International Journal of Advanced Business Studies
Volume 4. Issue 4. (2025)
ISSN: 2940-2735

Full length article

Nature Needs Underwriters: Redefining the Role of Insurance in African Conservation Policy

Agripah Marangwanda
University of Zambia, Zambia
E-mail: agripah.marangwanda@gmail.com
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0004-0739-4986

Article Info
Received: 14.05.2025
Accepted: 02.06.2025
Available online: 30.07.2025

Keywords:
Human-wildlife conflict, insurance sector, multi-stakeholder collaboration, Africa, conservation, risk management

DOI:
https://doi.org/10.59857/bugz6212

ABSTRACT

Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) presents a significant and escalating challenge across Africa, undermining both conservation efforts and the livelihoods of local communities. As human populations expand and pressures such as habitat loss, climate change, and increased human-wildlife interactions intensify, there is a pressing need for innovative solutions to mitigate the adverse impacts on both wildlife and human populations. The insurance sector has emerged as a promising tool for risk management, offering compensation mechanisms that can alleviate the financial burdens experienced by affected communities. However, the effectiveness of insurance-based solutions hinges on the active collaboration of multiple stakeholders, including governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international agencies, and local communities. This article examines the global context of HWC, with a particular focus on Sub-Saharan Africa, exploring the roles and contributions of key stakeholders and the potential of the insurance sector in mitigating HWC. Through a comprehensive desktop research methodology, the article critically evaluates existing approaches and highlights the importance of an integrated insurance framework that incorporates robust government policies and international partnerships. The findings underscore that effective, sustainable management of HWC requires a collaborative, multi-sectoral approach that combines insurance mechanisms with broader conservation strategies.

1. Introduction

Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) is an escalating global issue that presents significant challenges to biodiversity conservation and the livelihoods of communities residing near wildlife habitats. As human populations grow and expand into natural habitats, interactions between humans and wildlife become more frequent and often result in adverse outcomes. These conflicts can lead to human fatalities, injuries, livestock predation, crop destruction, property damage, and retaliatory killings of wildlife, thereby undermining conservation efforts and imposing economic and emotional burdens on affected communities (Treves et al., 2019).

In Sub-Saharan Africa, the situation is particularly acute due to the region's rich biodiversity and the reliance of many communities on agriculture and pastoralism. The encroachment of human activities into wildlife habitats

has intensified HWC incidents, threatening both human welfare and wildlife populations (Dickman, 2010). Addressing HWC in this context requires innovative and sustainable solutions that mitigate human and economic losses while preserving wildlife and maintaining ecological balance.

Theoretical frameworks such as the Tragedy of the Commons (Hardin, 1968), risk and resilience theory (Berkes, 2007), and social-ecological systems (SES) frameworks (Ostrom, 2009) provide valuable insights into the complex dynamics of HWC. These frameworks highlight the need for regulatory systems to manage shared resources, the importance of adaptive capacity in communities, and the interconnectedness of human and ecological systems.

Building on these theoretical perspectives, conceptual frameworks like the Ecosystem Services Framework (Costanza et al., 1997) emphasize the need to value wildlife for its ecological services. Such frameworks guide the development of integrated solutions, including insurance mechanisms, sustainable livelihood programs, and wildlife protection strategies, offering a holistic approach to HWC management.

The insurance sector has emerged as a promising tool for mitigating the financial impacts of HWC. By providing compensation for losses related to livestock predation, crop damage, property destruction, or human injury, insurance mechanisms offer a critical safety net that reduces the economic vulnerability of affected communities (McShane et al., 2011). Moreover, by alleviating financial pressures, insurance schemes can help reduce retaliatory actions against wildlife, thereby contributing to conservation goals. However, challenges such as affordability, accessibility, and efficient claim processing remain significant hurdles to the effective implementation of insurance-based solutions.

Successful insurance interventions in HWC mitigation require multi-stakeholder collaboration involving governments, conservation organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international donors, and local communities. Governments play a crucial role in policy formulation and subsidy provision to make insurance schemes more affordable. Conservation organizations and NGOs contribute technical expertise and raise community awareness, while international donors support capacity building and pilot projects. Active involvement of local communities in designing and implementing solutions ensures their relevance and acceptance (Redpath et al., 2013).

Furthermore, the complex and dynamic nature of HWC demands a comprehensive approach that integrates insurance with other mitigation strategies, such as wildlife corridors, early warning systems, community education, and sustainable livelihood programs. An integrated insurance framework should function as part of a broader conservation and development strategy that addresses the root causes of conflict while promoting coexistence between humans and wildlife.

This article aims to explore the potential of the insurance sector as a key instrument for mitigating HWC in Africa. It emphasizes the critical importance of multi-stakeholder engagement and highlights the role of innovative insurance products in enhancing community resilience and conservation outcomes. The study adopts a desktop research methodology, analyzing existing literature, policy frameworks, and case studies to provide comprehensive insights into the current landscape. By examining successful and failed interventions globally and regionally, the study identifies practical strategies and lessons learned, proposing a pathway for integrating

insurance into HWC management more effectively. Through this approach, the article seeks to contribute to the broader discourse on sustainable conservation strategies that balance human needs with wildlife protection.

2. Literature and Theory

2.1 Theoretical and Conceptual Frameworks Underpinning the Study

This study draws upon a multidisciplinary set of theoretical frameworks to conceptualize and address Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) from an integrated socio-ecological and financial resilience perspective. The selected theories provide the necessary scaffolding to understand the complexity of HWC and the viability of insurance as both a reactive and proactive risk management mechanism. Each framework adds a distinct analytical lens to interpret the interactions among humans, wildlife, institutions, and insurance mechanisms in shared landscapes.

2.1.1 Tragedy of the Commons: HWC as a Shared Resource Problem.

The Tragedy of the Commons (Hardin, 1968) remains foundational in understanding the degradation of common-pool resources such as grazing lands and wildlife habitats. In HWC-prone areas, unregulated access to shared land often leads to overuse and fragmentation, escalating the probability of wildlife encroaching on human settlements. This tragedy is particularly evident where livestock rearing, and subsistence agriculture exist adjacent to wildlife corridors. Applying this theory underscores the necessity for community-regulated access rights and institutional arrangements that internalize externalities (Ostrom, 1990).

Community-Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) frameworks have emerged as practical applications of Hardin's thesis, emphasizing locally devolved conservation and participatory regulation (Armitage, 2005). This aligns directly with insurance schemes that incorporate conservation incentives—such as premium discounts for communities adopting sustainable land-use practices—highlighting the importance of aligning individual and collective interests through financial mechanisms (Bulte & Rondeau, 2007).

2.1.2 Risk and Resilience Theory: Enhancing Adaptive Capacity through Insurance

Risk and resilience theory (Berkes, 2007) foregrounds the importance of adaptive capacity in responding to environmental disturbances, such as crop destruction or livestock predation. It builds on the premise that systems must not only absorb shocks but also reorganize to maintain function. The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (SLF) (DFID, 1999) operationalizes resilience by focusing on five capital assets: natural, financial, social, human, and physical capital.

Insurance mechanisms—particularly microinsurance and index-based insurance—serve as financial buffers that enable vulnerable populations to recover and adapt post-shock (Warren, 2009; Dercon et al., 2014). Resilience is further strengthened when insurance products are bundled with non-financial interventions such as early warning systems, veterinary services, and conservation education (Surminski & Oramas-Dorta, 2014). The integration of insurance with local knowledge systems and institutional support structures, such as local risk pooling associations, reinforces both adaptive capacity and collective action.

