




REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM

REVISED NATIONAL POLICY ON HUMAN WILDLIFE CONFLICT MANAGEMENT

2018 – 2027



April 2018





REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA
MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND TOURISM

Author: MET

Ministry of Environment and Tourism

Directorate of Wildlife and National Parks

Private Bag 13306

Windhoek

Phone: +264 61 2842111

Fax: +264 61 229936

© **MET 2018**

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes without prior permission from the copyright holder is authorized, provided the source is fully acknowledged.

Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes without prior written permission of the copyright holder is prohibited



Supported by
giz Deutsche Gesellschaft
für Internationale
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Section	Page
Table of contents.....	2
Forward.....	3
Abbreviations.....	4
Glossary.....	5
Executive summary.....	6
1. Introduction.....	7
2. Background.....	7
3. Rationale.....	8
4. Alignment.....	9
5. Principles.....	9
6. Policy Direction.....	10
6.1 Vision.....	10
6.2 Mission.....	10
6.3 Goal.....	10
6.4 Objectives.....	10
6.5 Strategies.....	10
6.5.1 Research and Monitoring.....	10
6.5.2 Duty of care, land use planning and integrated measures to avoid human wildlife conflict.....	11
6.5.3 Human capacity and resources.....	12
6.5.4 Community care and engagement.....	14
6.5.5 Delegation of decision-making authority.....	15
6.5.6 Removal of problem causing animals.....	16
6.5.7 Appropriate technical solutions for mitigating human wildlife conflict.....	17
6.5.8 Disaster Management.....	19
6.5.9 Application of revenues from problem causing animals to avoid future conflicts and to address the losses of affected persons.....	20
6.5.10 Protected Areas Neighbours and Residents.....	20
6.5.11 Human Wildlife Conflict Management Schemes.....	21
6.5.12 Public awareness, stakeholder engagement and coordination.....	24
7. Implementation Framework.....	25
7.1 Institutional arrangements.....	25
7.2 Legal and regulatory arrangements.....	26
7.3 Resource mobilization.....	26
7.4 Monitoring and evaluation.....	26
7.5 Implementation Action Plan.....	26
7.6 Conclusion.....	26
7.7 Annexures.....	26
8. Bibliography.....	26


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. 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.

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 is for these purposes that the National Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict Management was developed in 2009 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. This policy has been revised and updated to reflect changing circumstances, new thinking regarding HWC and the results of experience in addressing HWC management issues on the ground over the past seven years.





ABBREVIATIONS

CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resource Management
DWNP	Directorate of Wildlife and National Parks
DSS	Directorate of Scientific Services
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
GPTF	Game Products Trust Fund
HWC	Human-wildlife conflict
MET	Ministry of Environment and Tourism
MLR	Ministry of Land Reform
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PH	Professional Hunter

GLOSSARY

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

Authorized staff member	Regional heads of the Ministry authorized 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 Wildlife and National Parks
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	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, organization 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) or any similar schedules contained in legislation that replaces the Ordinance.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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 and predators, 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 scale and urgency of the problem required Government to develop an integrated, flexible and comprehensive policy towards dealing with human 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.

Objectives of the Policy are:

1. To develop future human wildlife conflict management legislative frame work.
2. To develop a standardized monitoring system for human wildlife conflict Management.
3. To establish best practice mitigation, protection and preventative measures for human wildlife conflict management.
4. To develop and implement innovative mechanisms to reduce the level of human wildlife conflict.
5. To provide clarity on the question of non-compensation with regard to damages caused by wild animals.
6. To develop innovative financial mechanisms and solutions for managing human wildlife conflict.
7. To provide for systems and clear processes for quick reaction to incidents of human wildlife conflict.
11. Public awareness and conservation education shall be conducted in order to manage human wildlife conflict efficiently and effectively.
12. The Government will continue with research and monitoring to reduce human wildlife conflict.
13. The Government will empower communities and farmers in order to manage human wildlife conflict.

In order to address the impact of human wildlife conflict, the Policy sets out twelve strategies which include research and monitoring; duty of care, land use planning and integrated measures to avoid human wildlife conflict; human capacity and resources; community care and engagement; delegation of decision-making authority; removal of problem causing animals; appropriate technical solutions for mitigating human wildlife conflict; disaster management; application of revenues from problem causing animals to avoid future conflicts and to address the losses of affected persons; protected areas neighbours and residents; human wildlife conflict management schemes; and public awareness, stakeholder engagement and coordination.

This Policy will allow for the management of human wildlife conflict in a way that recognizes the rights and development needs of local communities, recognizes the need to promote biodiversity conservation, promotes self-reliance and ensures that decision-making is quick, efficient and based on the best available information.

The Policy is based on a number of fundamental principles, and these are:

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. Human wildlife conflict is bound to occur where people and wildlife co-exist, and therefore the conflict needs to be managed.

3. The needs of the people and the aims of biodiversity conservation must be balanced for the present and future generations.
4. The Government shall strive to maintain viable populations of all species throughout the country.
5. The Government shall not establish a compensation scheme for losses caused by wildlife but shall put in place other measures to offset and mitigate the cost of living with wildlife.
6. It is the responsibility of all citizens and state agencies to manage human wildlife conflict wherever it occurs.
7. The policy on human wildlife conflict management must promote self-reliance by farmers and other affected parties in managing conflict.
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.
9. The economic value of wildlife should be used to develop and implement mitigation measures and to offset the losses caused by wild animals.
10. The Government shall take the leading role in the management human wildlife conflict, but it is the responsibility of all citizens to manage the conflict.

1. INTRODUCTION

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. It is therefore necessary that mechanisms are created for rural communities and farmers to manage and benefit from wildlife and other natural resources.

A variety of approaches can be implemented in order to manage the conflict efficiently and effectively, in line with the strategies set out in the policy. These include prevention strategies which endeavor to avoid the conflict occurring in the first place and take action towards addressing its root causes, and protection strategies that are implemented when the conflict is certain to happen or has already occurred, as well as mitigation strategies that attempt to reduce the level of impact and lessen the problem.

2. BACKGROUND

Human Wildlife Conflict occurs throughout Namibia on communal as well as freehold land and involves a variety of species. The main problems occur on the land where the most elephants and predators are found outside protected areas and where people are least able economically to bear the costs of damage and losses.

Namibia has adopted a number of innovative approaches to achieve biodiversity conservation within the framework of national development plans. Internationally we are regarded as leaders, and wildlife populations are stable or expanding despite growing human populations, numerous infrastructure developments including projects established on defiance of the Environmental Management Act which is there primarily to identify and mitigate potential impacts on the environment, including wildlife. 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. In most other countries in Africa wildlife has simply been displaced by people through conversion of habitat and illegal hunting.

