

A Study on Human-Wildlife Conflict Governance in the Circuit Procuratorial Supervision Practice of Qinghai Province

Xiaoxue Su¹, Jingyi Wang^{2*}, Minghua Wang³, Lianlong Ma³

¹College of Agriculture and Animal Husbandry, Qinghai University, Xining 810016, China

²Master's Student in Law, Qinghai Normal University, Xining 810016, China

³Senior Prosecutor, Qinghai Provincial People's Procuratorate, Xining 810008, China

**Corresponding author:* Jingyi Wang, 13897465586@163.com

Copyright: © 2026 Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY 4.0), permitting distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is cited.

Abstract: The circuit procuratorial supervision system for ecological and environmental public interest litigation, pioneered by procuratorial organs in Qinghai Province, constitutes a practical inheritance and innovative application of the Fengqiao Experience within contemporary environmental justice. Nevertheless, its targeted application and institutional refinement for human-wildlife conflict governance remain insufficiently examined in extant scholarship. Against this backdrop, this paper takes on-the-ground circuit procuratorial practice and representative local human-wildlife conflict cases in Qinghai's Sanjiangyuan region as its research footing to systematically explore an integrated governance pathway that embeds circuit procuratorial supervision into human-wildlife conflict administration. It delineates the rational demarcation between procuratorial supervision and administrative discretion, develops standardized institutional norms governing procuratorial oversight of wildlife damage compensation, and mitigates structural tensions between national park ecological conservation and the safeguarding of indigenous residents' lawful rights and interests. This research fills the theoretical void regarding the deployment of environmental public interest litigation for human-wildlife conflict governance, incorporates endemic plateau institutional features into the modernization of environmental rule of law, and establishes a viable innovative legal governance framework to foster harmonious coexistence between humanity and nature.

Keywords: Qinghai Province; Ecological environment; Circuit procuratorial supervision; Human-wildlife conflicts; Procuratorial public interest litigation

Online publication: August 14, 2026

1. Introduction

The Fourth Plenary Session of the 20th CPC Central Committee explicitly highlighted the imperative to reinforce procuratorial supervision and perfect public interest litigation mechanisms throughout the 15th

Five-Year Plan. In recent years, Qinghai's procuratorial organs have earnestly applied the President of the CPC's Thought on Ecological Civilization. Tailored to the province's unique geographical and ecological endowments, Qinghai's procuratorates have taken a nationwide lead in piloting circuit procuratorial supervision for eco-environmental public interest litigation, gradually rolling out a tiered institutional framework framed as provincial overall co-ordination, specialized procuratorate leadership, local collaborative linkage, technology-enabled operation and multi-stakeholder co-governance, which has evolved into a distinctive Qinghai-style institutional regime for eco-environmental public interest litigation ^[1].

Parallel to the nationwide institutional reform shifting protected-area management towards a national park-centered system, expanding wildlife habitats have increasingly overlapped with human habitation, fuelling the proliferation of human-wildlife conflicts. In separate research published in 2020 and 2025, scholars Li Lingyun and Li Dan argued that prevailing wildlife conservation public interest litigation is dominated by an ex post remedial judicial paradigm with inherent structural defects. Accordingly, developing preventive administrative public interest litigation grounded in risk-prevention governance logic is essential to unlock the forward-looking preventive value of public interest litigation. In a 2026 academic article, Qin Qianhong and Li Tianyu pointed out that procuratorial organs face the risk of improper discretionary exercise when advancing preventive legal governance, mandating clear delimitation of procuratorial competence via internal institutional constraints and external regulatory oversight. Further, in 2026, Sun Xiaoyu noted that whilst the mainstream pre-emptive prevention plus post-harm compensation conflict-resolution framework boasts practical operability, existing arrangements overemphasize direct wildlife-inflicted damages whilst overlooking adjustments to grassroots community social structures and benefit redistribution triggered by national park construction and ecological preservation; insufficient statutory provisions for indigenous residents' substantive governance participation obstruct the fundamental resolution of deep-seated human-wildlife conflicts. Relevant statistics indicate 80 percent of residents residing within Sanjiangyuan National Park sustained property damage or personal injury from wild animals in 2021. Balancing statutory wildlife conservation and indigenous communities' legitimate entitlements has emerged as a core pressing issue for the theoretical advancement and practical refinement of public interest litigation. In this context, research into human-wildlife conflict governance under Qinghai's circuit procuratorial supervision carries prominent practical urgency and solid theoretical grounding, laying robust foundations for realizing harmonious human-wildlife coexistence and advancing standardized implementation of eco-environmental circuit procuratorial supervision ^[2].