2.1.3 Social-Ecological Systems (SES) Theory: Interdependence of Human and Wildlife Systems.

The SES framework (Ostrom, 2009) conceptualizes the intricate feedback loops between ecological and social subsystems. It is particularly relevant to HWC because it acknowledges that interventions in one domain (e.g., fencing wildlife) can have unintended consequences in another (e.g., disrupting animal migration or community mobility). Adaptive co-management—a key concept within SES theory—advocates for flexible, learning-based governance systems involving multiple stakeholders (Armitage et al., 2009).

This aligns with insurance models that are co-developed with community input and ecological data, such as satellite-based monitoring or wildlife telemetry. By embedding insurance within the dynamics of coupled systems, policies can be adjusted iteratively in response to environmental and social feedback, thereby supporting long-term sustainability (Folke et al., 2005).

2.1.4 Conflict Resolution and Coexistence Theory: Collaborative Approaches to HWC.
The coexistence framework advanced by Treves and Karanth (2003) and further developed in conservation conflict literature emphasizes participatory dialogue and collaborative problem-solving as antidotes to adversarial conservation approaches. This theory views conflict not only as a function of resource competition but also as a product of power asymmetries and exclusion from decision-making (Redpath et al., 2013).
Insurance products rooted in participatory design and grievance redress mechanisms directly reflect this theory. Community insurance committees and peer verification models enhance transparency, fairness, and trust—hallmarks of collaborative governance (Galtung, 1996). Additionally, conflict resolution methods such as mediation and negotiation can help arbitrate disputes over damage verification, ensuring legitimacy and reducing moral hazard.

2.1.5 Sustainable Livelihoods Framework: Protecting Vulnerable Economies.
The Sustainable Livelihoods Framework (DFID, 1999; Scoones, 2009) provides a comprehensive lens for understanding the impact of HWC on rural poverty and economic vulnerability. It underscores that shocks from wildlife damage can erode physical and financial capital, pushing households into deeper poverty traps. Insurance becomes a form of financial capital that buffers losses and supports recovery.

This framework also highlights the value of diversification—agroforestry, tourism, and wildlife-friendly farming—as resilience strategies. By linking insurance with such livelihood diversification efforts, holistic strategies can be deployed that do not merely compensate but transform vulnerable households (Ellis, 2000). For example, premiums could be reduced for farmers who engage in conservation-compatible land use or participate in community wildlife scouts**.**

2.1.6 Institutional Theory: Designing Governance for HWC Insurance.
Institutional theory (North, 1990) focuses on the formal and informal rules that structure human interaction. In the context of HWC, institutions determine who bears risk, who receives compensation, and how accountability is maintained. The absence of clear legal and policy frameworks often leaves farmers and pastoralists exposed, deterring insurance uptake (Agrawal & Lemos, 2007).

By drawing on policy networks theory (Kooiman, 2003), this study conceptualizes HWC insurance as a multi-actor policy domain requiring horizontal and vertical coordination across state agencies, NGOs, insurers, and local communities. Institutional quality—measured through factors such as contract enforcement, regulatory

clarity, and stakeholder participation—is a precondition for scalable and sustainable insurance models (Helmke & Levitsky, 2004). Regulatory sandboxes, public-private partnerships, and inclusive policy platforms are institutional innovations that can support pilot testing and scale-up.

2.1.7 Environmental Economics and Ecosystem Services Theory: Valuing Nature

Environmental economics offers a pragmatic rationale for integrating conservation incentives into financial products. The Ecosystem Services Framework (Costanza et al., 1997; Daily, 1997) identifies the quantifiable benefits humans derive from nature, including pollination, soil fertility, and climate regulation. HWC can threaten these services when species integral to ecological balance (e.g., elephants, predators) are exterminated in retaliation killings.

By embedding Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES) into insurance mechanisms, financial value is returned to local communities for maintaining biodiversity and ecological integrity (Wunder, 2005). Market-based conservation strategies—such as biodiversity credits or wildlife stewardship contracts—can be integrated into insurance schemes to align financial and conservation incentives (Pagiola et al., 2004). These tools shift perceptions of wildlife from liabilities to assets, thus fostering coexistence and stewardship.

2.2 Understanding the Drivers of Human-Wildlife Conflict

Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) is a multifaceted phenomenon influenced by a convergence of ecological, socio-economic, and political dynamics. At its core, HWC arises when the interests and survival strategies of human communities intersect with the spatial and behavioural needs of wildlife, often resulting in antagonistic outcomes. Understanding the root causes and underlying drivers is essential for designing effective mitigation strategies that are contextually grounded and socially equitable. This section explores the principal drivers of HWC, namely habitat encroachment due to human expansion, human behavioural responses shaped by cultural and economic perceptions, and the accelerating impact of climate change. These drivers are not mutually exclusive; rather, they often interact in complex ways, amplifying conflict potential and complicating management responses.

2.2.1 Human Expansion and Habitat Loss.

The encroachment of human activities into wildlife habitats is arguably the most significant and well-documented driver of HWC globally. Rapid urbanization, infrastructural expansion, deforestation, and agricultural intensification have dramatically reduced and fragmented wildlife habitats, forcing animals to migrate into human-dominated landscapes in search of food, water, and shelter (Lindsey et al., 2013). In East Africa, this phenomenon is exemplified by the widespread clearing of forests and savannah for subsistence and commercial agriculture, which has diminished ecological buffers and increased direct interactions between people and wildlife.

For instance, the fragmentation of elephant migration corridors in Kenya and Tanzania has led to increased incidences of crop raiding, particularly during dry seasons when food and water are scarce (Graham et al., 2010). The resulting destruction of subsistence crops not only undermines food security and household income but also provokes retaliatory actions, including the use of snares, poison, and firearms. These responses have contributed to the decline of elephant populations and heightened tensions between local communities and conservation authorities (Harrison et al., 2019).

Habitat loss also disrupts ecosystem services and ecological connectivity, leading to ecological imbalances that further exacerbate conflict. Addressing this driver necessitates integrated land-use planning that balances human development needs with conservation priorities. Spatial planning frameworks, ecological corridor preservation, and community-based zoning strategies are essential to mitigate overlap and promote coexistence.

2.2.2 Human Behavior and Perception of Wildlife.

The behavioural and perceptual dimensions of HWC are equally critical in shaping conflict trajectories. How communities perceive wildlife—whether as economic assets, sacred entities, or threats—significantly influences their tolerance levels and responses to wildlife presence. In many rural contexts, especially in sub-Saharan Africa, wildlife is primarily viewed through a utilitarian lens. Animals that threaten crops, livestock, or human safety are often perceived negatively, regardless of their ecological or conservation value (Dickman, 2010).

These perceptions are rooted in historical, socio-cultural, and economic experiences. For instance, pastoralist communities in Kenya and Tanzania often view predators like lions and hyenas as direct threats to their livelihoods, leading to a culture of retaliatory killings and pre-emptive culling (Hazzah et al., 2009). Conversely, in areas where community-based conservation has successfully linked wildlife to economic benefits—such as tourism revenues or employment opportunities—attitudes tend to be more positive and supportive (Naidoo et al., 2016).

Educational interventions, awareness campaigns, and participatory conservation programs have been effective in reshaping these attitudes. In Namibia, for example, sustained conservation education efforts under the community conservancy model have fostered a cultural shift from viewing wildlife as a nuisance to recognizing its economic potential. This transformation has played a pivotal role in reducing conflict incidents and strengthening conservation outcomes.

Understanding and addressing these behavioural drivers requires a multidisciplinary approach that incorporates insights from psychology, anthropology, and behavioural economics. Strategies should prioritize culturally relevant messaging, participatory dialogue, and the inclusion of traditional ecological knowledge in decision-making processes.

2.2.3 Climate Change as an Amplifier.

Climate change is increasingly recognized as an accelerant of HWC, intensifying existing vulnerabilities and introducing new ecological pressures. Alterations in temperature, precipitation patterns, and extreme weather events are reshaping the distribution and behaviour of wildlife species, often driving them into closer contact with human settlements (Barua et al., 2013). For example, prolonged droughts in East and Southern Africa have reduced the availability of natural forage and water sources, compelling elephants and other large herbivores to raid crops, damage infrastructure, and compete with livestock for resources (Smith et al., 2020).

