

IIED/ EEEGL Human Wildlife Conflict Case Study Framework

The following pro-forma is designed to contribute to an iterative process of data gathering that will lead various products focussing on lessons learnt globally from HWC centring on the financial, institutional and structural components required to have sustained success.

Our intention is to follow this framework up with supplementary conversations; and to select some of the case studies for inclusion in a south-south learning mechanism yet to be fully determined but likely to include the making of a video that highlights the key issues.

Please work your way through the pro-forma, and get back to Evan Bowen-Jones e.bowenjones@mac.com who is heading up this work on behalf of IIED with any comments about its design or questions about its future usage, etc.

Finally: as you work your way through it please make a point of citing your evidence wherever possible.

1. GENERAL BACKGROUND

What is the name of the HWC scheme you are focussing upon?
Whose scheme is it e.g. NGO/ national government/ multiple agencies
What is your [the author's] relationship with the scheme?
<i>Please mention your name and position</i>
What are its objectives/ are there defined objectives?
Where is it applied – country/region/site e.g. protected area
How long has your scheme been in operation, and when did it start?
Is it still in operation?
<i>If not why not</i>
Is it species-specific? Or does it deal with multiple species?

<i>Please list the species in question</i>

2. TYPE OF INTERVENTIONS

Does your scheme, or the wider project it sits within, include one or more of the following mitigation measures ?
<i>if so please tick the appropriate boxes and give a brief description of the interventions in question – see note¹ below.</i>
Compensation [financial or non-financial]
Insurance
Performance/ incentive payments
Additional benefits being provided to HWC affected communities [e.g. under CBNRM]
<i>i.e. securing community land tenure and usage rights; tourism revenue sharing; alternative livelihoods projects; etc.</i>
How are the above benefits being linked to HWC resolution?
<i>i.e. how are you making the link between community benefits and conservation, and are the beneficiaries being differentiated on the basis of the level of HWC they experience?</i>

Does your scheme, or the wider project scenario it sits within, include any preventative measures ?	
<i>Please provide brief detail in the appropriate boxes:</i>	
Fencing	
Guarding	
Voluntary resettlement	
Land-use strategies	
Others	

¹ If your scheme does not involve compensation, insurance or performance payments, and nor does it have any other financial mitigation component then please don't fill in the rest of the case-study pro-forma, just return it as it is.

Does your scheme, or the wider project scenario it sits within, include any **reactive measures**?
e.g. lethal removal

--

Does your scheme, or the wider project scenario it sits within, contain any other elements that we have not listed above?

--

3. RELATIVE IMPORTANCE

Please rank the elements of the HWC resolution scheme in approximate order of relative importance as far as you are concerned

--

Describe the scheme, detailing how the various elements work together and any dependencies that there may be therein

e.g. land-use planning ensuring that compensation payments are kept to a reasonable level

--

Does the order of importance you gave match the perceptions of the beneficiaries?

i.e. are some elements given more significance than they really warrant e.g. dealing with large, dramatic HWC events versus regular, smaller events with higher total impact?

--

4. PROCESS

Whose idea was it to initiate this scheme, and why?

i.e. what stimulated its inception e.g. was the statutory authority involved not taking sufficient action; were levels of HWC escalating, etc.

--

What was the process of selection of the HWC interventions selected?

--

How were potential beneficiaries involved in the design of the scheme

--

Were or are there any important legal or institutional challenges that needed to be overcome to

establish and implement the scheme, or was the existing system sufficiently supportive?
How could any challenges you have mentioned be overcome

5. STRUCTURE AND COSTS OF THE SCHEME

What was the overall set-up cost for your scheme, and where did this money come from?
<i>Please list any major one-off items required for the initial establishment.</i>
What are the annual costs of running your scheme?
What were the main components of this cost? e.g. staff time, labour, etc
What is the total pay-out from the scheme to-date?
<i>If possible also tell us how many incidents it has been used to mitigate/ how many pay-outs there have been</i>
How have you funded this
<i>E.g. local government revenues; central government funding stream; tourism levy; or donor finance?</i>
Are the sources of funding permanent or time limited?
<i>And if so how many years are costs currently assured for?</i>
How is it decided who benefits from the scheme?
<i>e.g. eligibility criteria – such as minimum time of residence; geographic limits, etc.</i>
How did you work out what level of payment/compensation was appropriate, and is this amount subject to review [<i>if so when and how?</i>]
How are you dealing with any perverse incentives that you might have identified as arising from the scheme (e.g. <i>incentives to migrate to the area</i>) or any opportunities for/ instances of abuse?

How is the scheme administered; what are the different roles and responsibilities of the different groups involved?
<i>E.g. which is the lead organisation, and who is responsible for outreach/field implementation?</i>
Do the institutions involved have sufficient capacity to run the scheme effectively?

6. OUTCOMES

What are the main achievements of the scheme to-date; and what have the key challenges been?
<i>Achievements</i>
<i>Challenges</i>
Is the scheme achieving its objectives?
How are you measuring the impact of the scheme/ its effectiveness?
<i>I.e. what indicators do you use?</i>
Is it cost-effective compared to other options that could have been selected?
<i>And, if there were other more cost-effective options available why didn't you opt for these?</i>
Do the benefits to the local population/ communities from the scheme compare to the costs they incur as a result of problem animals?
How do you assess this?
<i>e.g. via community perceptions or level of satisfaction; or, through assessment of [financial/ nonfinancial] costs and benefits; are you using opportunity costs, and are you including wider benefits from CBNRM schemes, etc.</i>
Are there affected communities or individuals that are not benefiting from the scheme and why?
What percentage of households affected by problem animals are currently benefiting from the scheme?

What are the key lessons learnt so far
In hindsight has explicitly addressing HWC been the right approach to take, or would it have been better dealt with more circumspectly
<i>E.g. as part of a suite of other conservation issues, where expectations of success would have been lower?</i>

7. THE FUTURE OF THE SCHEME

What factors might affect the life and future effectiveness of this scheme?
Is this scheme adaptable to other species and contexts?
What would be the main constraints to scaling this scheme up?
How will the scheme be funded over the long term?
<i>E.g. could it be bought into any central government budget allocations; is there the potential to establish a Trust Fund; could Payment for Ecosystem Services come into play, etc.?</i>
How will/ could the scheme be managed over the long term?
<i>I.e. is there potential for it to be administered by local government, or devolved through local community structures?</i>
Do you think your scheme will prove successful when so many others have been tried and failed in the past? [Please explain your response]

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY [please list published & grey literature/ other sources of information]