It is therefore of great significance that Namibia's achievements in this regard are not underplayed or undermined.

Despite these successes, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism 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.

The Ministry 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 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.

Because of competition between growing human population and wildlife for the same living space and resources, movement of people for food security, drought, flood, continued negative attitudes towards wildlife and protected areas, negligent exposure to areas with dangerous wildlife, modification of wildlife habitats due to infrastructure development, agriculture, green schemes, fishing and other developmental projects, there has been reports of human wildlife conflict in the regions.

It is also evident that the wide spread serious drought in almost all of Namibia is aggravating the situation. People and wildlife in several places compete for the same resources. Some people have simply invaded land set aside for wildlife, with consequently severe conflicts. Nonetheless, there are ways to mitigate such conflicts and the Ministry is engaged within its resource limits in this matter.

The following are the conflicts related to wild animals with humans:

- Loss of human life and injuries to people.
- Injuries and death of live stock.
- Damage to property (water points and boreholes, fences, gates, kraals, houses, etc.).
- Damage to vegetation and wildlife.
- Competition with livestock for forage.
- Destruction of crops and gardens.

The above conflicts are caused because of competition between growing human population and wildlife for the same living space and resources; movements of people for reasons of safety or food security; continued negative attitudes towards wildlife and Protected Areas; negligent exposure to areas with dangerous wildlife, e.g. swimming by children in the Kavango River and modification of wildlife habitats due to infrastructure development, agriculture, green schemes, fishing and other developmental projects.

Many wild animals are destroyed in retaliation for incidents of human-wildlife conflict, even when the identification of the real culprit is not possible, especially with predators. This may eliminate the specie and affect the ecosystem and home ranges. This also has a broader environmental impact on ecosystem equilibrium and biodiversity conservation.

Human Wildlife Conflict therefore has social and economic or financial impact. It reduces cash income and has repercussions for health, nutrition, education and ultimately development.

This conflict can have negative impact on the livelihood of rural communities, e.g. the killing of livestock (donkeys for transport) by predators. The ban of hunting of species that are killed in large numbers as problem animals, which may generate income for the State, rural communities and farmers when hunted as trophy animals can also be a negative implication. There are also economic costs of damage caused by wild animals, and the exposure to wildlife diseases, physical injuries and loss of human lives in some cases disrupts normal lives of families and has financial implications.

3. RATIONALE

In 2009, Cabinet approved the National Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict Management. The Policy provides a framework for addressing human-wildlife conflict efficiently and effectively in order to promote both biodiversity conservation as well as human development.

Human wildlife conflicts in Namibia have become more frequent and severe over recent decades as a result of human population growth, wildlife population growth, unplanned agricultural activities, and expansion of agricultural and industrial activities which together have led to increased human encroachment on previously wild and uninhabited areas. Competition for the available natural habitats and resources has increased. Moreover, the effects of climate change are exacerbating these conflicts. The situation is even worsened by the drought in most part of the country over the years.

With the current challenges and new innovative ideas on how to address the conflict, it has become imperative that the National Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict Policy be reviewed. The new policy should be focused and specific on affected areas and the specific conflict should be addressed.

The policy should also have an implementation plan that also outlines the required human and financial resources required to deal with the problem.

The policy should also speak to other policies such as those addressing issues of land matters, agriculture and forestry.

4. ALIGNMENT

The Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (Ordinance 4 of 1975) as amended by the Nature Conservation Amendment Act (Act 5 of 1996) provides legislative basis for control of specific problem causing animals, declaration of problem animal, hunting and rights on the utilization of wildlife. This Policy is aligned to this legislation.

The Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill is being prepared and will repeal the Nature Conservation Ordinance, as amended. The Bill will provide for a proper administrative, legal and procedural framework for human wildlife conflict management.

5. PRINCIPLES

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

- 5.1 Wildlife is part of the natural environment that people depend on, and based on Article 95 (I) of the Constitution, must be maintained throughout the country as part of the sustainable development that the Government of Namibia is committed to pursue.
- 5.2 Human wildlife conflict is bound to occur where people and wildlife co-exist, and therefore the conflict needs to be managed.
- 5.3 The needs of the people and the aims of biodiversity conservation must be balanced for the present and future generations.
- 5.4 The Government shall strive to maintain viable populations of all species throughout the country.
- 5.5 The Government shall not establish a compensation scheme for losses caused by wildlife but shall put in place other measures to offset and mitigate the cost of living with wildlife.
- 5.6 It is the responsibility of all citizens and state agencies to manage human wildlife conflict wherever it occurs.
- 5.7 The policy on human wildlife conflict management must promote self-reliance by farmers and other affected parties in managing conflict.
- 5.8 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.
- 5.9 The economic value of wildlife should be used to develop and implement mitigation measures and to offset the losses caused by wild animals.
- 5.10 The Government shall take the leading role in the management of human wildlife conflict, but it is the responsibility of all citizens to manage the conflict.
- 5.11 Public awareness and conservation education shall be conducted in order to manage human wildlife conflict efficiently and effectively.

5.12 The Government will continue with research and monitoring to reduce human wildlife conflict.

5.13 The Government will empower communities and farmers in order to manage human wildlife conflict.

6. POLICY DIRECTION

6.1 Vision

To manage human wildlife conflict in a way that recognizes the rights and development needs of local communities, recognizes 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, the Government will develop appropriate mitigation and monitoring methods and develop the capacity of all stakeholders to manage human wildlife conflict.

6.2 Mission

To provide a framework for addressing human wildlife conflict efficiently and effectively in order to promote both biodiversity conservation as well as human development.

6.3 Goal

To provide measures and approaches to manage and reduce human wildlife conflict in Namibia from the current incidents of about five thousand per year to less than one thousand incidents by 2026.

6.4 Objectives

The objectives of the Policy are:

- 6.4.1 To develop future human wildlife conflict management legislative framework.
- 6.4.2 To develop a standardized monitoring system for human wildlife conflict Management.
- 6.4.3 To establish best practice mitigation, protection and preventative measures for human wildlife conflict management.
- 6.4.4 To develop and implement innovative mechanisms to reduce the level of human wildlife conflict.

- 6.4.5 To provide clarity on the question of non-compensation with regard to damages caused by wild animals.
- 6.4.6 To develop innovative financial mechanisms and solutions for managing human wildlife conflict.
- 6.4.7 To provide for systems and clear processes for quick reaction to incidents of human wildlife conflict.