Moreover, climate-induced shifts in habitat suitability can lead to range expansions or contractions for certain species, altering predator-prey dynamics and increasing the unpredictability of wildlife movement patterns. This unpredictability complicates traditional mitigation strategies such as seasonal guarding or fencing, which may no longer align with the altered behaviour of conflict-prone species (Jones et al., 2021).

In fragile ecosystems, these changes can also exacerbate inter-community tensions, particularly where natural resources are already contested. Climate change thus acts as a threat multiplier, deepening socio-economic inequalities and undermining the resilience of both human and wildlife populations.

Adaptation strategies must therefore be integrated into broader HWC frameworks, including climate-resilient land-use planning, early warning systems, and ecosystem restoration. Furthermore, investing in climate-smart agriculture and sustainable water management can help reduce competition over resources and buffer communities against conflict-related shocks.

2.3 Insurance-Based Interventions in Human-Wildlife Conflict Management

Human-wildlife conflict (HWC) continues to be a formidable barrier to biodiversity conservation and sustainable rural development, particularly in agrarian and pastoralist societies where livelihoods are intrinsically linked to land and natural resources. As wild species increasingly encroach into human settlements—often due to habitat fragmentation, resource competition, and expanding agriculture—local communities bear disproportionate economic and safety risks, including crop damage, livestock predation, human injury, and fatalities (Dickman et al., 2011). Traditional responses, such as retaliatory killings, electric fencing, and translocation, often address symptoms rather than underlying vulnerabilities, sometimes undermining long-term conservation goals (Treves & Karanth, 2003).

In response, insurance-based mechanisms have emerged as an innovative and adaptive strategy to mitigate the financial burden of wildlife-related losses. These schemes aim to internalize ecological risks and incentivize tolerance by providing timely and predictable compensation, thus shifting the discourse from conflict to coexistence (Mishra et al., 2003; Zabel & Holm-Müller, 2008). Unlike ad hoc compensation, which often suffers from delays and political manipulation, insurance-based models introduce risk-sharing principles that enhance equity, accountability, and financial sustainability. This section critically evaluates various insurance-based HWC interventions across Africa, Asia, Europe, North America, and Latin America. The discussion emphasizes contextual dynamics, operational design, institutional models, stakeholder engagement, and emerging lessons for policy and practice.

2.3.1 Africa

Africa has been at the forefront of experimenting with diverse HWC insurance mechanisms. Given the continent's rich biodiversity and deep-rooted conservation traditions, several African nations have developed hybrid schemes that merge formal insurance principles with community-based governance. These models often arise in contexts with limited public financing and weak institutional capacity, making innovation and adaptability central to success.

2.3.1.1 Kenya – Mobile-Enabled Wildlife Insurance Pilot.

Kenya has piloted one of the most technologically advanced wildlife insurance schemes in the Global South. In 2024, a collaboration among AB Entheos, Minet Kenya, Pula, and the Kenya Wildlife Service introduced a digitized wildlife insurance initiative aimed at high-conflict regions such as Narok and Laikipia counties. The program enables smallholder farmers and pastoralists to report incidents via USSD codes and app-based interfaces, allowing for rapid claim verification and payout via mobile money platforms such as M-Pesa. The

pilot covered losses from crop raids by elephants, livestock killings by carnivores, and even human injury and fatalities.

With over 6,000 validated claims and a payout ratio exceeding 28%, the scheme demonstrated the feasibility of using mobile-enabled infrastructure to enhance claim efficiency and transparency. Community sensitization sessions were also conducted to improve understanding of coverage terms and reduce false claims. Importantly, the pilot revealed that digital literacy and mobile connectivity were critical determinants of participation, underscoring the need for inclusive technological design (Winnie et al., 2023). Moreover, integration with local county wildlife offices provided a semi-decentralized claims assessment process, increasing legitimacy and community trust.

2.3.1.2 Namibia – Human-Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme (HWCSRS).

Namibia's Human-Wildlife Conflict Self Reliance Scheme (HWCSRS), implemented under the Ministry of Environment, Forestry and Tourism (MEFT), represents a notable example of a semi-formal insurance approach rooted in Namibia's robust community conservancy system. Established in 2009, the scheme provides ex gratia compensation to victims of wildlife damage, including for crop losses, livestock predation, and human injury or death (Conservation Namibia, 2023). Funding is sourced from national wildlife revenues, including tourism levies and game hunting licenses, while community conservancies are tasked with claim documentation and verification.

The HWCSRS is distinctive for its emphasis on local agency. Conservancies play a central role in vetting claims and disbursing payments, thus fostering stewardship and shared responsibility for conservation outcomes (Jones et al., 2012). Moreover, the scheme is tiered—different species and types of damage attract different levels of compensation, based on historical data and ecological risk mapping. Although not an actuarial insurance scheme in the formal sense, HWCSRS incorporates many insurance principles, including risk pooling and moral hazard mitigation through community monitoring.

2.3.1.3 Uganda – Safari-Backed Compensation Scheme.

In Uganda, the private sector has taken the lead in implementing informal but functional compensation models. A notable example is the initiative near Lake Mburo National Park, where a consortium of safari operators collectively funds a compensation program for livestock losses due to lion and leopard predation. The scheme targets pastoralist communities who are otherwise inclined to retaliate against predators that threaten their herds. Compensation is tied to verified losses and administered through local wildlife clubs (Kissui et al., 2019).

This model has effectively reduced predator persecution and improved relations between the tourism sector and surrounding communities. While limited in scale and lacking formal insurance regulation, it exemplifies how tourism-derived revenue can be reinvested into risk mitigation. Its success has prompted discussions about replicating the model in other high-conflict zones, particularly where tourism operators rely on charismatic wildlife to sustain their businesses.

2.3.1.4 Botswana and Zimbabwe – Revenue-Sharing Trusts.

Botswana and Zimbabwe have adopted community-based revenue-sharing models that, while not insurance in the strict actuarial sense, functionally serve to mitigate wildlife-related risk. In both countries, community trust funds collect and redistribute revenue from hunting concessions, photographic tourism, and park entry fees. These funds offer partial compensation for losses caused by elephants and lions—two of the most conflict-prone species in southern Africa (Jones et al., 2012).

In Zimbabwe's CAMPFIRE program and Botswana's community trust models, decision-making on compensation is typically conducted by elected village committees. These mechanisms promote transparency and local accountability, although challenges persist in terms of fund mismanagement and uneven compensation across regions. Nevertheless, such schemes exemplify how African societies have localized insurance logics to fit socio-political contexts characterized by communal land tenure and hybrid governance systems (Murphree, 2009).

2.3.2 Asia

Asian HWC insurance schemes are diverse, reflecting the continent's varied ecosystems, cultural traditions, and governance structures. Many programs are built on longstanding community institutions and often include conservation education, ecological monitoring, and microinsurance frameworks.

2.3.2.1 India – Snow Leopard Insurance in Spiti.

The Snow Leopard Insurance Program in India's Spiti Valley is a globally acclaimed model for integrating insurance with species conservation. Developed by the Snow Leopard Trust and the Nature Conservation Foundation, the scheme insures yak herders against losses caused by snow leopard attacks (Mishra et al., 2003). Community members contribute to a locally managed fund, which is disbursed upon verified predation incidents. Verification is typically conducted by village-appointed wildlife monitors, ensuring timely response and minimizing bureaucratic delay.

