a family who has lost a family member to certain species of wild animals under conditions where the affected person could not reasonably have been expected to defend himself/herself or to avoid the incident, and where the family has to incur costs for a funeral. Further the MET wishes to demonstrate its commitment to the welfare of the people of Namibia while at the same time promoting biodiversity conservation. The financial support to bereaved families is aimed at covering basic funeral costs and is not in any way intended as compensation for loss of life.

Strategic approach

This policy will apply in *bona fide* incidents of accidental death caused by wild animals included in Schedules 3, 4 and 5 of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (Ordinance 4 of 1975, as amended), provided that:

- The deceased was not engaged in poaching or other illegal activity.
- It can be ascertained as far as possible that the attack by the wild animal was not provoked
- The deceased has no funeral insurance coverage elsewhere or is not eligible for receiving funeral costs from a conservancy or other organisation
- A Ministry official or member of the Namibian Police has investigated the incident and verified the circumstances as meeting all relevant requirements for the application of the Policy.

The procedure for making payments for funeral costs is provided in Annex 4.

2.4.10 Application of revenues from problem-causing animals to avoid future conflict and to address the losses of affected persons

If generating income from problem-causing animals is to be successful in addressing problems at household level, then the income needs to be used to provide relief to those persons that suffered the impact and/or to avoid the repetition of the same problems in future.

The specific objective of this strategy is:

To ensure that income derived from the hunting or sale of problem-causing animals is applied to avoid future conflicts between humans and wildlife.

Strategic approach

The Ministry will, when authorising the trophy hunting of a problem-causing animal, establish a condition that the revenue from such hunting must be used to alleviate the impact of the problem for those persons affected by the incident/s that gave rise to the animal being authorised to be trophy hunted. Funds from problem-causing animals, or a portion of it, will in certain cases as determined by the Ministry be deposited in the GPTF.

The Ministry will establish a guideline price for the trophy hunting of problem-causing animals that will be mandatory. This guideline should make provision for variation in the quality of trophies, to avoid that incentives are created for the hunting of animals other than those that caused the problem.

The Ministry will advise and assist conservancies to establish an internal mechanism to ensure that they can comply with these conditions and expeditiously assist persons that were negatively affected.

Where conservancies are not able to establish such mechanisms, the Ministry will require that such revenues are deposited in the GPTF to ensure that the Ministry has proof of payment, after which conservancies must specify how these funds will be used to address impacts. Once this has been agreed, the Ministry will arrange that the GPTF releases the funds to the relevant community or conservancy.

CHAPTER 3

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION 3.6

- 3.1 The MET will play the coordinating and leading role in the implementation of this Policy.
- 3.2 Traditional authorities, communal area farmers, freehold farmers, communal area conservancies, line ministries and regional councils will in practical terms, support these strategies by implementing programmes and projects that can bring about the intended goals.
- 3.3 Where relevant the NGOs and private sector will be invited to become involved in the provision of planning, training, extension services, material inputs and control of the conflicts by wild animals.
- 3.4 Line ministries and regional councils will ensure that all individuals, organisations and State agencies take responsibility for carrying out appropriate land-use planning and developing integrated measures that are aimed at avoiding and / or reducing HWC.
- 3.5 Traditional authorities should provide proper guidance to their communities on

the best appropriate measures for avoiding or reducing HWC.

Communal area conservancies and farmers as local wildlife management units are committed to sustainable use of wildlife and other natural resources, and therefore should have an integrated HWC management plan that includes measures for the prevention and / or reduction of HWC, the mitigation of problems caused by HWC and for gathering data on human-wildlife incidents and are responsible for the implementation of the management plans thereof.

CHAPTER 4

MONITORING AND EVALUATION FOR POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

- 4.1 The impact of the implementation of this Policy and progress and constraints regarding its implementation will be periodically assessed by the MET in consultation with other stakeholders.
- 4.2 The Event/Incident Book System and the HWC Data form will be used for monitoring and evaluation of HWC.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ministry of Environment and Tourism. 2005. National workshop on human-wildlife conflict management in Namibia. Safari Hotel, Windhoek
2. Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996 (Act 5 of 1996)
3. Nature Conservation Ordinance of 1975 (Number 4 of 1975)

Glossary

For the purposes of this policy, the words or phrases set out below have the following meanings:

Authorised staff member	Regional heads of the Ministry authorised by the Minister to carry such duties, functions and responsibilities.
Capacity building	Transfer of knowledge, information, skills and understanding.
Conservancy	Communal area conservancy gazetted in terms of the Nature Conservation Amendment Act (No.5 of 1996).
Culling	Lethal removal of wild animals to reduce their numbers.
Director	Director of Parks and Wildlife Management.
Human-wildlife conflict	Any event in which wild animals harm, destroy or damage human life or property (including damage to or destruction of crops), or in which wild animals are injured, captured or destroyed as a result of a perceived threat to humans or their property.
Government	Government of the Republic of Namibia.
Ministry	The Ministry of Environment and Tourism.
Problem-causing animal	An identified individual wild animal that at any point in time harms, destroys or damages human life or property.
Professional Hunter	A professional hunter approved by MET.
Protected Area	Formal protected area proclaimed in the Government Gazette according to legislation.
Staff member	Person appointed in terms of the Public Service Act (13 of 1995).
Stakeholder	Any individual, group of individuals, organisation or Government department or agency that is affected by HWC or is involved in research on HWC or implementation of measures to mitigate HWC.
Wild animal	Any wild animal that is included in Schedules 3, 4 and 5 of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (Ordinance 4 of 1975, as amended).

ANNEXES





ANNEX 1:

Guidelines concerning the delegation of authority to Regional Offices of MET and other designated institutions to determine when to destroy a problem-causing animal

Authorised staff members of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) and other designated institutions will determine when to destroy a problem-causing animal, based on the following criteria and procedures:

- 1) This delegation does not apply to situations on land in proclaimed protected areas (except in multiple use areas).
- 2) Authorised staff members must, prior to causing an animal to be destroyed, use the resources available to them to verify the reported problem and to assess the seriousness of the problem.
- 3) Decisions to destroy any animal must be based on an assessment whether:
 - a. An animal has injured or killed a person
 - b. An animal has persistently killed livestock
 - c. An animal remains close to settlement and behaves aggressively such that residents feel threatened going about their daily lives, and
 - d. Further problems will be caused if the animal(s) concerned are not destroyed, and
 - e. The responsible animal can be identified, located and destroyed with the resources available to the authorised staff member, and
 - f. The destruction of the specific animal(s) will at least in part resolve a problem.
- 4) Authorised staff members may task other MET staff members only in such instances where they are confident that the relevant staff member is fully skilled and equipped for the task and that the risks of wounding an animal or otherwise creating secondary problems are minimised.
- 5) MET staff should, in the interests of public safety, aim to avoid the destruction of an animal in the presence of the public (including the media) wherever possible.
- 6) At no time is any MET staff member allowed to destroy an animal without another staff member present to witness the procedure.
- 7) Authorised staff members must ensure in all cases where an animal is destroyed by a MET staff member outside of a conservancy that all trophies be recovered, prepared and safeguarded for future sale to the benefit of MET (through the GPTF). For elephant skins, DPWM and DSS will advise on recovery methods appropriate to field conditions after consultation with local tanning industries.
- 8) In the case of an animal being legally destroyed in an authorised conservancy by MET staff or by a designated person from the authorised conservancy, the income from the trophy will be accrued as directed by the authorised staff member. The delegation to an authorised conservancy should include directions as to how the products derived from that animal may be used by the conservancy or retained to the State in terms of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (No. 4 of 1975), as amended.
- 9) Authorised staff members must ensure that the meat of any edible animal killed be made available to the person(s) who were affected, alternatively via the relevant traditional authority if it can not be determined who should benefit or how the meat should be divided. If so preferred by the affected persons, permits can be issued for the selling of such meat.
- 10) Authorised staff members must determine whether the greatest positive impacts can be achieved by an MET staff member or designated person destroying an animal versus having the animal shot by a client of a professional hunter against payment. Such a decision should be based on the urgency of the matter, the availability of suitable staff and resources to monitor the hunt, and the availability of a professional hunter or client, and the suitability of the animal in question. In the case of an animal legally destroyed by a scheduled client of a Professional Hunter with an existing contract with an authorised conservancy, the income from the trophy will be accrued as directed by the authorised staff member.
- 11) Where the option of a professional hunter is required outside of a conservancy, the authorised staff member or authorised institution should approach the nearest professional hunter operating in that region. If none, or if such hunter is not available or interested or able to carry out the task, the authorised staff member or authorised

institution should contact the Director who will maintain a list of professional hunters for this purpose and who will thereafter determine if there is a demand or if MET should itself take such action. Note that the Director will ensure that Treasury authorisation is obtained both for the destruction of animals under this delegation as well as the fees that can be charged and the disposal of perishables such as meat.