6.5 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 or relocated.
- 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 the Government has developed the following strategies:

6.5.1 Research and Monitoring

In order to manage Human-Wild life conflict 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 standardized 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 recognizes that many claims of losses or damage are exaggerated by local people because they wish to emphasize 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.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.1.1 To develop a standardized monitoring and reporting system on animals that causes HWC that captures the most relevant data for use by all stakeholders.
- 6.5.1.2 To monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of different HWC mitigation methods and to disseminate findings to all stakeholders.
- 6.5.1.3 To determine the social behavior and movement of certain species that can cause conflicts.
- 6.5.1.4 To develop data and statistics for effective management of human wildlife conflict.

Strategic Approach

Establish national data base for human wildlife conflict management in the Ministry. This data base should include historical data and data from existing systems and current incidents.

Record data from each reported HWC incident capturing:

- Species involved and number
- Location of incident (GPS reading)
- 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 fifty 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.

Develop standardized data gathering and monitoring systems that are simple and cost-effective to implement, using a compulsory or legal form which is filled regularly.

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 standardized method of evaluating crop losses.

Establish an “Early Warning System” in the regions and nationally. Researchers often collar wild animals to monitor their movements through satellite tracking.

Different techniques exist by which this information on elephant and lion movements can be used to provide communities and farmers with an early warning that elephants or lions are approaching their crop fields or livestock. The communities and farmers can then take appropriate measures to prevent damage to crops or livestock losses. The early warning system should provide information on a daily basis.

Private wildlife researchers who monitor wildlife movements through satellite tracking should provide regional MET offices and local wildlife management units with daily movements of collared predators and elephants. MET, conservancies and the researchers should establish mechanisms for this information to be speedily relayed to affected farmers.

MET will establish a central based Rapid Response Unit which will include a veterinarian among the staff members, and which will work with other stakeholders to be able to respond to the need to capture or lethally remove problem causing animals.

Carry out research on the social behavior and movement 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, 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.

both result in a long-term viable wildlife population but reduced levels of conflict.

Thereafter, develop a management programme 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.

All wild animals destroyed as problem causing animals should be reported back, to ensure that such actions contribute to the better management of human wildlife conflict.

6.5.2 Duty of Care, Land Use Planning and Integrated Measures to avoid HWC

Every person and all organs of State has a general duty of care to take reasonable measures to prevent or minimize damage being caused or to be caused by wild animals.

It is the responsibility of all citizens, farmers, organizations and organs of State that engage in land uses that can be affected by HWC to take measures to avoid such conflict. The Ministry of Environment and Tourism will assist individuals, farmers, organizations and organs of State to take such measures but is not responsible for damage to property caused by wild animals.

Specific Objective

To ensure that every person, organizations and organs of State take responsibility for carrying out appropriate land-use planning (in accordance with the provisions of the Ministry responsible for land matters), taking reasonable measures to prevent or minimize damage caused by wild animals and developing integrated measures that are aimed to avoid and/or reduce HWC.

Strategic Approach

Every person, organization, company, organ of State 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 Impact Assessment must be conducted for certain activities to avoid human wildlife conflict.

In terms of the Environmental Management Act of 2007 (Act No. 7 of 2007), an environmental clearance certificate must be obtained for the following activities which could lead to HWC:

- The establishment of land resettlement schemes.
- The abstraction of ground or surface water for industrial or commercial purposes.
- Construction of dams, reservoirs, levees and weirs.
- Construction of facilities for aquaculture production, where the structures are not situated within an aquaculture development zone declared in terms of the Aquaculture Act, 2002.
- The declaration of an area as an aquaculture development zone in terms of the Aquaculture Act, 2002.
- Irrigation or green schemes for agriculture.
- Forestry activities.
- Tourism development activities.
- Water resource developments.
- Construction of cemeteries, camping, leisure and recreation sites.
- Fencing.

Environmental Inspectors and Wildlife Officers shall collaborate to ensure that activities and projects that require environmental assessments do not cause human wildlife conflict.

Environmental Assessments for these activities should specifically identify the extent to which HWC may take place as a result of these activities and should include measures to prevent or reduce and mitigate HWC. Environmental Assessments that assess the potential for causing or increasing HWC should be carried out for the provision of water to livestock grazing schemes and small-scale farm development schemes, particularly where they are close to National Parks or could affect wildlife corridors.

There are other development activities which can also lead to HWC. Particular attention should be given to assessing and mitigating HWC in the planning and development of new water points, agricultural 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 human wildlife conflict 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 Ministry of Environment and Tourism (MET) may 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), where necessary, which should be signed by all relevant parties and should spell out the roles and responsibilities of each party. The MET may 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 organizations 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 and implement area-based and regional HWC management and mitigation plans.

The MET will identify 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 would receive priority assistance from the Ministry in terms of technical assistance and advice and the development of local HWC management plans.

The development of Integrated Regional Land Use Plans under the Ministry responsible for land matters should take into account the zonation plans of local wildlife management units which identify wildlife corridors and exclusive wildlife and tourism zones. In order to avoid HWC, other sectors should avoid the planning of new infrastructure, agricultural schemes and water provision in these wildlife corridors and zones.

Leasehold should be considered for allocation to protect wildlife corridors and to prevent other activities that may lead to human wildlife conflict.

Communal Land Boards should take into account wildlife matters and activities that may lead to human wildlife conflict when allocating leaseholds. Integrated Land Use Plans and plans related to wildlife management and human wildlife conflict management should be considered by the Communal Land Boards.

6.5.3 Human Capacity and Resources

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism should have human resources available for addressing HWC management and to build the capacity of personnel to carry out HWC functions. These steps are required to address the growing number of HWC incidents and to help reduce the impacts of HWC on local livelihoods, particularly in communal areas.

Suitable and sufficient equipment is critical for enabling game wardens, rangers, scouts and game guards to effectively carry out activities to reduce and mitigate HWC. Personnel operating in the field require the basic field equipment to operate with a reasonable level of comfort and to be able to deal with problem causing animals.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.3.1 To ensure that MET creates specific and focused HWC staff component and that such staff component have sufficient and appropriately trained personnel to address the HWC problems and issues present in the specific regions.
- 6.5.3.2 To ensure that MET HWC management personnel are sufficiently and appropriately equipped to carry out their tasks.
- 6.5.3.3 To create a collaborative approach for prevention and mitigation of HWC with local wildlife management units.

Strategic Approach

MET shall create a coordination unit on human wildlife conflict management issues at national level and specific staff component in each region that is focused and with HWC management as their main task and responsibility. MET will identify the training and equipment needs of such teams and ensure that they have the appropriate skills and equipment for carrying out their tasks. MET personnel will work closely with the relevant staff members of local management units (such as conservancy game guards) and personnel from other relevant organizations. Rapid reaction teams will be established between MET and partner organizations to ensure speedy responses to HWC incidents.