2. Definition of relevant concepts and existing legal regimes governing human-wildlife conflict administration

Human-wildlife conflict encapsulates concentrated contradictions arising in human-nature interactions. The evolution of human civilization is intrinsically bound up with the shifting relational dynamics between humanity and the natural world. Humans have continuously converted natural ecological terrain into spaces for production and habitation to construct a human-centric spatial order. From an ecological perspective, such human-centered spatial arrangements govern interactions between humans and biotic as well as abiotic elements within defined geographical boundaries, regulated by anthropogenic ecosystems including urban and agroecological systems.

Sustained expansion of artificial ecosystems has fragmented and contracted natural habitats, with human-wildlife conflicts manifesting concretely as spatial clashes between human-dominated productive land and wildlife-governed ecological territory. Such conflicts have intensified globally in recent decades for two principal reasons. First, adaptable species including wild boars and macaques readily acclimatize to modified rural and urban landscapes, penetrating human production and living spaces to forage amid widespread habitat fragmentation. Second, ongoing protected-area development has boosted wildlife population sizes alongside constrained habitat and food availability; compounded by socioeconomic and institutional factors, these shifts drive recurrent confrontations between local communities and wild fauna, defined as protected-area human-wildlife conflict in institutional research ^[2-3].

Article 18 of the Wildlife Conservation Law of the People's Republic of China prescribes that competent government departments shall erect isolation and protective installations, install safety warning signage and implement wildlife population regulation measures in line with on-site practical requirements. Article 19 establishes statutory compensation and insurance mechanisms for losses stemming from wildlife damage. Article 48 of the National Parks Law of the People's Republic of China stipulates that local people's governments shall provide legal compensation for personal and property losses arising from legally protected wildlife or severe depredations by other terrestrial wild animals within national park precincts, with central fiscal subsidies allocated pursuant to regulatory provisions; competent authorities may also incentivize insurance carriers to develop wildlife damage indemnity products. The Ecological and Environmental Code of the People's Republic of China further consolidates foundational overarching legislative norms governing holistic wildlife damage prevention and mitigation. Collectively, these national statutes furnish top-level principled legal authority for standardized human-wildlife conflict governance.

Authorized under Article 19 of the Wildlife Conservation Law, provincial people's governments have formulated location-specific wildlife damage compensation rules. For instance, Guangdong Province issued the Guangdong Provincial Measures for Compensation for Damage Caused by Terrestrial Wild Animals (Yue Fu Han [2025] No. 194) on 15 September 2025, effective 1 December 2025, establishing a dual-track regime of statutory insurance plus government financial safety net. Yunnan Province revised and enacted its provincial terrestrial wildlife damage compensation measures in 2025, formally incorporating damage-intensive species such as wild boar within statutory compensation coverage. By contrast, Qinghai pioneered relevant local regulation upon the 86th Executive Meeting of the Qinghai Provincial People's Government adopting the Qinghai Provincial Measures for Compensation for Personal Injury and Property Damage Caused by Key Protected Terrestrial Wildlife on 6 September 2011, which entered into force on 1 January 2012, rendering Qinghai among China's earliest provincial jurisdictions with formalized administrative compensation legislation for wildlife-inflicted harm. The province rolled out the Pilot Scheme for Insurance Compensation for Personal Injury and Property Damage Caused by Terrestrial Wildlife in Qinghai Province across all administrative regions on 15 May 2022, under which provincial finance earmarks an annual special fund of 3 million Renminbi for unified provincial government liability insurance covering wildlife losses.

In 2024, led by the Sanjiangyuan National Park Administration and jointly with the Qinghai Provincial Forestry and Grassland Bureau alongside the People's Governments of Yushu and Golog Tibetan Autonomous Prefectures, stakeholders promulgated the Action Plan for the Prevention and Mitigation of Human-Wildlife Conflicts in Sanjiangyuan National Park. This document instantiates a mature governance paradigm integrating proactive prevention, targeted regulation and post-incident compensation, delivering a

replicable operational template for nationwide human-wildlife conflict management. Building upon decades of accumulated practical experience, Qinghai promulgated the Qinghai Provincial Regulations on Wildlife Conservation on 26 November 2025, effective 1 January 2026, embedding a full-chain prevention-control framework anchored in prevention, administration and remedial compensation.