The program's success lies in its participatory design. By engaging herders in fund governance and integrating livestock corralling practices, it has reduced retaliatory killings and strengthened tolerance for snow leopards. Furthermore, the scheme has been expanded to include education campaigns and conservation-linked livelihood support, reinforcing its long-term impact (Suryawanshi et al., 2014).

2.3.2.2 Sri Lanka – Livelihood Insurance from Elephants (LIFE) Project.

Sri Lanka's LIFE Project addresses the chronic elephant-human conflict that afflicts farming communities in the dry zone. Co-developed with NGOs and local stakeholders, the program provides microinsurance coverage for crop damage and property destruction caused by elephants (Fernando et al., 2008). Villagers organize themselves into committees that handle premium collection, claim documentation, and disbursement.

One of the distinctive features of the LIFE Project is its integration with spatial elephant movement data collected via GPS collaring. This enables proactive risk communication and helps communities prepare for potential elephant incursions. The program also includes deterrence tools, such as electric fences and early warning systems, creating a holistic conflict management system.

2.3.2.3 China – State-Led Elephant Conflict Insurance.

In China's Yunnan Province, where the population of wild Asian elephants has grown due to conservation efforts, human-wildlife conflict has escalated. In response, the provincial government introduced a formal insurance scheme underwritten by state-owned insurers and managed in collaboration with forestry departments (Zhang et al., 2018). The program covers property, crop, and personal damage and uses satellite and GIS mapping for verification and dispute resolution.

While effective in improving community tolerance, the scheme has struggled with sustainability due to increasing elephant populations and inflation-adjusted losses. Moreover, moral hazard and fraudulent claims remain a concern, prompting calls for integrating technological surveillance and adaptive underwriting into future iterations (Li et al., 2020).

2.3.3 Europe

European countries have developed a range of insurance and compensation models for managing human-wildlife conflict (HWC), largely benefiting from robust public financing and operating under strong biodiversity mandates. The continent's extensive legal frameworks, environmental policies, and institutional support structures for wildlife conservation enable the implementation of complex, multi-layered systems that balance economic, social, and ecological goals. Unlike regions with limited resources, European schemes often receive substantial government backing, both financially and legislatively. These models reflect Europe's commitment to the European Union's (EU) biodiversity strategy, which emphasizes coexistence with wildlife through innovative mechanisms that minimize the impact of conservation on local communities (European Commission, 2020). Insurance-based HWC interventions in Europe have evolved from basic compensation programs to more integrated solutions that include proactive measures, such as monitoring, prevention, and habitat management, often supported by technology.

The key characteristic of many European models is that they are designed to protect both wildlife and human livelihoods while fostering a sense of shared responsibility between local communities, governments, and conservation organizations. As such, these programs are frequently characterized by public-private partnerships, performance-based compensation, and a commitment to both species preservation and sustainable land use (Zabel & Holm-Müller, 2008).

2.3.3.1 Germany – Otter Bonus Compensation Scheme

In Germany, the Otter Bonus Compensation Scheme in Saxony serves as a notable example of how targeted compensation schemes can mitigate resistance to the reintroduction of carnivores while promoting the conservation of legally protected species. The scheme was established to address the growing conflicts between fish farmers and the Eurasian otter (Lutra lutra), a species that had been successfully reintroduced to the region following conservation efforts (Dickman et al., 2011). Unlike traditional indemnity compensation models, which are often reactive and focus solely on damage mitigation, the Otter Bonus is proactive, focusing on incentivizing the conservation of otter populations while compensating fish farmers for the losses they may experience due to otter predation.

The program, which was initiated in 2003, operates by providing bonuses to fish farmers who maintain otter-friendly practices, such as the construction of otter-proof fences and the introduction of other mitigation measures (Hansen et al., 2012). The German government, through a combination of federal and regional funds,

provides financial support for these conservation efforts. The compensation model is thus not only reactive to damage caused by otters but also encourages the long-term coexistence of human and wildlife interests. As a result, the Otter Bonus scheme has been praised for its innovative approach in promoting biodiversity conservation without causing significant economic harm to local communities (Hansen et al., 2012).

Additionally, the scheme's success has been attributed to its comprehensive monitoring system, which tracks otter populations and the effectiveness of mitigation measures, as well as the active involvement of fish farmers in the conservation process. These elements help build local ownership and ensure the program's sustainability over time. However, the scheme's expansion has been hindered by a lack of resources to cover all affected farmers and regions, which suggests that scaling the model up to other areas of Germany and beyond will require increased funding and logistical support (Dickman et al., 2011).

2.3.3.2 Sweden and Norway – Carnivore Compensation.

Scandinavia offers two prominent examples of insurance-based compensation models focused on carnivores. Both Sweden and Norway have developed government-backed compensation programs to address the predation of livestock by large carnivores, including wolves (Canis lupus), brown bears (Ursus arctos), and Eurasian lynxes (Lynx lynx). These programs are unique in that they not only compensate for verified losses but also provide financial incentives for communities to tolerate the presence of these carnivores, which are otherwise perceived as threats to livelihoods (Zabel & Holm-Müller, 2008).

In Sweden, the compensation scheme for livestock losses due to carnivores was introduced in the early 1980s, and it has been evolving ever since. Under the Swedish model, farmers receive compensation for confirmed depredations by wolves, bears, and lynxes, but unlike traditional indemnity schemes, compensation is also provided for the mere presence of these species in an area. This performance-based compensation system was designed to align financial incentives with broader conservation goals, ensuring that farmers are rewarded not just for losses but also for the environmental value of having carnivores in their region (Swedish Environmental Protection Agency, 2017). The aim is to incentivize communities to view carnivores as valuable assets for biodiversity rather than as obstacles to their livelihoods.

Norway's model mirrors Sweden's approach, with the key distinction being that the Norwegian government has more direct involvement in both the compensation and monitoring processes. In Norway, the compensation system is managed by the state through the Directorate for Nature Management, which works closely with regional wildlife authorities to verify claims and determine compensation levels (Norwegian Environment Agency, 2018). In addition to indemnity payments, Norway has invested heavily in mitigation strategies, such as the use of electric fences and guard dogs, to reduce conflict before it occurs. These proactive measures are coupled with efforts to increase public awareness about carnivore conservation and to engage local communities in monitoring activities.

Both Sweden and Norway's compensation schemes have demonstrated positive outcomes in terms of reducing human-wildlife conflict and improving tolerance for large carnivores. Nevertheless, challenges remain, including the financial sustainability of these programs as carnivore populations continue to grow, and the political and social tensions associated with increased carnivore numbers, particularly among rural farming

communities (Linnell et al., 2008). The success of these schemes relies heavily on the ongoing commitment of government resources and the active participation of farmers in the conservation process.

2.3.3.3 Switzerland – Alpine Wildlife Conservation and Insurance Models.
Switzerland has adopted a combination of insurance-based mechanisms and compensation programs to address the human-wildlife conflicts that arise from alpine wildlife, particularly the predation of livestock by wolves and lynxes. The Swiss government operates a sophisticated system of compensation for livestock depredation, but what sets Switzerland apart is the integration of insurance models designed to help farmers absorb the financial costs of wildlife damage. This system is particularly relevant to the alpine farming communities that rely on grazing for their livelihoods, where the presence of large carnivores like wolves is both a threat to their herds and a subject of strong national conservation mandates (Tromp, 2004).

The Swiss model includes an insurance component that provides payouts for livestock lost to predators, but it also offers subsidies for preventative measures. This dual approach helps farmers manage risks while fostering cooperation in wildlife management (Swiss Federal Office for the Environment, 2017). Farmers who implement mitigation strategies such as reinforced fences or the use of guard dogs are eligible for subsidies that lower the costs of these interventions. The insurance component covers losses that cannot be mitigated, including attacks by particularly bold carnivores, which have become more common as wolf populations expand (Tromp, 2004). By integrating insurance with compensation and preventive measures, Switzerland has created a balanced model that addresses both immediate risks and long-term sustainability in human-wildlife interactions.