NGOs working with local community organizations such as conservancies should also appoint HWC coordinators who have the specific task of addressing HWC and work closely with MET. Local level management units should also establish their own structures for addressing HWC. They should have dedicated teams that can work with MET personnel, NGOs and private researchers in developing and implementing joint HWC management plans and carrying out joint rapid response activities, as approved by MET.

6.5.4 Community care and engagement

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, nor do farmers who have acquired rights of leasehold on communal land.

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, people living outside conservancies, and farmers with leasehold rights.

Specific Objective

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

Strategic Approach

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

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

The 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.

The 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 which may not be appropriate for conservancy formation and operation such as leasehold farms, but where HWC is present. In order to do this Government will assist the appropriate local authorities (e.g. traditional authorities, village development committees,) and individual farmers 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). In addition, Government will also explore and establish appropriate legal channels for commercial farmers, and leasehold and/or resettlement farmers to derive economic benefits from wildlife.

6.5.5 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, individuals 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. There are also cases however, 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 escaped, or has persistently killed livestock and escaped and there is the fear in the community or 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 devolved 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.

Specific objectives

- 6.5.5.1 To devolve decision-making authority over the destroying of identified problem-causing wild animals to a staff member (s) and/or local management unit so that the correct individual animal can be speedily destroyed, providing protection to people and their property.

6.5.5.2 To provide sufficient safe guards to ensure that specific animals are destroyed for good reason.

Strategic Approach

Amendments to the Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (Ordinance 4 of 1975) shall be done to give powers to the Minister to authorize a staff member or staff members responsible for management of Wildlife and National Parks in the Ministry to determine when to destroy a problem-causing animal under the guidelines provided in Annex 1. The authorized 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 local management unit to which authority has been delegated by the MET. The authorized staff member will also be responsible for ensuring that local management unit that have received delegated authority comply with this policy and all relevant legislation as well as the reporting requirements contained in Annex 2.

In addition, Government will also explore and establish appropriate legal channels for commercial farmers, and leasehold and/or resettlement farmers to derive economic benefits from wildlife.

In such cases where an animal is destroyed, the authorized staff member must provide a written report to the Director responsible for management of Wildlife and National Parks. The Director will furnish a written report on the incident to the Permanent Secretary.

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

The authorized staff member will be responsible for determining that the animal was destroyed for good reason, by following an example set up in Annex 3. If the authorized staff member finds that an animal was destroyed without permission and in contravention of the Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (No. 4 of 1975), or any subsequent legislation that replaces the said 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 local wildlife management unit if that local wildlife management unit carries out the destruction of an animal in contravention of the provisions of this policy or in contravention of the Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (No. 4 of 1975), as amended.

Local wildlife management unit will have the right to inform the Professional Hunter with which 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 authorized staff member. The local wildlife management unit will have the right to charge the Professional Hunter a fee in terms of Section 11 (i) of Annex 2.

If an animal is hunted in this way then the local wildlife management unit is responsible for the reporting requirements contained in Section 14 of Annex 2.

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

6.5.6 Removal of problem-causing animals

The Ministry recognizes 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.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.6.1 To provide a framework for the removal of problem-causing animals when appropriate.
- 6.5.6.2 To set a condition on the filming of wild animals removed as problem-causing animals.

Strategic Approach

In order to address the need for removal of individual animals from populations the Ministry will delegate conditional authority for the destruction of identified problem-causing animals in terms of Section 6.5.5 above.

From time to time and as becomes necessary, increase hunting quotas in the short term for certain species where appropriate.

Where local wildlife management units 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. Consideration can also be given to issuing quotas where in certain cases the occurrence of problems is predictable, along with the number of wild animals that would be killed per year.

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 channeled 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 relation to the human population and in relation 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 the 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.

No person will be allowed to film any animal destroyed as a problem causing animal or any actions or activity being conducted for removing problem causing animals without the approval of the Minister.

6.5.7 Appropriate technical solutions for mitigating HWC

One of the methods for managing Human Wildlife Conflict 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. For example, livestock losses can be reduced by ensuring that the 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 electric fences although this has major financial implications.

Specific Objective

To promote the development and application by every person, organization, state office, Ministry or agency and all relevant stakeholders of appropriate and effective plans and measures to prevent or reduce HWC.

Strategic Approach

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

- Dissemination of information about the effectiveness of specific methodologies that are appropriate for addressing HWC in each region;
- 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);

Where appropriate and when funds are available, the Ministry will provide such funding to stakeholders in need of financial assistance to test and/or implement mitigation measures. Such financial assistance will be dependent upon the existence of a HWC management and mitigation plan that has been approved by the Ministry, or in the case of a conservancy, is included in its Wildlife Management Plan.

A written agreement must be concluded between the Ministry and a funding recipient which 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.

In all regions of the country, local wildlife management unit should develop their own Human-Wildlife Conflict Management Plans. These plans should contain a set of objectives, identify management strategies and actions, involve all relevant stakeholders, assign responsibility for actions and allocate funding.

In order to develop HWC management plans communities and farmers should develop partnerships with researchers, NGOs and the MET. Local wildlife management units should invest a portion of their own income in implementing their HWC Management Plans and where necessary should seek additional funding from NGOs, and sources such as the Environmental Investment Fund and the Game Products Trust Fund.

Local wildlife management units should carry out local level land-use planning as a means to reduce HWC. As part of zoning their area for different land-uses should identify areas that can be set aside as exclusive wildlife and tourism zones and/or wildlife corridors. Such zones should for example be established on land adjacent to National Parks and where wildlife moves across international boundaries and between protected areas.

Residents should be encouraged not to settle or grow crops in such zones. Traditional Authorities and Communal Land Boards should avoid allocating land for residential and agricultural purposes in these zones. Local level planning should also consider the consolidation of crop fields to make it easier to protect them from crop raiding animals.

Cooperation between conservancies and local water point committees should be promoted as much as possible.

Conservancies and farmers can help to fund the protection of water points, the development and maintenance of alternative water points for elephants and/or the provision of diesel to pump water at settlements where elephants drink regularly. With assistance from conservancies water points committees can help to maintain water points for elephants and ensure a regular supply of water.

Relocation of some predators is possible means of reducing HWC. Relocation does not work well for “problem lions” that habitually prey on livestock as they tend to return to the conflict area and/or continue to kill livestock. However, re-location can be very effective for lions that can be described as “occasional raiders”. These animals tend to stay in the area they are re-located to. It is important to identify which category lions fall into when considering relocation as an option for addressing HWC. Some research indicates that relocation does not work well with leopards as they tend to return to the area where they were captured.

With regard to elephants, relocation is technically possible, but there are some key problems. These include the very high costs of moving large numbers of elephants, a lack of areas where elephants could be moved to, and the possibility that elephants would return to the original sites. In an area such as Zambezi Region removing a herd of elephants would not stem the movement of others from Botswana into the region.