Within the same year, the Qinghai Provincial People's Procuratorate issued two core normative documents: the "Trial Rules on Circuit Procuratorial Work for Ecological and Environmental Public Interest Litigation of Qinghai Procuratorial Organs" and the "Trial Guidelines for Handling Wildlife Protection Public Interest Litigation Cases of the Qinghai Provincial People's Procuratorate". Cumulatively, Qinghai has constructed a sophisticated locally tailored legal system combining administrative compensation, commercial insurance indemnity and procuratorial public interest litigation, outperforming most other provincial jurisdictions in institutional comprehensiveness for wildlife damage redress ^[3-5].

3. Practical predicaments of human-wildlife conflict governance amid Qinghai's circuit procuratorial practice

In June 2022, during eco-environmental public interest litigation circuit inspections, the Banma County People's Procuratorate of Golog Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture identified recurrent wildlife-inflicted casualties across its jurisdiction traceable to inadequate administrative performance: absent hazard-warning signage in high-risk wildlife activity zones, insufficient protective infrastructure, understaffed routine patrol teams, and deficient grassroots publicity and safety training, all constituting infringements upon public interests. Having accepted the case lead, Banma Procuratorate issued statutory procuratorial recommendations to local forestry and grassland authorities mandating rectification within fixed deadlines.

Issuing recommendations requiring hazard sign installation and joint community defense team formation is reasonably aligned with source-based preventive governance and statutory interest protection objectives. Nevertheless, critical boundary-setting questions persist regarding the granularity of procuratorial recommendation content: whether procuratorial organs may prescribe overly specific administrative implementation details including exact sign placement, installation quantities or technical specifications for protective works. Whilst such granular stipulations ostensibly conform to constitutionally-endowed procuratorial supervisory authority, unchecked detailed prescription risks overlapping administrative competences, blurring institutional boundaries and disrupting established administrative legal order through excessive intervention.

Per the "Qinghai Provincial Measures for Compensation for Personal Injury and Property Loss Caused by Key Protected Terrestrial Wildlife", administrative departments bear exclusive statutory responsibility for compensation application admissibility, loss quantification and standardized indemnity calculation. This raises a pivotal supervisory question: do administrative omissions or selective duty performance — such as unreasonable application deferral, inconsistent loss appraisal benchmarks for identical damage types, or overly restrictive interpretation of compensation eligibility thresholds — fall within the remit of procuratorial public interest litigation supervision ^[2, 4-6].

Fundamental benchmark divergence frequently sparks institutional friction: procuratorial organs tend to adopt outcome-orientated review (assessing substantive remedial effects), whereas administrative authorities adhere to procedural compliance standards (verifying completion of statutory formalities). Without

restrained deployment of procuratorial supervision, such normative divergence readily results in unwarranted encroachment upon administrative professional discretion in case-specific implementation.

During May 2022 circuit procuratorial inspections, the Zadoi county People's Procuratorate of Yushu Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture uncovered prominent grassroots governance deficiencies. Over the preceding three years, frequent predation incidents involving bears and wolves in the Lancang River catchment inside Sanjiangyuan National Park caused extensive personal injury and property losses to herdsman. Despite local pastoralists submitting 204 formal insurance claims for wildlife-inflicted harm, the overwhelming majority of township-level residents remain unfamiliar with the wildlife liability insurance framework. This phenomenon signals inadequate downward policy dissemination at the grassroots level alongside weak resident awareness of statutory remedies once lawful interests sustain impairment ^[4].

Official 2022 statistics show merely 34 percent of wildlife-disaster-affected households within Sanjiangyuan National Park submitted formal compensation applications. Average claim-processing cycles exceed three calendar months, with final settled compensation equating to less than 70 percent of verified actual economic losses. Field interviews reveal systemic insurance design defects: prevailing contractual clauses restrict eligible indemnity to fully intact killed livestock, setting a fixed compensation rate of 2,000 Renminbi per head of yak against a prevailing local market value of 10,000–15,000 Renminbi per adult animal. Field investigations across northern Tanggula further document arbitrary claim rejection by insurance carriers on pretexts including absence of on-site blood evidence or incident proximity to riverine terrain. Local herders are consequently compelled to photograph carcasses at predation scenes to secure basic eligibility; even after formal claim approval, fund disbursement commonly takes approximately twelve months. Additional widespread dissatisfaction stems from extremely low compensation thresholds for bear-inflicted damage to stored grain, domestic furniture and residential premises, severely depressing resident satisfaction with the extant compensation architecture ^[5].