12) The approval to a professional hunter to destroy any animal must be accompanied by clear instructions, an appropriate permit issued, and the hunting must be supervised by an MET staff member (but leaving this to the discretion of the authorised staff member in cases where hunting takes place in a conservancy and under the supervision of conservancy members).

i. The approval for such hunting must be on the condition that the revenue from such hunting must be used to alleviate the impact of the problem for those persons affected by the incident/s that gave rise to the animal being authorised to be trophy hunted.

ii. MET will establish a guideline price for the trophy hunting of problem-causing animals that will be mandatory. This guideline should make provision for variation in the quality of trophies, to avoid that incentives are created for the hunting of animals other than those that caused the problem.

13) Authorised staff members must maintain records for all cases reported to them, their assessment according to section 3 above, decisions and actions taken by them, and the outcome of those actions and decisions, the disposal of the meat and trophies of the animal killed. The authorised staff member must provide a written report to the Director: Parks and Wildlife, within 10 days. Reports must include the following:

- The species of animal destroyed
- Where and when the animal was destroyed
- That there were good grounds in terms of the guidelines provided in Section 3 above for the destruction of the animal and that these conform to the reasons provided in the decision-making framework for the region
- That there were good grounds for being reasonably confident that the animal causing the problems was the animal that was destroyed and an explanation of the reasons for this confidence
- The disposal of the products such as ivory, meat, hide, etc.
- An account of the operation
- The costs of the operation to MET if MET destroyed the animal
- Identification of the staff member that carried out the destruction
- Where the destruction was carried out by a professional hunter, the relevant part of the report must be signed by the hunter and countersigned by the staff member who supervised the hunting as a true reflection of the incident (or not, as may be the case).

14) If the authorised staff member fail to report to the satisfaction of the Minister and account for their decisions, or otherwise do not comply with the criteria or procedures outlined in the delegation, the delegation can be revoked at any time and grounds for a misconduct charge will be investigated. Similarly, if the authorised staff member is considered to be unreasonably giving cause to the unjustifiable destruction of an animal or an unjustifiable number of animals, the delegation can be revoked at any time and the staff member charged with misconduct.

ANNEX 2:

Guidelines for destruction of a problem-causing animal by a conservancy to which authority has been delegated by the MET

Authorised staff members of the Directorate of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) may provide written permission to an authorised conservancy to destroy a problem-causing animal, based on the following criteria and procedures:

- 1) This delegation does not apply to situations on land in proclaimed protected areas.
- 2) Authorised staff members may provide such permission to a conservancy if the MET does not itself have the resources or the opportunity to destroy the animal concerned.
- 3) Authorised staff members must, prior to providing permission to a conservancy to cause an animal to be destroyed, use the resources available to them to verify the reported problem and to assess the seriousness of the problem.
- 4) An authorised conservancy may only use a designated person approved by the authorised staff member for the region to destroy an animal.
- 5) The authorised staff member may authorise an MET staff member to observe the destruction of a problem-causing animal by a conservancy or by the professional hunter with which the conservancy has an existing contract.
- 6) Conservancies or the professional hunter with whom they have an existing contract should, in the interests of public safety, aim to avoid the destruction of an animal in the presence of the public (including the media) wherever possible.
- 7) At no time is any designated person from an authorised conservancy allowed to destroy an animal without another staff member present to witness the procedure.
- 8) An authorised conservancy must ensure that the meat of any edible animal killed be made available to the person(s) who were affected, alternatively via the relevant traditional authority if it can not be determined who should benefit or how the meat should be divided. If so preferred by the affected persons, permits can be issued for the selling of such meat.
- 9) Authorised conservancies must determine whether the greatest positive impacts can be achieved by designated person destroying an animal versus having the animal shot by a client against payment. Such a decision should be based on the urgency of the matter, the availability of suitable staff and resources to monitor the hunt, and the availability of the professional hunter with whom the conservancy has an existing contract and whether that PH has a scheduled client in the conservancy at the time.
- 10) The approval to a professional hunter to destroy any animal must be accompanied by clear instructions, an appropriate permit issued, and the hunting may be supervised by an MET staff member.
- 11) The approval for such hunting must be on the condition that the revenue from such hunting must be used to alleviate the impact of the problem for those persons affected by the incident/s that gave rise to the animal being authorised to be trophy hunted.
 - i. MET will establish a guideline price for the hunting of problem-causing animals that will be mandatory. This guideline should make provision for variation in the quality of trophies, to avoid that incentives are created for the hunting of animals other than those that caused the problem.
 - ii. Conservancies should establish internal mechanisms to ensure that they can comply with these conditions and to expeditiously assist persons that were negatively affected by the problem-causing animal.
 - iii. Where conservancies are not able to establish such mechanisms to directly assist persons affected by the problem-causing animal, MET should require that such revenues are deposited in the Game Products Trust Fund (GPTF) to