Lethal removal is recognised as a means of addressing HWC where wild animals persistently cause problems or where numbers of wildlife animals are so high that conflict becomes and intolerable burden on resident people. Lethal removal is usually used when a lion or elephant for example has attacked a person.

Where possible, authorisation should be given for a declared problem animal to be destroyed by a trophy hunter in order to raise income either for MET or a local wildlife management unit. Strict legal conditions apply to the lethal removal of certain species and everyone should be aware of the legal requirements before attempting lethal removal of any wild animal.

6.5.8 Disaster Management

There is strong evidence, both globally and in Namibia, of an increase in the observed frequency and intensity of weather and climate-related hazards.

Namibia is the driest sub-Saharan country in Africa and has a fragile environment. Consequently, it is vulnerable to climate-related hazards. Climate variability is not new in Namibia’s history but the frequency and severity of extreme weather events, especially floods and droughts, has increased sharply in recent years.

When there are droughts and floods, human wildlife is also experienced as humans and wild animals compete for the little available resources. Wild animals will always move with the flood waters.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.8.1 To ensure that human wild life conflict management is part of the disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction programmes, in line with the Disaster Risk Management Act, 2012 (Act No. 10 of 2012).
- 6.5.8.2 To ensure that preventative and mitigation measures are provided for during times of drought and floods in the country.

Strategic Approach

Government shall ensure that human wildlife conflict management is part of the disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction programmes in line with the Disaster Risk Management Act, 2012 (Act No. 10 of 2012. In this regard, human wildlife conflict management, in particular preventative and mitigation measures during times of drought and floods, shall be considered under the National Disaster Fund.

Human development and environmental issues are inter-linked. Climate change and disasters modify the natural environment through various processes, including increased desertification and land degradation. These processes are induced or conditioned by human actions and inactions, such as overgrazing, overexploitation of natural resources and settlement development related activities in wetlands that exacerbate the effects of climate change and disasters. Therefore, to reduce these amplifying effects, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction needs to promote measures to protect the natural environment by strengthening its stewardship to preserve ecosystems and biodiversity and to reduce environmental pollution.

Settlement of communities and emergency grazing in core wildlife areas during drought and flood times shall be avoided.

Preventative and mitigation measures shall be put in place when there are temporary movements of people during drought and flood times, e.g. livestock kraals should be built as strong as possible to prevent attacks by predators.

6.5.9 Application of revenues from problem causing animals to avoid future conflicts 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.

Specific Objective

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 authorizing 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 authorized to be trophy hunted.

Funds from problem animals, or a portion of it, will in certain cases as determined by the Ministry deposited in the Game Product Trust Fund (GPTF). In areas where there are local wildlife management units, such funds will be shared between the GPTF and the local wildlife management units. In areas where there are no local wildlife management units, such funds will be shared between the GPTF and the Regional Development Fund of the respective Regional Council.

The Ministry will establish a guideline price for the trophy hunting of problem 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 local wildlife management units and Regional Councils to establish an internal mechanism to ensure that they can comply with these conditions and expeditiously assist persons that were negatively affected.

The Ministry will consider the issuance of permits to keep and sell of wild animal skins in incidents of human wildlife conflict.

6.5.10 Protected Areas Neighbours and Residents

Many of the conflicts between people and wildlife occur when wildlife leaves Protected Areas and enters neighbouring farm land and conservancies. This situation, where wildlife leaving protected areas amounts to the export of economic and social costs to neighbours, undermines the conservation objectives of the 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 communities and farmers in addressing HWC which results from wildlife leaving protected areas.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.10.1 To reduce the impact on park neighbours of wildlife that leaves protected areas and causes problems.
- 6.5.10.2 To 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 neighbours such as conservancies, to help offset livestock and crop losses as a result of HWC and to promote positive relationships with park neighbours.

In accordance with the National Policy on Protected Areas' Neighbours and Resident Communities, the MET will promote landscape conservation approaches that bring land holders together to manage wildlife and other natural resources in an integrated manner.

As part of the landscape conservation approach MET will support the development of wildlife-based economic opportunities. MET 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 to develop and implement joint HWC management and mitigation plans and provide advice and technical support in applying mitigation methods.

The Ministry will also ensure that HWC management is part of the Park Management Plans for National Parks where such conflict is an issue or a problem.

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

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

The Ministry will also ensure that HWC management is part of the Park Management Plans for National Parks where such conflict is an issue or a problem.

The Ministry will enter into collaborative management arrangements (e.g. specific agreements or MOUs) with protected area neighbours 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 through existing programmes such as transfrontier conservation areas.

6.5.11 Human Wildlife Conflict Management Schemes

6.5.11.1 Scheme for Human Wildlife Conflict Mitigation and Preventative Measures

A variety of approaches can be implemented in order to manage the conflict efficiently and effectively. These include prevention strategies which endeavor to avoid the conflict occurring in the first place and take action towards addressing its root causes, and protection strategies that are implemented when the conflict is certain to happen or has already occurred, as well as mitigation strategies that attempt to reduce the level of impact and lessen the problem.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.11.1.1 To create a programme or project within the Ministry, that is internally and externally funded, to support implementation of mitigation and preventative measures for human wildlife conflict.
- 6.5.11.1.2 To establish a budget vote to support a programme for human wildlife conflict mitigation and preventative measure in the Ministry.

Strategic Approach

The Ministry will create a programme or project that is internally and externally funded, to support the implementation of mitigation and preventative measures for human wildlife conflict. Such a programme or project will have specific terms and conditions and will work closely with the staff members of the Ministry and local wildlife management units through a determined annual log frame and action plan.

Such a programme or project establish, set up or construct preventative and mitigation measures such as protection walls or ring trenches for water points, crocodile enclosures, livestock kraals, chili pepper fences, chili boms, alternative waterpoints for elephants, improved livestock husbandry, etc.

The Ministry will establish a budget vote to support a programme for human wildlife conflict mitigation and preventative measures that should be financed appropriately annually.

6.5.11.2 Human Wildlife Conflict 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 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 Ministry of Environment and Tourism 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.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.11.2.1 To provide the means to directly offset the losses of communities and individual farmers caused to livestock and crops.
- 6.5.11.2.2 To promote the equitable distribution of benefits so that individuals who suffer losses can benefit from wildlife income.
- 6.5.11.2.3 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 and related costs.

Strategic Approach

Payments under the Human Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme are made to cover live-stock losses at rates which 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 as well for human death and injuries to people.

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

In terms of this Policy, livestock include cattle, goats, 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 live stock 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 one day of the incident occurring, unless a valid reason of 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 advice where strengthening is required.