National park construction and ecological restoration inherently impose developmental restrictions on indigenous productive and residential spaces under the dominant institutional logic of human retreat to facilitate wildlife recovery. As the core territorial component of Sanjiangyuan National Park, Yushu Prefecture has incorporated most local grasslands within protected zoning, driving marked population growth of brown bears and other wild species whilst shrinking available forage and depressing local livestock husbandry yields. Articles 29 and 37 of the National Parks Law impose statutory obligations on local people's governments to implement resettlement for relocated indigenous residents and guarantee reasonable developmental entitlements for peripheral communities, respectively. Despite such legislative design targeting root-cause conflict resolution, practical institutional hurdles persist in balancing ecological conservation cost apportionment and indigenous right protection at economically sustainable administrative cost.

The National Parks Law's legislative purpose centers on advancing modernized harmonious human–nature coexistence, which necessitates indigenous resident participation as a core conflict-management strategy. Current institutional frameworks, however, confine indigenous communities to passive victim status under prevention-first, post-harm redress mechanisms, lacking structured incentives and supporting provisions for proactive grassroots governance involvement.

For example, the Sanjiangyuan National Park Administration has engaged 16,500 local pastoralists as contracted ecological rangers for daily conservation patrols; nevertheless, wildlife damage compensation

insurance design and implementation — a matter of direct existential importance to enrolled rangers — remains fully controlled by administrative authorities and commercial insurance providers. Discrepancies between formally stipulated compensation benchmarks and empirically sustained resident losses fuel pastoralist antipathy toward wildlife conservation policies, exacerbating on-the-ground human-wildlife friction and obstructing indigenous transition from passive loss-bearers to positive co-governance stakeholders ^[6].

4. Root-cause analysis of prevailing governance dilemmas

When delivering preventive rule-of-law outcomes and participating in social governance, procuratorial organs are statutorily required to exercise due deference to administrative competence to forestall ultra vires encroachment, forming functionally complementary arrangements that remedy administrative governance loopholes across human-wildlife conflict domains. In responsibility allocation terms, procuratorial organs perform public-interest representation mandates without assuming full blanket accountability for all public-interest safeguarding obligations. Administrative authorities remain primary public-interest custodians vested with statutory duties, institutional resources and operational capacity to deliver effective interest protection ^[7].

Within public-interest governance, procuratorial supervision occupies supplementary rather than sole or primary representative standing. Administrative bodies carry primary social governance responsibility rooted in administrative power's proactive, expansive and specialized attributes: hierarchical organizational structures, vertical management frameworks and broad jurisdictional remits enable rapid resource mobilization and cross-departmental coordination to satisfy social governance's efficiency and flexibility demands, vesting administrations with priority competence over in-house regulatory affairs. Crucially, procuratorial supervision operates exclusively on a case-specific concrete basis, precluding abstract supervision decoupled from actual legal disputes. The Supreme People's Procuratorate has repeatedly affirmed the core supervisory philosophy of supervising through case handling and performing supervision in case handling, mandating restrained exercise of procuratorial authority to avoid competence transgression during legal oversight implementation ^[7–11].

Risk-prevention-orientated procuratorial intervention inherently harbors latent risk prevention at all costs institutional bias. Without binding proportionality principle constraints, preventive judicial instruments including rigid procuratorial recommendations or public interest litigation may be disproportionately severe relative to underlying risk probability and foreseeable harm magnitude, culminating in excessive procuratorial power deployment. For illustration, sporadic brown bear predation incidents would violate the legal necessity limb of proportionality should procuratorial organs mandate local governments to complete large-scale high-expense perimeter fencing within unreasonably compressed construction timelines. Such disproportionate supervisory stipulations arise principally from insufficient appraisal of regional fiscal affordability during supervisory requirement formulation.

When verifying administrative compliance with statutory compensation obligations, procuratorial organs principally benchmark administrative conduct against the statutory acting in accordance with law standard. Current oversight interpretation, however, remains confined to superficial procedural checks: confirmation of formal institutional establishment, insurance procurement, and routine claim-processing completion. Clear statutory authorization and operable supervisory provisions remain absent for substantive-fairness-oriented

review covering compensation standard reasonableness, damage-assessment procedural scientificity, and indemnification sufficiency. This traps existing procuratorial oversight within procedural box-ticking focused on formal administrative action completion, prohibiting in-depth substantive review of implementation quality and distributive fairness ^[8].