However, while the Swiss model is regarded as successful, it is not without its challenges. A key issue is the cost of insuring livestock in regions with high predation rates, which has led some farmers to express concerns about the rising premiums for coverage. Additionally, the need for continual monitoring and adjustments to compensation levels based on ecological trends and social dynamics poses ongoing logistical and financial challenges (Tromp, 2004). Nevertheless, the Swiss example remains a valuable case study for integrating insurance into broader conservation and agricultural policy frameworks.

2.4 Key model Take aways
2.4.1. Technological Integration for Operational Efficiency (Kenya)
Mobile-Enabled Insurance: In Kenya, a mobile-enabled wildlife insurance program launched in 2024 leverages technology to enhance claims management and operational transparency in regions with significant human-wildlife conflict (HWC).

Key Insight: The integration of mobile money platforms and digital tools proves pivotal in addressing logistical and infrastructural limitations common in low-resource settings. This model underscores the potential of technology to overcome geographical and socioeconomic barriers, although challenges related to digital inclusion and accessibility remain crucial considerations for broader participation.

2.4.2. Community-Based Risk Mitigation (Namibia)
Community Conservancy Model: Namibia's model of HWC mitigation operates through community conservancies, where local governance structures are entrusted with the management and disbursement of insurance claims in response to wildlife-related damages.

Key Insight: This model exemplifies the efficacy of locally governed, community-based insurance systems, which foster a sense of ownership and stewardship over wildlife resources. However, concerns about the equitable distribution of funds, regional disparities in implementation, and the potential for mismanagement highlight the challenges inherent in decentralizing risk management.

2.4 3. Private Sector-Driven Initiatives (Uganda)

Safari-Backed Compensation: In Uganda, safari operators play a central role in funding compensation for livestock losses attributed to predator attacks, creating an insurance model that balances the interests of tourism stakeholders and local communities.

Key Insight: This hybrid approach effectively reduces human-wildlife conflict and strengthens the relationship between the tourism sector and local communities. Nevertheless, the model's reliance on private-sector funding limits its scalability and sustainability, compounded by the lack of formal regulatory oversight in wildlife insurance schemes.

2.4.4 Revenue-Sharing Models for Conservation (Botswana and Zimbabwe)

Community Trust Funds: In both Botswana and Zimbabwe, a portion of tourism revenues is allocated to community trust funds, which are used to compensate for wildlife damage to crops and livestock.

Key Insight: These revenue-sharing models demonstrate the potential of channelling economic benefits from wildlife conservation into local communities. However, challenges remain with respect to the equitable allocation of funds, local administrative capacity, and the sustainability of such models in the face of fluctuating revenue streams from tourism.

2.4.5. Participatory Insurance for Species Conservation (India and Sri Lanka)

Snow Leopard Insurance (India): A community-based insurance scheme targeting yak herders in India, who face depredation from snow leopards, integrates local governance and resource management with compensation mechanisms.

LIFE Project (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka's microinsurance model addresses crop damage resulting from elephant incursions, integrating GPS tracking systems to predict and mitigate conflict risk.

Key Insight: Both models illustrate the value of participatory, localized approaches to insurance, where community involvement in governance structures not only fosters a sense of ownership but also enhances the adaptive capacity of conservation efforts. Additionally, technological innovations such as GPS tracking offer promising avenues for mitigating human-wildlife conflict in high-risk areas.

2.4.6. State-Led Formal Insurance Programs (China).

Elephant Conflict Insurance (China): The state-sponsored insurance program in China aims to mitigate conflicts arising from elephant populations in Yunnan province, offering formalized coverage to affected communities.

Key Insight: State-led initiatives can provide comprehensive coverage and institutional support for managing human-wildlife conflicts. However, the sustainability of such programs is questioned due to the escalating costs of wildlife conservation and potential moral hazard concerns associated with state-backed insurance.

2.4. 7. Proactive and Performance-Based Compensation (Europe)

Otter Bonus Scheme (Germany): Germany's Otter Bonus Scheme incentivizes farmers who implement conservation-friendly practices to protect otters, integrating financial rewards for proactive wildlife management.
Carnivore Compensation (Scandinavia): Sweden and Norway offer compensation schemes for livestock depredation by large carnivores, coupled with additional financial incentives for farmers who adopt mitigation practices.
Key Insight: European models combine reactive compensation with proactive incentives, promoting coexistence between agriculture and wildlife conservation. These schemes are underpinned by significant public funding, yet their scalability and long-term financial viability are challenged by rising administrative costs and the growing frequency of wildlife-related incidents.

2.4. 8. Hybrid Approaches for Long-Term Sustainability (Switzerland).
Alpine Wildlife Insurance (Switzerland): Switzerland integrates insurance coverage with compensation for damages caused by carnivores, such as wolves, to livestock in the Alpine region. The model also emphasizes preventive measures alongside insurance payouts.
Key Insight: The Swiss approach highlights the potential for hybrid models that combine insurance with proactive conservation strategies, such as exclusion fencing and livestock monitoring. However, the rising cost of premiums presents a significant barrier to the long-term sustainability of this model, particularly as wildlife populations continue to expand.

2.5 General Observations

- ***Community Engagement and Local Governance:*** The success of these models hinges on active community involvement in both decision-making and the management of funds, ensuring that compensation mechanisms are responsive to local needs. In several cases, local governance structures provide the necessary framework for effective risk management.
- ***Role of Technology:*** The incorporation of technological tools, such as mobile money systems, GPS tracking, and digital claims platforms, has proven essential in enhancing the transparency, efficiency, and scalability of insurance schemes. However, digital literacy and access to technology remain key barriers to successful implementation in many regions.
- ***Public-Private Partnerships:*** Many of the models reviewed involve collaborative efforts between the public and private sectors, underscoring the importance of shared responsibility in addressing complex environmental and social challenges. These partnerships can amplify the impact of insurance schemes but require careful alignment of interests and resources to ensure sustainability.
- ***Scalability and Sustainability Challenges:*** While these models show promise in mitigating human-wildlife conflict, challenges related to scalability, financial sustainability, and equitable implementation persist. In particular, the increasing frequency and intensity of wildlife conflicts require adaptive models that can respond to changing ecological and socio-economic contexts.

These insights contribute to a growing body of knowledge on the potential of insurance as a tool for mitigating human-wildlife conflict and offer valuable lessons for designing similar programs in different regions and contexts.

3. Methodology

This study adopted a desktop research methodology to systematically explore existing literature and secondary data sources related to Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) and insurance-based interventions. The research design aimed to develop a comprehensive understanding of prevailing trends, challenges, and best practices in using insurance mechanisms to mitigate HWC, with insights drawn from both global and regional experiences. The approach enabled integration of diverse perspectives from academic publications, governmental and policy reports, and relevant industry documentation, offering a holistic lens on the subject.

3.1 Data Collection Techniques

The study employed secondary data analysis as its core method of data collection. This entailed an extensive review of scholarly articles, government reports, white papers, and policy documents that addressed HWC and its management through insurance frameworks. This method was selected for its efficiency and broad coverage, particularly valuable in addressing regions where logistical constraints limit the feasibility of primary data collection.

3.2 Databases and Search Strategy:

A structured search protocol was used across multiple academic databases, including:

- JSTOR – for peer-reviewed journal articles on risk management, insurance, and conservation.
- Scopus – for identifying multidisciplinary research outputs on wildlife and insurance.
- Google Scholar – for accessing academic papers, government reports, and grey literature relevant to HWC.

Search Terms: Keywords such as "Human-Wildlife Conflict," "insurance interventions," "wildlife risk management," "conservation insurance," and "public-private partnerships in HWC" guided the search.