Payments to crops will be made to damages caused only by elephants, buffaloes and hippopotamus. Damages by other animals except for elephants, buffaloes 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 Human Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme shall apply to both conservancy and non-conservancy areas on State Land and Re-settlement farms, but not on private land.

In terms of this Policy, livestock include cattle, goats, 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 live stock 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 one day of the incident occurring, unless a valid reason of 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 advice where strengthening is required.

Payments to crops will be made to damages caused only by elephants, buffaloes and hippopotamus. Damages by other animals except for elephants, buffaloes 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 animals, tourism concessions and permit fees from trophy hunting through the Game Product Trust Fund.

Contribution to the Human Wildlife Conflict 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 the losses by 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.

This policy will apply in bona fide incidents of accidental death and injuries 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 or injured person 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 or injured person has no insurance coverage elsewhere or is not eligible for receiving costs from another organization.
- 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.

Payment for accidental death and injuries caused by wild animals shall apply throughout the country provided that the above conditions and any other conditions set up by the Minister are applied.

Amounts for payment through the "Human Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme will be as follows:

Human death:

Funeral expenses and related costs	N\$ 100 000
------------------------------------	-------------

Injuries to persons:

Type of injury	Amount (N\$)
Injury with no loss of body part	10 000
Injury with loss of body part	30 000
Disability	50 000

Livestock:

Livestock	Amount (N\$)
Cattle (cow or bull)	3 000
Goat	500
Sheep	700
Horse	800
Donkey	500
Pig	700

Crop damages:

Hectares	Amount (N\$)
One quarter of a hectare	250
One hectare	1000

The Minister shall adjust the amount for payment from time to time as may be deemed appropriate, in consultation with relevant stakeholders.

The Minister will further establish procedures, conditions and guidelines for qualifying and use of the Human Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme.

The Ministry will further explore possibilities for payment of damages to properties such as fences, water points, etc. by wild animals. This is highly dependent on the availability of funds.

6.5.11.3 Human Wildlife Conflict Insurance 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 reduce the growing tension around HWC as losses of human lives, livestock, and crops as well as damage to infrastructure are highly emotional issues and affect livelihoods.

Specific Objectives

6.5.11.3.1 To establish an insurance scheme for human death and injury caused by wild animals.

6.5.11.3.2 To establish a human wildlife conflict livestock insurance scheme.

Strategic Approach

The Ministry will investigate and establish an insurance scheme that would provide payments to affected parties whose family members die or are severely injured as a result of HWC. This will apply in all areas of the country but with specific conditions.

The Ministry will also investigate and establish a HWC livestock insurance scheme to offset the costs of livestock deaths.

In order for both the death and injury, as well as the livestock insurance scheme to operate, the Ministry through its annual budget provisions, or through its development support partners or through the GPTF will make funding available that will be paid through a professional insurance company or a specific Human Wildlife Conflict Fund and that company or Fund will then provide payments to affected parties as prescribed. Terms and conditions will apply. Once in place and fully functional, the Human Wildlife Conflict Insurance Scheme will replace the Human Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme.

6.5.12 Public awareness, stakeholder engagement and coordination

In order to address HWC efficiently and effectively, there is a need to conduct awareness and educate the communities,

farmers and the general public on the preventive and mitigation measures that should be put in place.

It is also necessary to provide information on species behavioural patterns in order to help the public understand how best to avoid conflict arising.

There is also a need to engage other stakeholders such as the traditional authorities, Regional Councils, NGOs and line Ministries on how best to manage HWC.

Specific Objectives

- 6.5.12.1 To ensure that all relevant stakeholders are aware of the need for HWC prevention and mitigation measures and have access to information on how to manage HWC according to their own circumstances and requirements.
- 6.5.12.2 To ensure that HWC management activities and responses are coordinated between all relevant stakeholders.

Strategic Approach

The Ministry of Environment and Tourism will hold regular meetings with key stakeholders such as farmers' associations, conservancies, community forests, water points committees, etc. in order to sensitize their members to the need to incorporate HWC management in their plans and activities and find ways to implement information given.

MET will develop appropriate information material that farmers and communities can use in order to develop their own HWC management plans and in order to apply their own prevention and mitigation measures.

MET will also work closely with other line Ministries such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry and the Ministry of Land Reform to ensure that the plans and activities of these ministries incorporate HWC management.

This is particularly important where agricultural or resettlement schemes are being established. NGOs, conservancies and traditional authorities should also play an active role in providing awareness to farmers about HWC management.

Public awareness on human wildlife conflict management will be conducted through the media, billboards, brochures, pamphlets, radio, and ways that is possible.

7. IMPLEMENTATION FRAMEWORK

7.1 Institutional Arrangements

- 7.1.1 The Ministry of Environment and Tourism will play the coordinating and leading role in the implementation of this Policy.
- 7.1.2 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 which can bring about the intended goals.
- 7.1.3 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.
- 7.1.4 Line Ministries and Regional Councils will ensure that all individuals, organizations and State agencies take responsibility for carrying out appropriate land-use planning and developing integrated measures that are aimed to avoid and / or reduce human-wildlife conflict therefore should develop and implement an integrated human-wild life conflict management plan that includes measures for the prevention and/or reducing of HWC, the mitigation of problems caused by HWC and for gathering data on HWC incidents.
- 7.1.5 The media should report on human wildlife conflict appropriately and responsibly, and support awareness on prevention and mitigation of human wildlife conflict.
- 7.1.6 Professional Hunters should contribute to human wildlife conflict mitigation and preventative measures and ensure that in an event a problem causing animal have to be controlled through hunting, such hunting should be done in a professional manner and accepted hunting ethics.

7.2 Legal and Regulatory Arrangements

The Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (Ordinance 4 of 1975) as amended by the Nature Conservation Amendment Act (Act 5 of 1996) provides legislative basis for control of problem causing animals, hunting and rights on the utilization of wildlife. This Policy is aligned to this legislation.

The Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill is being prepared and will repeal the Nature Conservation Ordinance, as amended. The Bill will provide for a proper administrative, legal and procedural framework for human wildlife conflict management.

7.3 Resource Mobilization

All role players in the implementation of this policy need to budget or mobilize resources in order to fulfil their role and responsibilities in the implementation of actions for this policy.

7.4 Monitoring and Evaluation

- 7.4.1 The impact of the implementation of this policy and progress and constraints regarding its implementation will be periodically assessed by the Ministry of Environment and Tourism in consultation with other stakeholders.
- 7.4.2 The Event/Incident Book System and the Human-Wildlife Conflict Data form will be used for monitoring and evaluation of the human-wildlife conflict.
- 7.4.3 Statistical figures per year on human wildlife conflict incidents, including financial implications will be used for monitoring and evaluation.
- 7.4.4 Procedures for reporting and provision of feedback on incidents and mitigation measures shall be developed and used

7.5 Implementation Action Plan

See Annex 4 below.