Contemporary wildlife damage compensation increasingly adopts the hybrid government-backed basic insurance plus supplementary commercial insurance institutional model. Whilst procuratorial organs may supervise policyholder administrative authorities' performance of insurance-contract statutory obligations, definitive statutory grounds and actionable supervisory pathways are missing to intervene in insurance carriers' market-based operational details including claim settlement protocols, damage appraisal rules and contractual claim-rejection criteria.

Even where insurance carriers impose onerous, inequitable assessment clauses eroding indigenous lawful entitlements, procuratorial organs cannot directly compel clause revision via administrative public interest litigation: such provisions constitute private-law contractual terms shielded by freedom of contract doctrine from unwarranted judicial interference. These insurance-contract arrangements therefore form a permanent procuratorial oversight blind spot, removing the public-interest-centric wildlife compensation architecture from comprehensive judicial supervision coverage. Existing human-wildlife conflict resolution frameworks center on hazard minimization plus post-incident financial indemnity to offset indigenous economic and personal losses, yet monetary compensation alone rarely fully redresses holistic multi-dimensional developmental deprivation. Amid ongoing national park and nature reserve development, peripheral indigenous communities routinely forfeit established vested rights and developmental options for ecological preservation whilst securing negligible reciprocal conservation-derived benefits.

Legislative neglect of indigenous interests manifests via over-reliance upon punitive and administrative regulatory instruments that unduly constrain traditional livelihood and productive activity, breeding grassroots opposition to formal ecological conservation systems. Wildlife damage compensation insurance across most regions is government-procured via competitive tendering to commercial insurers. Critical regulatory gaps deny indigenous residents – ultimate compensation beneficiaries – formal participatory entitlements concerning core insurance design parameters: indemnity caps, claim protocols and damage-assessment benchmarks, alongside structured institutional avenues for input during rulemaking.

Existing indigenous conservation participation is largely restricted to limited-quota fixed-income ecological ranger roles, incapable of delivering sustained material living-standard uplift. Restricted participatory scope drastically suppresses indigenous initiative and voluntary enthusiasm for co-governing local ecological and human-wildlife conflict affairs ^[9–10].

5. Targeted optimization pathways for human-wildlife conflict governance within Qinghai's circuit procuratorial regime

Qinghai's provincial procuratorial organs shall coordinate cross-departmental stakeholders to enact the Detailed Rules for Public Interest Litigation Handling in Human-Wildlife Conflict Governance, formally codifying positive and negative lists defining procuratorial supervisory purview. Supervision shall be strictly restricted to procedural and statutory-compliance checks: verification of lawfully promulgated compensation rules, timely activation of eligible damage claim channels and full implementation of statutory safety-

warning obligations. Conversely, technical discretionary determinations including exact compensation quantum and protective-engineering design specifications fall within exclusive administrative professional remit; procuratorial review is limited to assessing decision-making procedural lawfulness and manifest substantive unfairness without substantive administrative technical intervention ^[11].

Procuratorial organs shall complete necessity-and-proportionality evaluations prior to issuing any formal supervisory opinion, implementing a staggered progressive oversight hierarchy prioritizing administrative consultation, procuratorial recommendation issuance, and final preventive public interest litigation initiation to curb excessive rigid judicial intervention. Operational sequencing mandates preliminary bilateral communication to rectify identified governance lapses; partial remedial administrative action without full statutory compliance triggers formal procuratorial corrective recommendations; preventive litigation is reserved exclusively as a last-resort remedy where repeated supervisory reminders fail to compel competent authorities to fulfill core preventive statutory obligations. This tiered architecture safeguards preventive supervision efficacy whilst precluding overbearing judicial intervention that disrupts rational division of state institutional competences.

Relevant public interest litigation guiding documents shall be refined to expand supervised subjects beyond compensation-bound administrative authorities to include government-authorized insurance service providers, bringing insurers' claim-settlement fairness and reasonableness within formal procuratorial supervision scope. Unified operable statutory benchmarks shall be established covering the full compensation lifecycle: adequacy of institutional publicity, accessibility of claim application pathways, procedural convenience for claimants, scientific robustness of damage-assessment standards, rationality of final indemnity levels and punctuality of fund disbursement to realize comprehensive substantive oversight.

