La quasitotalité des populations rurales puisent des milieux naturels, sans précaution particulière, l'essentiel des ressources dont elles ont besoin.

L'état des forèts n'est pas bien connu et l'inventaire forestier ne tient pas compte du potentiel faunique c'est à dire de l'éléphant.

Combien de temps faut-il laisser une exploitation forestière pour recouvrir son potentiel faune? Comment les sociétés forestières peuvent-elles réduire leur impact dans les concessions pour ne pas permettre beaucoup de modification du milieu? Voilà des questions auxquelles il faut réfléchir pour assurer Ia promotion d'une exploitation durable des forèts d'Afrique Centrale.

QUELLE SERAIT LA STRATEGIE A METTRE EN OEUVRE POUR LA GESTION DE L'ELEPHANT EN MILIEU FORESTIER?

- La défaillance de la loi et son inaction ne devraient pas limiter les utilisateurs des ressources naturelles renouvelables à réfléchir sur ce qui est possible de faire pour une bonne gestion de l'éléphant en milieu forestier
- Les inventaires forestiers devront tenir compte de la faune avant toute exploitation des concessions forestières
- Les compagnies d'exploitation forestières devront avec l'appui du personnel chargé de la faune être responsabilisées pour la lutte anti-braconnage dans leurs "juridictions"
- Promouvoir l'émergence des modèles de plan d'aménagement de l'éléphant à la satisfaction de l'écologiste, l'aménagiste d'une part et de l'exploitant, l' industriel et l' utilisateur d' autre part
- Inclure l'éléphant dans la réflexion globale de Ia politique forestière nationale et internationale
- Faire obligation aux exploitants forestiers d'assurer la formation de leur personnel avant l'octroi de permis.

PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS OUTSIDE PROTECTED AREAS

John M Waithaka
Elephant Programme Kenya Wildlife Service PO Box 40241, Nairobi, Kenya

SUMMARY OF PRESENTATION FROM RAPPORTEUR NOTES

This presentation is based on the experiences drawn from the management and conservation of elephants in Kenya, a country with 56 conservation areas. The Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) has a total workforce of 4,000 employees. Thirty per cent of its 500 vehicles are based at the KWS headquarters in Nairobi. In comparison, Kruger National Park (KNP) alone employs 3,000 people! As such, there is a clear difference in the amount and distribution of resources and personnel between the two countries.

A dramatic reduction of elephant range in Kenya was the inevitable result of a high increase in human population (and thus a high demand for land), which has more than tripled from 8,000,000 people at **Independence (1 963) to over** 24.000.000 today.

A major problem which has to be dealt with is the negative attitude towards conservation legislation laws and policies in general. This can be traced back to the colonial regime, during which the concept of parks and reserves was introduced, forcing people off their land in an effort to impose the new laws. This was in contrast to the traditional way of life where people interacted freely with animals. At the time of Independence, although people were told that the animals were being conserved for them, the oppressive game laws remained in place. Currently, Kenya is exploring new concepts and approaches to wildlife management which ensure that conservation is by the people and for the people!

Problems which are specific to elephant conservation include: human death and injury; damage to crops and property; degazetting of forest elephant habitats; cross-border conflicts and different cross-border in

terests; logging in elephant forest habitats; poaching in areas where there is banditry eg. north Meru National Park; unpopular policies e.g. no land-use plans and no compensation for property damage, etc.; too much reliance on donor money for conservation activities; high human population increase and therefore encroachment and clearing of land for settlements; very little management- orientated research for elephants; extreme poverty among most of the rural populace; pollution; fragmentation of land; bad infrastructure outside parks; and lack of policy enforcement and implementation.

Some solutions towards the above-mentioned problems which have been tried in Kenya include: provision of food-relief; early harvesting; education programmes and building of classrooms by KWS in conflict areas; placing radio-collars on elephants to track their movements; helping to start tourist resorts outside protected areas; promoting traditional methods of chasing away animals; creating barriers in the form of unpalatable crops e.g. tea zones; taming elephants and/or considering elephant-riding safaris; training scientists to comprehend and resolve problems; problem animal control shooting; improving security and training more rangers; and erecting electric fences and conducting translocation trials.

SESSION TITLE: ADDRESSING KEY MANAGEMENT CHALLENGES

WORKING GROUP SUMMARIES

SAVANNA WORKING GROUP

Chair: David Cumming
Rapporteur: Colin Craig

The group's aim was to start developing an objective system of decision-making to identify appropriate solutions to elephant management problems.

The group identified a number of potential elephant management problems both inside and outside protected areas, as shown in Table l below.

Table l. Elephant management problems.

Inside parks	Outside parks
Habitat degradation	Human/elephant conflict
Poaching	Loss of habitat/range
Water provision	Absence leading to habitat change
Movement out	Land-use conflicts (e.g. stock, water)
Overpopulation	Population viability
Disease	Poaching
Small populations in small areas	Disruption of migration routes
Impacts of tourists and tourist/elephant interactions	Management of legal hunting
Lack of information	Lack of information

It was put to the group by Dr.Cumming that problems could be tackled at a number of points, depending on resources, which led to a number of options for action. Options could be determined from a "tree" describing the hierarchy of the ways in which a problem could arise. An example of such a "tree" was constructed, with group participation, for the problem of habitat degradation (see figure).

As time was limited, it was decided to exemplify the determination of options for solutions from the part of the "tree" hierarchy which described the problems leading to water localisation, as seen in Table 2.

Table 2. Possible solutions/interventions.

1 . Provide alternative water, Press/Pulse
1.1. Does an alternative exist?
1.2. Can it be made available?
1.3. What are the consequences of providing this water?
2. Reduce elephant population. How?
2.1. Translocate
2.2. Cull
2.3. Contraception
3. Expand range to include more water
4. Close existing water supply, if natural