7.6 Conclusion

Human wildlife conflict is a challenge that the country is faced with. Addressing human wildlife conflict therefore requires striking a balance between conservation priorities and the needs of people living with wildlife.

Mechanisms need to be put in place to reduce the level of human wildlife conflict, to ensure that benefits of conservation management far outweighs the costs, and to build on the significant successes in managing human wildlife conflict. The strategies of this Revised National Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict Management should be interrogated by all and implemented accordingly and as required.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- 8.1 Ministry of Environment and Tourism. 2005. National workshop on human-wildlife conflict management in Namibia. Safari Hotel, Windhoek.
- 8.2 Ministry of Environment and Tourism. 2017. National workshop on human-wildlife conflict management in Namibia. Safari Hotel, Windhoek.
- 8.3 National Policy on Human Wildlife Conflict Management. 2009. Ministry of Environment and Tourism.
- 8.4 Nature Conservation Amendment Act of 1996 (Act 5 of 1996).
- 8.5 Nature Conservation Ordinance of 1975 (Number 4 of 1975).



ANNEXES

Annex 1:

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

Annex 2:

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

Annex 3:

HWC Decision-making frameworks.

Annex 4:

Implementation action plan.

Annex 1: Guidelines concerning delegation of authority to Regional Offices of MET and other designated institutions to determine when to destroy a problem-causing animal

Authorized staff member or staff members of the Ministry of Environment and Tourism 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.
2. Authorized staff member 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.
 - d. Further problems will be caused if the animal(s) concerned are not destroyed.
 - e. The responsible animal can be identified, located and destroyed with the resources available to the authorized staff member, and
 - f. The destruction of the specific animal(s) will at least in part resolve a problem.
4. Authorized staff member 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 minimized.
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. Authorized staff member 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, DWNP 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 authorized local wildlife management unit by MET staff or by a designated person from the authorized local wildlife management unit, the income from the trophy will be accrued as directed by the authorized staff member. The delegation to an authorized local wildlife management unit should include directions as to how the products derived from that animal may be used by the local wildlife management unit or retained to the State in terms of the Nature Conservation Ordinance (No.4 of 1975), as amended.
9. Authorized staff member must ensure that the meat of any edible animal destroyed be made available to the person(s) who were affected, alternatively via the relevant Traditional Authority if it cannot 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. Authorized staff member 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 authorized local wildlife management unit, the income from the trophy will be accrued as directed by the authorized staff member.
11. Where the option of a Professional Hunter is required outside of a local wildlife management unit, the authorized staff member or authorized institution should approach the nearest Professional Hunter operating in that area. If none, or if such hunter is not available or interested or able to carry out the task, the authorized staff member or authorized 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.
 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 authorized 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 authorized to be trophy hunted.
 - ii. MET will establish a guideline price for the trophy hunting of problem 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. Authorized 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 authorized staff member must provide a written report to the Director responsible for management of Wildlife and National Parks 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 authorized staff member fails 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 authorized 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 local wildlife management unit to which authority has been delegated by the MET.

Authorized staff member of the Ministry may provide written permission to a local wildlife management unit 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. Authorized staff member may provide such permission to a local wildlife management unit if the MET does not itself have the resources or the opportunity to destroy the animal concerned. The permission may be for once off only.
3. Authorized staff member must, prior to providing permission to a local wildlife management unit 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 authorized local wildlife management unit may only use a designated person approved by the authorized staff member for the region or that specific unit to destroy an animal.
5. The authorized staff member may authorize an MET staff member to observe the destruction of a problem causing animal by a local wildlife management unit or by the Professional Hunter (PH) with which the local wildlife management unit has an existing contract.
6. Local wildlife management unit or the PH with which 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 authorized local wildlife management unit allowed to destroy an animal without another staff member present to witness the procedure.
8. An authorized local wildlife management unit 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 cannot 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. Authorized local wildlife management unit 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 PH with which the local wildlife management unit has an existing contract and whether that PH has a scheduled client in the local wildlife management unit at the time.
10. The approval to a PH 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 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 authorized to be trophy hunted.

- 
- i. MET will establish a guideline price for the hunting of problem 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. Local wildlife management unit 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 local wildlife management unit 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 Product Trust Fund to ensure that MET has proof of payment, after which local wildlife management unit 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.
 - iv. The submission of proof of such payment must be obtained by the authorized 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. Authorized local wildlife management unit 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 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).
 13. If authorized local wildlife management unit 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: HWC Decision-making frameworks

1. Decision process to determine appropriate management action in areas with human-wildlife conflict
 - Is there a human wildlife problem in the area?
*If the answer is no, then no further action should be taken.
If the answer is yes, proceed to next question.*
 - Is the area a conservation area?
*If the answer is yes, implement community awareness and protection strategies, and remove problem individuals.
If the answer is no, proceed to the next question.*
 - Can animals (wildlife) be managed in the area so that benefits of maintaining them are greater than those of removing them?
*If the answer is yes, develop and implement plans to manage wildlife sustainably in the area, implement community awareness and protection strategies, remove problem individuals and monitor.
If the answer is no, proceed to the next question.*
 - Can land use be planned to accommodate wildlife cost-effectively?
*If the answer is no, remove the animals (wildlife).
If the answer is yes, develop and implement plans to manage wildlife sustainably in the area, implement community awareness and protection strategies, remove problem individuals and monitor.*
2. Framework for deciding when a problem-causing animal should be destroyed

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.

Decision-making framework

- 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.*
- 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.

- Can the animal be identified, located and destroyed with resources directly available to the MET/local wildlife management unit?
If the answer is no, then the MET/local wildlife management unit 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/local wildlife management unit 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/local wildlife management unit has the resources to take action or a professional hunter and client are available, then proceed to the next question.
- 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.