Where insurance carriers draft one-sided standard-form contractual terms that unlawfully exempt carrier liability and disproportionately inflate indigenous pastoralists' indemnity burdens, procuratorial organs may institute civil public interest litigation to petition people's courts for judicial invalidation of inequitable clauses to rectify systemic defects at source. Alternatively, procurators may intervene during government-insurer contract negotiation by issuing procuratorial recommendations prompting competent local governments to reopen contractual renegotiations on problematic provisions. In the medium-to-long term, provincial authorities may roll out statutory minimum baseline standards for wildlife insurance contractual clauses prohibiting compensation ceilings falling below stipulated statutory thresholds to solidify indigenous lawful-interest safeguards.

Instead of limiting oversight to written administrative replies against procuratorial recommendations, procuratorial organs shall deploy unscheduled field audits and random spot checks to verify full, punctual compensation disbursement alongside indigenous resident satisfaction ratings, eliminating tokenistic formalistic supervision. Concurrently, procuratorial organs may submit targeted thematic research reports and formal recommendations to local governments proposing inclusion of wildlife-compensation resident satisfaction metrics, claim-processing efficiency and fund-payout timeliness within annual administrative department performance appraisal systems to bind institutional implementation accountability and secure substantive indigenous rights protection ^[11-12].

Grounding institutional design in procuratorial legal supervision and recommendation instruments, authorities shall build a multi-tiered holistic ecological compensation regime underpinned by socialized shared conservation-cost allocation to offset indigenous communities' livelihood losses and developmental

sacrifices incurred amid national park construction and ecological preservation. Vertical fiscal compensation: Central finance assumes primary funding obligations for national park management and indigenous interest protection via intergovernmental fiscal transfers. Given national park construction delivers nationwide collective ecological security as a core state strategic public good, associated conservation costs ought to be collectively underwritten by the state on behalf of all citizens.

Horizontal inter-regional ecological compensation: Downstream and peripheral jurisdictions accruing tangible ecological dividends including freshwater provision and climate regulation from national park ecosystems shall negotiate binding compensatory arrangements with upstream host communities to share conservation costs fairly.

Corresponding procuratorial public interest litigation provisions shall be revised to extend supervisory ambit beyond mere administrative procedural compliance to substantive review of compensation-standard rationality, claim-procedure accessibility and distributive-outcome fairness. Statutory investigatory and verification powers shall be vested in procuratorial organs, authorizing independent auditing of commissioned insurers' internal claim rules and operational datasets to close existing supervisory loopholes and strengthen indigenous substantive-right protection^[13–14].

The existing institutional framework, which frames indigenous residents merely as passive hazard victims and compensation recipients, requires structural optimization to empower them as equal, active stakeholders in ecological conservation governance through three core strategies. First, systematic legal and technical training shall be delivered to enhance indigenous residents' ecological and legal awareness through the popularization of wildlife protection laws, animal behavioral knowledge, and human-wildlife safe coexistence norms. Second, grassroots community cadres will act as coordination pivots to incorporate indigenous participation in community-based reporting and feedback mechanisms, enabling real-time conflict monitoring and early risk prevention. Third, statutory provisions shall clarify residents' legal right to necessary self-defense against unavoidable wildlife intrusions, with standardized non-lethal mitigation guidelines issued to prevent the wrongful criminalization of residents who inadvertently harm protected wildlife in legitimate emergency defense scenarios.

6. Conclusion

The eco-environmental public interest litigation practice pioneered by Qinghai's procuratorial organs has forged a distinctive regional judicial pathway to resolve Sanjiangyuan's endemic human-wildlife conflict governance challenges. Built upon mature national and provincial statutory frameworks, Qinghai has erected a comparatively comprehensive local regulatory architecture governing relevant conflict administration. To fully unlock such institutional potential, however, further normative refinement remains essential to rationalize procuratorial-administrative competence demarcation, codify institutionalized procuratorial compensation oversight, and resolve embedded structural frictions between national park conservation mandates and indigenous-right protection. Deepening Qinghai's distinctive circuit procuratorial institutional innovation will facilitate development of a replicable, scalable Qinghai Model for nationwide human-wildlife conflict governance, delivering plateau-specific Chinese rule-of-law experience to advance global institutional construction for harmonious human-nature coexistence.

Acknowledgments

Financial support from Project 2023-193 under the Kunlun Talent Program of Qinghai Province is gratefully acknowledged. The authors are grateful to Jingyi Wang, Minghua Wang, and Lianlong Ma for their help with data collation and analysis, as well as their insightful academic exchanges.