3.3 Inclusion Criteria:

Only publications that are from peer-reviewed journals, authoritative government documents, and reputable policy publications were prioritised to ensure academic rigor and contemporary relevance.

3.4 Data Analysis Techniques

The data collected were analyzed using thematic analysis, a qualitative approach well-suited to identifying recurring patterns across heterogeneous data sources. This allowed the study to distill key themes that inform the understanding of how insurance can be leveraged in mitigating HWC.

The thematic analysis followed these steps:

- *Familiarization* – Repeated reading of documents to grasp the overall context and nuances.
- *Initial Coding* – Identification of relevant data segments based on the study's research questions, focusing on areas such as risk-sharing models, stakeholder engagement, and conservation outcomes.
- *Theme Development* – Codes were grouped into thematic categories aligned with the research objectives. Key themes included:
    - *Global Approaches to HWC Management:* International experiences with insurance-based models.
    - *Regional Case Studies:* Context-specific insights, especially from Africa and Asia.

- *Stakeholder Collaboration*: Roles of governments, insurers, NGOs, and communities.

- *Review and Refinement* – Thematic categories were iteratively refined to ensure consistency, supported by triangulation with additional literature.
- *Synthesis and Interpretation* – Final themes were synthesized into coherent narratives addressing the core research questions, combining both theoretical and practical perspectives.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

As the research was based entirely on publicly available secondary data, it did not involve human participants or the collection of primary data. Ethical integrity was maintained by**:**

- Ensuring full citation of all sources.
- Adhering to academic standards in data handling, interpretation, and reporting**.**

3.6 Limitations of the Methodology

Despite the value of desktop research in synthesizing wide-ranging insights, the study faced certain limitations:

- *Data Availability Bias*: Reliance on published sources may exclude recent field developments or unpublished stakeholder data.
- *Interpretive Subjectivity*: Thematic analysis can introduce researcher bias; however, efforts were made to minimize this through careful triangulation and cross-verification of sources.

Nevertheless, the methodological rigor applied ensured a credible and comprehensive exploration of the intersection between HWC and insurance interventions.

4. Discussion and Results

The findings of this study reveal a multifaceted approach to mitigating the impacts of Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in Africa, highlighting several key dimensions that are critical for the design and implementation of insurance mechanisms. These include the complexity of risk assessment, the importance of integrating proactive conservation efforts, and the need for multi-stakeholder collaboration. The results also emphasize the role of innovative insurance models that transcend traditional compensation frameworks, advocating for the inclusion of risk reduction strategies, community engagement initiatives, and the alignment of financial incentives with broader conservation objectives.

At the core of these findings is the realization that the insurance sector's role extends beyond its traditional function as a financial intermediary for loss indemnification. It emerges as a strategic actor, with the potential to influence behavioural, ecological, and economic outcomes. This is achieved through the development of tailored insurance products, investment in robust data infrastructure, and the establishment of coordinated partnerships with stakeholders. When properly integrated into the broader framework for managing HWC, the insurance industry becomes an active contributor to resilience-building, ecosystem preservation, and socio-economic stability in regions prone to wildlife-related conflict.

4.1 Theoretical Implications

This study makes a substantial contribution to the theoretical discourse surrounding risk management, particularly by introducing a holistic framework that considers both individual and collective risk dimensions. Traditional risk management paradigms in the insurance sector often prioritize individualized risk profiles,

focusing on the quantification and compensation of losses on a case-by-case basis. However, the nature of HWC demands a shift toward collective risk management, where the burden of risk is distributed across multiple stakeholders—such as conservation agencies, local communities, insurers, and government bodies.

The proposed collective risk management framework advances theoretical understanding by recognizing the interconnectedness of risks associated with HWC. Wildlife movements and habitat encroachments often transcend administrative boundaries, highlighting the need for cooperative, cross-jurisdictional approaches to risk mitigation. This paradigm challenges conventional models that compartmentalize risk within individual policyholders, advocating instead for a more expansive societal responsibility towards risk management. In this context, insurance companies play a pivotal role not just as risk underwriters, but also as risk educators and mitigators, helping to shape behaviours through incentive-based mechanisms aimed at promoting conservation actions.

Furthermore, this research bridges the gap between ecosystem services theory and insurance risk management. By incorporating ecosystem services into the framework of HWC insurance, the study reveals that addressing wildlife-related risks is not merely about compensating for immediate losses. Rather, it involves the preservation of ecological functions that sustain human livelihoods, thus enabling the transition from a reactive compensation model to one that supports proactive ecosystem management. In this way, the insurance industry plays a critical role in reducing long-term liabilities by fostering practices that maintain biodiversity and ecosystem health.
A key theoretical advancement emerging from this study is the integration of proactive risk management strategies into the insurance model. Traditional insurance frameworks are largely reactive, focusing on indemnification after the occurrence of a loss. In contrast, the proposed model emphasizes pre-emptive actions—such as the use of early warning systems, wildlife monitoring, and community education—designed to reduce the frequency and severity of conflict events. This proactive approach fosters a culture of preparedness and resilience, positioning the insurance sector as an enabler of conservation outcomes, rather than merely a provider of financial compensation.

4.2 Practical Applications

The findings of this study provide actionable insights for a diverse range of stakeholders engaged in managing Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC). By re-framing insurance as a systemic enabler of risk reduction and resilience-building, this section outlines practical strategies for operationalizing the study's framework across different stakeholder groups, contributing to a unified conservation-development agenda.

4.2.1 Insurance Companies

Insurance companies are positioned to drive a fundamental shift from passive loss coverage to active risk management. This transformation involves leveraging advanced technologies such as remote sensing, artificial intelligence, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to develop predictive models that map wildlife movements, conflict hotspots, and changing ecological conditions. Such tools can inform flexible underwriting processes, enabling the creation of parametric or index-based insurance products that trigger payouts based on objective ecological indicators, rather than relying on manual claims verification.

Strategic collaborations with conservation actors and local stakeholders will significantly enhance insurers' ecological intelligence, allowing them to design insurance products that are sensitive to local dynamics. For

instance, insurers could offer reduced premiums for communities that implement wildlife deterrence infrastructure or engage in wildlife monitoring programs, thereby creating a feedback loop that incentivizes conservation actions.

Importantly, insurance companies must position themselves as ecosystem risk managers. This shift requires them to invest in loss prevention strategies, sponsor public awareness campaigns, and facilitate microinsurance schemes that provide access to rural, low-income populations. By aligning with broader development goals, insurers can unlock new markets, reduce long-term liabilities, and make a meaningful contribution to sustainable rural transformation.

4.2.2 Governments

Governments have a dual responsibility: to foster regulatory innovation and to institutionalize insurance as a key component of national strategies for HWC and biodiversity conservation. Regulatory frameworks should encourage insurance experimentation—through regulatory sandboxes or parametric licensing regimes—that allow for the rapid testing and scaling of innovative HWC insurance products. Additionally, governments can use fiscal tools, such as tax incentives, premium subsidies, or reinsurance guarantees, to mitigate the risks faced by private insurers and expand coverage to underserved regions.

Public-private partnerships (PPPs) are crucial in creating blended finance models, where public funds catalyze private insurance delivery. Governments should also spearhead public education campaigns to raise awareness of insurance mechanisms, clarify policyholder rights, and build community trust. By integrating insurance into protected area management and rural development policies, governments can embed coexistence models that balance ecological integrity with human security.

4.2.3 Conservation Organizations

Conservation NGOs and research institutions play a central role in co-producing ecologically informed insurance models. These organizations provide scientific expertise in wildlife tracking, ecological modelling, and the identification of biodiversity hotspots, which serve as the actuarial foundation for sustainable insurance products. They must go beyond advocacy, taking active roles in the design, implementation, and evaluation of insurance schemes.