ensure that MET has proof of payment, after which conservancies must specify how these funds will be used to address impacts. Once this has been agreed, MET will arrange that the GPTF releases the funds to the relevant community or conservancy.

- iv. The submission of proof of such payment must be obtained by the authorised staff member and Director from the professional hunter, and failure to provide such proof will be used as reasonable grounds to refuse the future registration of that hunter with MET and/or other appropriate measures such as the revoking of permits, concessions, etc. Non-compliance with any of the conditions specified with the approval of such a hunt must similarly be reported and commensurate action taken by MET through the Director.

- 12) Authorised conservancies must maintain records for all cases where they have caused a problem-causing animal to be destroyed in terms of this policy, the disposal of the meat and trophies of the animal killed. Reports must include the following:

- The species of animal destroyed
- Where and when the animal was destroyed
- That there were good grounds for being reasonably confident that the animal causing the problems was the animal that was destroyed and an explanation of the reasons for this confidence
- The disposal of the products such as ivory, meat, hide, etc.
- An account of the operation
- Identification of the staff member who carried out the destruction
- Where the destruction was carried out by a professional hunter, the relevant part of the report must be signed by the hunter and countersigned by the staff member who supervised the hunting as a true reflection of the incident (or not, as may be the case).

- 13) If authorised conservancies fail to report to the Ministry and account for their actions, or otherwise do not comply with the criteria or procedures outlined in the delegation of authority, the delegation can be revoked at any time and grounds for prosecution investigated if illegal activity is suspected.

ANNEX 3:

Example of a framework for deciding when a problem-causing animal should be destroyed

1. Introduction

This decision-making framework provides the foundation for taking a decision that a problem-causing animal should be destroyed. It poses a number of questions, the answers to which lead to the next level of question and ultimately to a decision to destroy the animal concerned.

2. Decision-making framework

- 1) Has the report of the problem been received in sufficient time to enable the specific problem-causing animal to be located and destroyed?
*If not, then no further action should be taken. The reason for taking no further action should be explained to the person(s) making the report.
If yes, proceed to next question.*
- 2) Has the animal (or animals):
 - a) Injured or killed a person?
 - b) Persistently killed livestock?
 - c) Remained close to a settlement, behaving aggressively such that residents feel threatened?Or would further problems be caused if the animal(s) concerned is not destroyed?
If the answer is "no" to all of these questions, then no further action

should be taken and the reasons explained to the person(s) making the report.

If the answer to one of these questions is "yes" then proceed to the next question.

- 3) Can the animal be identified, located and destroyed with resources directly available to the MET/conservancy?
*If the answer is no, then the MET/conservancy should determine whether a professional hunter can find a client to destroy the animal within sufficient time for the specific animal to be located. If the MET/conservancy does not have the resources and no professional hunter and client can be found in time then no further action should be taken.
If the MET/conservancy has the resources to take action or a professional hunter and client are available, then proceed to the next question.*
- 4) Will the destruction of the specific animal(s) at least in part resolve a problem?
*If the answer is no, then no further action should be taken.
If the answer is yes, then the decision should be taken to destroy the animal.*

ANNEX 4:

Procedures for providing funeral expenses to the deceased's family in the case of death caused by a wild animal

Amount of expenses

- a) The amount to be paid from the Game Products Trust Fund (GPTF) to cover funeral expenses shall in all cases be N\$5,000.00. This amount may be adjusted from time to time as may be deemed appropriate.
- b) This amount is intended to support the family with the costs for a coffin and other basic expenses associated with the funeral, or if the body is not recovered, for any memorial service associated with the death.
- c) This amount should be paid either by bank transfer or cheque if the family has a bank account or by post office telegram if there is no bank account.
- d) The MET staff member investigating the incident must obtain the name and address of a person from the family of the deceased to whom payment will be made, if the claim is successful.
- e) The investigating officer(s) will provide a report to the Permanent Secretary providing all relevant information relating to the circumstances of death and the eligibility of the family to receive funeral costs, and the name and address of the person to whom payment should be made.
- f) The Permanent Secretary will then initiate a claim for the funds to be released from the Game Products Trust Fund to the family concerned.