Funding

This study was financially supported by the 2023-193 Kunlun Talent Program of Qinghai Province.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author contributions

Xiaoxue Su contributed to manuscript preparation and conceived the research idea; Jingyi Wang participated in the conception of this study; Minghua Wang and Lianlong Ma assisted with data analysis and offered constructive discussions.

References

- [1] Huang Y, Yang J, Zhang H, et al., 2021, A Comparative Study on the Current Status of Human-Wildlife Conflict Management in Protected Areas at Home and Abroad. *World Forestry Research*, 34(6): 27–32. <http://doi.org/10.13348/j.cnki.sjlyyj.2021.0093.y>
- [2] Liu SQ, Liu JH, Zhang LM, et al., 2024, The Current Status, Issues, and Mitigation Strategies of Human-wildlife Conflicts in National Parks. *National Park*, 2(6): 383–391. <http://doi.org/10.20152/j.np.202403210043>
- [3] Jiao HC, Huang QZ, 2026, The Role and Institutional Development of Legal Supervisory Bodies in Environmental Public Interest Litigation. *Hebei Law Review*, 44(1): 16–35. <http://doi.org/10.16494/j.cnki.1002-3933.2026.01.002>
- [4] Guo XH, 2026, A Study on the Statutory Nature and Implementation Strategies of Procuratorial Supervision over the Ecological Environment. *Journal of Social Sciences, Jilin University*, 66(2): 122–128 + 268–269. <http://doi.org/10.15939/j.jujss.2026.02.fx4>
- [5] Wang CY, 2018, On the System of “Preventive” Administrative Public Interest Litigation Initiated by Procuratorial Organs. *Zhejiang Social Sciences*, 2018(11): 51–58 + 157. <http://doi.org/10.14167/j.zjss.2018.11.007>
- [6] Sun XY, 2026, The Rule of Law Approach to Resolving Human-Wildlife Conflicts in China’s National Parks. *Biodiversity*, 34(1): 218–227.
- [7] Dai YC, 2020, A Study on the Characteristics, Risks and Driving Factors of Human-Bear Conflict in the Sanjiangyuan Region, thesis, Chinese Academy of Forestry Sciences. <http://doi.org/10.27625/d.cnki.gzlk.2020.000089>
- [8] Li LY, 2020, From Damage Control to Risk Prevention: An Optimized Approach to Public Interest Litigation for Wildlife Conservation. *China Environmental Management*, 12(5): 130–137, <http://doi.org/10.16868/j.cnki.1674-6252.2020.05.130>
- [9] Li D, 2025, From Remedies for Damage to Risk Governance: The Legislative Framework for Preventive

- Procuratorial Public Interest Litigation in Administrative Matters. *Guangdong Social Sciences*, 2025(4): 256–269.
- [10] Li SX, 2022, On the Interface between Biodiversity Damage and Public Interest Litigation Concerning the Ecological Environment: A Case Study of Damage to Wildlife Resources. *Journal of Yunnan Minzu University (Philosophy and Social Sciences Edition)*, 39(3): 137–148, <http://doi.org/10.13727/j.cnki.53-1191/c.20220505.013>
- [11] Qin HY, Yin SH, 2025, Economic Compensation for Damage Caused by Wild Animals: Challenges and Controversies. *World Forestry Research*, 38(5): 100–106, <http://doi.org/10.13348/j.cnki.sjlyyj.2025.0085.y>
- [12] Shi CM, Xu JL, Zhai B, et al., 2025, An Analysis of Adaptive Governance Models for Human-Wildlife Conflict Based on the IAD-SES Framework: A Case Study of Yushu Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture, Qinghai, China. *World Forestry Research*, 38(1): 126–134, <http://doi.org/10.13348/j.cnki.sjlyyj.2025.0017.y>
- [13] Jiumaocuo, Gacangcuo, 2023, Current Status, Hot Topics and Trends in Research on China's Sanjiangyuan National Park: A Visualization Analysis Based on Bibliometrix. *Ecological Economics*, 39(10): 221–229.
- [14] Zhao XN, Chen Q, Zhi ZM, 2024, Risk Assessment of Human–Wildlife Conflict in the Three-River-Source National Park. *Journal of Wildlife Research*, 45(1): 148–156.

Publisher's note

Bio-Byword Scientific Publishing remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.