ANNEXURE 4: Implementation Action Plan

	Strategies	Activities/Tasks	Baseline	Possible Indicator(s)	Lead Agency	Supporting Partners	Time frame	Cost N\$
1.	Research and Monitoring	Establish a national data base for human wildlife conflict management	Standard forms available	Computerized and file system established	MET	NACSO GIZ	2018	250 000
		Establish an "Early Warning System" for reporting human wildlife conflict incidents	Some elephants and predators already collared	Functional system at regional offices established for elephants and predators	MET	Researchers	2018	10,000,000
		Create a "Rapid Response Unit" in the MET	None	Unit that includes a Veterinarian established at MET head office	MET	NGOs Researchers	2018	2,000,000
		Carry out research on the social behavior and movement of certain species or /and sub populations to inform human wildlife conflict management	None	Mapping on the movement on the elephants, predators and other large herbivores, and wildlife corridors established	MET	NGOs Researchers	2018 and ongoing	2, 500, 000
		Establish target population levels for certain species or/and sub populations to reduce human wildlife conflict	None	Target populations identified	MET	NGOs Researchers Farmers Conservancies	2019	500 000
2.	Duty of care, land use planning and integrated measures to avoid human wildlife conflict	Conduct EIA for specific projects to avoid human wildlife conflict	None	EIAs produced	MET	Proponents	2018 and ongoing	250 000
		Identify areas with chronic problems as HWC zones and provide necessary support	None	Chronic problem areas identified	MET	NACSO	2018	300 000
		Develop Integrated Regional Land Use Plans that takes into account zonation plans for wildlife and mitigation measures for human wildlife conflict thereof	Land Use Plan for Kavango East Region exists	At least three Land Use Plans with more HWC incidents produced	MET	MLR	2018 and ongoing	5,000,000
3.	Human Capacity and Resources	Create a Coordination Unit for human wildlife conflict at national level	Two staff members already appointed	Functional unit appointed and equipped	MET	OPM	2018	3,000,000
		Establish a Human Wildlife Conflict Management Unit in each region	Staff members from the current staff establishment exist	Reorganized staff structure of the Directorate of Wildlife and National Parks to create Human Wildlife Conflict Management Unit put in place and functional	MET	OPM	2018 – 2019	50,000,000
4.	Community care and engagement	Create sufficient economic and other benefits from the use of wildlife so that rural communities and farmers view wildlife as an asset rather than a liability	Six community concessions already awarded	Ten more community concessions awarded	MET	NACSO	2018 and ongoing	500 000
		Explore legal channels for commercial farmers, and leasehold and/or resettlement farmers to derive economic benefits from wildlife	None	Legal mechanisms created for benefits to farmers, leasehold and resettlement farmers	MET	MLR Farmers Unions	2019 and ongoing	850 000
5.	Delegation of decision-making authority	Provide delegation of powers by the Minister in the repeal of the Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (4 of 1975)	Draft Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Bill available	Nature Conservation Ordinance, 1975 (4 of 1975) repealed by the Protected Areas and Wildlife Management Act	MET	MoJ Attorney General	2018	500 000
		Provide guidelines on how products derived from problem causing animals can be used	Regulations available	Amended Regulations to the current and future legislation and specific guidelines produced	MET	MoJ Attorney General NAMPARKS	2018	500 000
6.	Removal of problem causing animals	Remove problem causing animals when appropriate	Number of animals already removed each year	Animals to be removed identified	MET	NAPHA Professional Hunters	2019	350 000
		Increase hunting quotas in the short term for certain species that cause human wildlife conflict	Quotas for conservancies and other areas already exists	Areas and species for increase of quota identified	MET	NACSO	2018 and ongoing	500 000

	Strategies	Activities/Tasks	Baseline	Possible Indicator(s)	Lead Agency	Supporting Partners	Time frame	Cost N\$
7.	Appropriate technical solutions for mitigating human wildlife conflict	Develop and implement technical solutions and mitigation measures for each region to reduce human wildlife conflict	Guidelines for implementation of the current HWC Policy exists	Revised guidelines for implementation of the HWC Policy developed and approved	MET	Line Ministries Communities Farmers NACSO	2018	300 000
8.	Disaster Management	Ensure that human wildlife conflict management is part of the disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction programmes	None	Incorporation of HWC as part of disaster risk management and disaster risk reduction programmes	MET	OPM Regional Councils	2018	100 000
		Ensure that preventative and mitigation measures are provided for during times of drought and floods in the country	None	Preventative and mitigation measures put in place	MET	OPM Line Ministries Communities Farmers NACSO	2018 and ongoing	35,000,000
9.	Application of revenues from problem causing animals to avoid future conflicts and to address the losses of affected persons	Ensure that income derived from hunting or sale of problem causing animals is applied to avoid future conflicts between humans and wildlife	None	Income generated applied as such	MET	Conservancies Farmers	2018 and ongoing	1,500,000
10.	Protected Areas Neighbors and Residents	Provide economic and other benefits from Protected Areas to park neighbours and residents	Six community concessions already awarded	Ten more concessions awarded	MET	NACSO	2018 and ongoing	500 000
		Upgrade, rehabilitate and maintain the fence of Etosha National Park to prevent elephants and predator conflict with neighbours	120 kilometers upgraded	At least 400 kilometers completed	MET	MoF NPC	2018 and ongoing	500,000,000
11.	Human Wildlife Conflict Management Schemes	Create a programme or project within the MET to support implementation of mitigation and preventative measures for human wildlife conflict management	None	Programme/project established in MET	MET	MoF NPC NGOs Development partners	2018 and ongoing	500,000,000
		Establish a budget vote to support a programme for human wildlife conflict mitigation and preventative measures in the MET	None	Human wildlife conflict management vote created and budgeted for, for both operational and development budget	MET	MoJ NPC	2018 - 2019	0
		Implement the Revised Human Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme	Current HWC Self Reliance Scheme exists	Revised HWC Self Reliance Scheme exists	MET	GPTF Conservancies	2018 and ongoing	4,000,000 per year
		Investigate and provide a system/plan for an insurance scheme for human death and injury caused by wild animals	None	Insurance scheme investigated and system put in place	MET	MoF WWF NACSO Development partners	2018	20,000,000 per year
		Investigate and provide a system/plan for an insurance scheme for human wildlife conflict livestock insurance scheme	None	Insurance scheme investigated and system put in place	MET	MoF WWF NACSO Development partners	2019	40,000,000 per year
12.	Public awareness, stakeholder engagement and coordination	Establish coordination forums for human wildlife conflict management	Ad Hoc forums and committees exists	Well established forums and committees	MET	Relevant appropriate stakeholders	2018 and ongoing	500 000
		Hold regular meetings of stakeholders as part of awareness raising in reducing human wildlife conflict	Ad Hoc meetings conducted	Well established meetings conducted	MET	Relevant appropriate stakeholders	2018 and ongoing	500 000
		Develop and disseminate human wildlife conflict management information material as part of awareness raising in reducing human wildlife conflict	None	Brochures, stickers, pamphlets, etc. produced	MET	Relevant appropriate stakeholders	2018 and ongoing	10,000,000 per year
13.	Resource mobilization	Provide budget under MET to implement human wildlife conflict programmes and projects	None	Funding provided under MET annual budget	MET	MoF NPC	2018 and ongoing	30,000,000 per year
		Conduct fundraising for implementation of human wildlife conflict management programmes and projects	One fundraising event conducted	One fundraising event conducted per year	MET	MoF NGOs Development partners	2019	300 000

© MET 2018