Conservation organizations contribute longitudinal ecological data and engage in risk mapping, which helps ensure that insurance products are tailored to habitat-specific dynamics. Furthermore, their involvement in community mobilization ensures that insurance programs respect local knowledge systems and promote inclusive benefit-sharing. NGOs can also serve as third-party verifiers, enhancing transparency and legitimacy in claims processes, while facilitating payment-for-ecosystem-services (PES) schemes that financially reward biodiversity stewardship.

4.2.4 Local Communities

Local communities are not simply beneficiaries of HWC insurance schemes but co-creators of effective solutions. Empowering communities through participatory processes—such as co-designing insurance models, conducting community risk mapping, and providing insurance education—ensures that insurance solutions are culturally

relevant and sustainable over the long term. Engaging community leaders and local organizations in the governance of insurance schemes enhances accountability, fosters trust, and minimizes the risk of moral hazard. Establishing community insurance committees or localized reinsurance pools, supported by NGOs or governments, can promote peer enforcement, reduce fraudulent claims, and increase efficiency. By empowering communities to monitor wildlife, deploy deterrence measures, and report incidents via digital platforms, insurance programs become integrated into daily life, rather than being perceived as external interventions. This integration fosters a sense of ownership and reinforces a collective conservation ethos.

4.2.5 International Donors and NGOs

International donors and NGOs play a critical catalytic role in scaling and sustaining HWC insurance programs. They provide seed funding for pilot initiatives, offer technical assistance in product development, and invest in cross-border learning platforms that accelerate adoption and replication of insurance models. Donors also have the capacity to convene stakeholders for regional knowledge-sharing and policy harmonization.

These actors can support the development of high-risk pools, invest in data infrastructure, and bridge the gap between humanitarian aid and market-based wildlife conflict solutions. Additionally, their role in monitoring and evaluation ensures continuous program improvement, while aligning HWC insurance efforts with international commitments, such as the SDGs, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration**.**

5. Conclusion

This study makes a significant contribution to the evolving theoretical and practical discourse on the role of insurance in managing Human-Wildlife Conflict (HWC) in Africa. By introducing a collective risk management framework, it challenges the conventional, reactive paradigms that have traditionally defined the insurance industry. Rather than merely compensating for losses post-conflict, this study positions insurance as a proactive and strategic partner in both conservation and community resilience. This shift is crucial because it moves beyond traditional indemnity-based models to adopt an approach that anticipates risks, encourages positive behavioural change, and aligns conservation objectives with the welfare of human populations affected by HWC. The findings underscore that to effectively address the complexities of HWC, insurance mechanisms must evolve. These mechanisms need to integrate technological advancements such as early warning systems, wildlife tracking, and community-based surveillance. This requires insurers to take a broader, ecosystem-informed approach to risk, moving from insuring individual losses to enabling integrated strategies that combine ecological and social resilience. Insurers must partner with conservationists, governments, NGOs, and local communities to design flexible, context-specific products that encourage sustainable coexistence between wildlife and human populations. The role of insurance companies is thus expanding from simply underwriting policies to actively enabling ecosystem and community protection strategies.

Governments have a pivotal role in creating regulatory frameworks that foster innovation in insurance products for HWC management. By facilitating public-private partnerships, offering tax incentives, and implementing pilot programs in regulatory sandboxes, governments can encourage experimentation and scaling of effective insurance solutions. Their ability to create supportive policies will ensure that these innovative insurance products reach underserved areas and populations, addressing the risks of HWC and contributing to broader biodiversity conservation efforts.

Conservation organizations, equipped with vital ecological knowledge and data, play an essential role in co-producing insurance models. Their expertise in wildlife tracking, habitat mapping, and biodiversity hotspots provides the scientific foundation necessary for designing sustainable insurance products. Conservation NGOs must not only advocate for solutions but also engage directly in the implementation and evaluation of insurance programs, ensuring that they are grounded in ecological realities and responsive to local needs.

At the community level, the involvement of local populations in the co-design of HWC insurance mechanisms is critical for success. Empowering communities through participatory processes ensures that insurance products are culturally relevant, widely accepted, and sustainable. Local ownership of insurance schemes increases the likelihood of compliance, reduces moral hazard, and enhances the long-term effectiveness of the interventions. When local communities are involved in wildlife monitoring, implementing deterrence measures, and reporting conflicts, insurance becomes more than just a safety net—it becomes integrated into daily life, fostering a proactive conservation ethos.

International donors and NGOs play a catalytic role in supporting the scaling and sustainability of HWC insurance programs. Through seed funding, technical assistance, and the facilitation of cross-border collaboration, they help bridge gaps in funding and capacity that may hinder the widespread adoption of these innovative insurance solutions. Their involvement in monitoring and evaluation ensures that HWC insurance programs are continuously refined and aligned with international conservation commitments, such as the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).

This research redefines insurance as more than an economic tool. It positions it as a governance mechanism capable of driving environmental sustainability and social protection in conflict-prone regions. The African insurance sector is uniquely positioned to contribute to biodiversity conservation, rural development, and the achievement of the African Union's Agenda 2063 and the global SDGs. The integration of insurance with conservation objectives opens up new opportunities for sustainable rural transformation and poverty alleviation, ensuring that communities and ecosystems are resilient in the face of both current and future challenges.

In conclusion, this study calls for a paradigm shift in how HWC is understood and managed. The future of insurance in managing human-wildlife conflict lies in a holistic, collective risk management approach that emphasizes proactive risk reduction, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and the integration of conservation with community welfare. Such an approach will not only mitigate losses but will transform vulnerability into resilience, and conflict into opportunity, enabling peaceful and productive coexistence between humans and wildlife across Africa. By embracing this new insurance paradigm, we can help to secure both the livelihoods of affected communities and the long-term health of Africa's unique ecosystems.

References

Agrawal, A., & Lemos, M. C. (2007). A greener revolution in the making? Environmental governance in the 21st century. Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development, 49(5), 36-45.

Arias, P., Bellouin, N., Coppola, E., Jones, R., Krinner, G., Marotzke, J., ... & Zickfeld, K. (2021). Climate Change 2021: the physical science basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; technical summary.

Armitage, D. (2005). Adaptive capacity and community-based natural resource management. Environmental management, 35, 703-715.

Barnes, J., & Jones, B. (2012). Game ranching in Namibia. In Evolution and innovation in wildlife conservation (pp. 113-126). Routledge.

Barua, M., Bhagwat, S. A., & Jadhav, S. (2013). The hidden dimensions of human–wildlife conflict: Health impacts, opportunity and transaction costs. Biological conservation, 157, 309-316.

Berkes, F. (2007). Community-based conservation in a globalized world. Proceedings of the National academy of sciences, 104(39), 15188-15193

Bjarnegård, E., & Kenny, M. (2015). Revealing the "secret garden": The informal dimensions of political recruitment. Politics & Gender, 11(4), 748-753.

Bulte, E., & Rondeau, D. (2007). Compensation for wildlife damages: Habitat conversion, species preservation and local welfare. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 54(3), 311-322.

Costanza, R., d'Arge, R., De Groot, R., Farber, S., Grasso, M., Hannon, B., ... & Van Den Belt, M. (1997). The value of the world's ecosystem services and natural capital. nature, 387(6630), 253-260.

Costanza, R., De Groot, R., Sutton, P., Van der Ploeg, S., Anderson, S. J., Kubiszewski, I., ... & Turner, R. K. (2014). Changes in the global value of ecosystem services. Global environmental change, 26, 152-158.

Daily, G. C. (1997). Introduction: what are ecosystem services. Nature's services: Societal dependence on natural ecosystems, 1(1).