Procedures

- a) The family of the deceased must report the incident to a local Police station or MET office on a standard form available from MET or Police stations.
- b) The report must be accompanied by any relevant documentation related to the deceased (e.g. death certificate) and by information regarding the circumstances of the death.
- c) Once a report has been received, the Police and the relevant regional office of MET will investigate the incident to verify that the Policy is applicable.
- g) MET, with the support from the Game Products Trust Fund, will endeavour to make such payments within 24 hours after a valid claim has been received, and will issue a standard letter noting that the Government is not liable for any compensation or responsible for any further liabilities.

ANNEX 5:

Procedures for providing payment for the Human Wildlife Self Reliance Scheme

Amount of expenses

- a) The amount to be paid for livestock (from the age of six month) is as follows:

Livestock	Amount (N\$)
Cattle (cow or bull)	1 500.00
Goat	200.00
Sheep	250.00
Horse	500.00
Donkey	250.00
Pig	250.00

- b) The amount to be paid for crop damages is as follows:

Hectares	Amount (N\$)
One quarter of a hectare	200.00
One hectare	800.00

- c) The Minister shall adjust the amount for payment from time to time as may be deemed appropriate, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.
- b) This amount should be paid either by bank transfer or cheque if the farmer or community member has a bank account or by post office telegram if there is no bank account.

Procedures

- a) The farmer, community member or owner of the livestock (s) killed or crop damaged must report the incident to the MET office or the Conservancy office.
- b) On receiving the report of the death of livestock or damage to crops, the Ministry staff member and a Conservancy Ranger when it is inside a conservancy, visits the place with the owner of the livestock or crop where the incident or damage occurred to gather more details.
- c) Where livestock has been killed, the Ministry staff member and Conservancy Ranger must see the animal's carcass or

remains *in situ* in order to gather any evidence that the livestock has been killed by a listed problem-causing animal, and that the time and place of the death matches the conditions of the scheme. Similarly, the Ministry staff member and Conservancy Ranger must see crop damaged and verify that the damage occurred and has been caused by elephants or hippos.

- d) If there is insufficient or dubious evidence in the livestock killed or crop damaged, the claim cannot be continued.
- e) If the incident or damage is confirmed to meet the criteria for the scheme, a Problem-causing Animal Report Form is filled out by the Ministry staff member or Conservancy Ranger, and the information should also be entered into the Event / Incident Book. All the relevant details should be filled out correctly as failure to do so may delay or invalidate the claim.
- f) If there is full agreement that the conditions of the scheme have been met and the claim is valid, a Human Wildlife Claim Form must be completed by the authorised staff member of the Ministry or his/her representative, and when it is inside a conservancy by the conservancy manager or a representative of the conservancy committee.
- g) The Human Wildlife Claim Form then needs to be verified and considered by the respective traditional authority. Meetings with the traditional authority should be set every month though not necessarily on fixed dates to avoid delays in processing claims.
- h) From the traditional authority, the authorised staff member of the Ministry should forward the claim to the Ministerial Review Committee for further consideration and recommendation to the Minister for approval.
- i) The Permanent Secretary will then initiate a claim for the funds to be released from the regional council to the farmer or community member affected.
- j) Claims for incidents inside the

conservancies will once considered by the traditional authority forwarded to a review panel of the conservancy for recommendation and thereafter for approval by the conservancy committee.

k) The conservancy committee will then initiate a claim for the funds to be released by the conservancy to the farmer or community members affected.

l) A record must be kept of all claims and

payments, against which new claims should be cross-referenced. Each conservancy shall provide the Minister with all proceedings and decisions related to the scheme on a quarterly basis.

m) MET with support from the regional councils and conservancies will endeavour to make such payments within a month after a valid claim has been received.

Designed and printed with support from
the Integrated Community-based Ecosystem Management (ICEMA) Project
and the Strengthening the Protected Area Network (SPAN) Project



Photo credits: Vincent Guillemin (cover image), Linda Baker, Colin Nott, Midori Paxton, Andy Thompson