Dao, H., Peduzzi, P., & Friot, D. (2018). National environmental limits and footprints based on the Planetary Boundaries framework: The case of Switzerland. Global environmental change, 52, 49-57

Dercon, S., Hill, R. V., Clarke, D., Outes-Leon, I., & Taffesse, A. S. (2014). Offering rainfall insurance to informal insurance groups: Evidence from a field experiment in Ethiopia. Journal of Development Economics, 106, 132-143.

Dickman, A. J. (2010). Complexities of conflict: the importance of considering social factors for effectively resolving human–wildlife conflict. Animal conservation, 13(5), 458-466.

Dickman, A. J., Macdonald, E. A., & Macdonald, D. W. (2011). A review of financial instruments to pay for predator conservation and encourage human–carnivore coexistence. Proceedings of the national academy of Sciences, 108(34), 13937-13944.

Duriez, O., Kato, A., Tromp, C., Dell'Omo, G., Vyssotski, A. L., Sarrazin, F., & Ropert-Coudert, Y. (2014). How cheap is soaring flight in raptors? A preliminary investigation in freely-flying vultures. PloS one, 9(1), e84887

Eksvärd, K., & Marquardt, K. (2018). From change to transition? Learning from environmental protection activities in Sweden. Agroecology and Sustainable Food Systems, 42(2), 189-209

Ellis, F. (2000). The determinants of rural livelihood diversification in developing countries. Journal of agricultural economics, 51(2), 289-302.

Fernando, P., Wikramanayake, E. D., Janaka, H. K., Jayasinghe, L. K. A., Gunawardena, M., Kotagama, S. W., ... & Pastorini, J. (2008). Ranging behavior of the Asian elephant in Sri Lanka. Mammalian Biology, 73(1), 2-13

Folke, C., Hahn, T., Olsson, P., & Norberg, J. (2005). Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour., 30(1), 441-473.

Friedlingstein, P., O'sullivan, M., Jones, M. W., Andrew, R. M., Hauck, J., Olsen, A., ... & Zaehle, S. (2020). Global carbon budget 2020. Earth System Science Data Discussions, 2020, 1-3.

Goergen, J. D., Louis, M. P., Kellner, K. F., Roloff, G. J., Lindeque, M., & Belant, J. L. (2025). Local management and governance improve natural resource incomes of communal conservancies in Namibia. Conservation Science and Practice, e70054.

Hansen, J., Sato, M., & Ruedy, R. (2012). Perception of climate change. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 109(37), E2415-E2423.

Hardin, G. (1974). The tragedy of the commons. Crowding and Behavior, 162(8.5699198).

Harrison, R. D., Thierfelder, C., Baudron, F., Chinwada, P., Midega, C., Schaffner, U., & Van Den Berg, J. (2019). Agro-ecological options for fall armyworm (Spodoptera frugiperda JE Smith) management: Providing low-cost, smallholder friendly solutions to an invasive pest. Journal of environmental management, 243, 318-330.

Hazzah, L., Mulder, M. B., & Frank, L. (2009). Lions and warriors: social factors underlying declining African lion populations and the effect of incentive-based management in Kenya. Biological Conservation, 142(11), 2428-2437.

Kissui, B. M., Kisimir, E. L., Lichtenfeld, L. L., Naro, E. M., Montgomery, R. A., & Kiffner, C. (2022). Human-carnivore coexistence in the Tarangire ecosystem. In Tarangire: Human-wildlife coexistence in a fragmented ecosystem (pp. 295-317). Cham: Springer International Publishing.

Kooiman, J. (2003). Societal governance (pp. 229-250). vs Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Li, L. L., Wang, Q. Y., Yang, H. P., Tao, Y. X., Wang, L. X., Yang, Z. B., ... & Quan, R. C. (2023). Mobile animals and immobile protected areas: improving the coverage of nature reserves for Asian elephant conservation in China. Oryx, 57(4), 532-539

Li, W., Liu, P., Yang, N., Pan, H., Chen, S., & Zhang, L. (2023). Spatio-temporal trend and mitigation of human–elephant conflict in Xishuangbanna, China. The Journal of Wildlife Management, 87(8), e22485.

Lindsey, P. A., Balme, G., Becker, M., Begg, C., Bento, C., Bocchino, C., ... & Zisadza-Gandiwa, P. (2013). The bushmeat trade in African savannas: Impacts, drivers, and possible solutions. Biological conservation, 160, 80-96.

Linnell, J. D., Broseth, H., Odden, J., & Nilsen, E. B. (2010). Sustainably harvesting a large carnivore? Development of Eurasian lynx populations in Norway during 160 years of shifting policy. Environmental management, 45, 1142-1154

McShane, T. O., Hirsch, P. D., Trung, T. C., Songorwa, A. N., Kinzig, A., Monteferri, B., ... & O'Connor, S. (2011). Hard choices: Making trade-offs between biodiversity conservation and human well-being. Biological conservation, 144(3), 966-972.

Mensah, E. J. (2011). The sustainable livelihood framework: A reconstruction.

Mishra, A. K., & Singh, V. P. (2011). Drought modeling–A review. Journal of Hydrology, 403(1-2), 157-175.

Murphree, M. W. (2009). The strategic pillars of communal natural resource management: benefit, empowerment and conservation. Biodiversity and Conservation, 18, 2551-2562

Naidoo, G. (2016). The mangroves of South Africa: An ecophysiological review. South African Journal of Botany, 107, 101-113.

North, D. C. (1990). A transaction cost theory of politics. Journal of theoretical politics, 2(4), 355-367.

Olaussen, J. O. (2018). Environmental problems and regulation in the aquaculture industry. Insights from Norway. Marine Policy, 98, 158-163.

Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. Science, 325(5939), 419-422.

Pagiola, S., Agostini, P., Gobbi, J., Haan, C. D., Ibrahim, M., Murgueitio, E., ... & Ruíz, J. P. (2004). Paying for biodiversity conservation services in agricultural landscapes.

Redpath, S. M., Young, J., Evely, A., Adams, W. M., Sutherland, W. J., Whitehouse, A., ... & Gutierrez, R. J. (2013). Understanding and managing conservation conflicts. Trends in ecology & evolution, 28(2), 100-109.

Scoones, I. (2009). The politics of global assessments: the case of the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD). The Journal of Peasant Studies, 36(3), 547-571.

Sunderlin, W. D., Angelsen, A., Belcher, B., Burgers, P., Nasi, R., Santoso, L., & Wunder, S. (2005). Livelihoods, forests, and conservation in developing countries: an overview. World development, 33(9), 1383-1402.

Surminski, S., & Oramas-Dorta, D. (2014). Flood insurance schemes and climate adaptation in developing countries. International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction, 7, 154-164.

Suryawanshi, K. R., Bhatia, S., Bhatnagar, Y. V., Redpath, S., & Mishra, C. (2014). Multiscale factors affecting human attitudes toward snow leopards and wolves. Conservation Biology, 28(6), 1657-1666.

Treves, A., & Karanth, K. U. (2003). Human-carnivore conflict and perspectives on carnivore management worldwide. Conservation biology, 17(6), 1491-1499

Treves, A., Krofel, M., Ohrens, O., & Van Eeden, L. M. (2019). Predator control needs a standard of unbiased randomized experiments with cross-over design. Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution, 7, 462.

Warren, M. E. (2009). Governance-driven democratization. Critical policy studies, 3(1), 3-13.

WINNIE, C. (2023). Mega-Projects, Land Tenure and Local Institutions Changes in Nakuprat-Gotu Community Conservancy in Isiolo County, Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, Kenyatta University).

Zabel, A., & Holm-Müller, K. (2008). Conservation performance payments for carnivore conservation in Sweden. Conservation biology, 22(2), 247-251.

Zimmermann, N. E., Edwards Jr, T. C., Graham, C. H., Pearman, P. B., & Svenning, J. C. (2010). New trends in species distribution modelling. Ecography, 33(6), 985-989.