Illegal Wildlife Trade: Half Year Report

(due 31st October 2014)

Project Ref No	IWT-01
Project Title	Building Capacity for Pro-Poor Responses to Wildlife Crime
Country(ies)	Uganda
Lead Organisation	IIED
Collaborator(s)	Imperial College, Wildlife Conservation Society – Uganda, Uganda Wildlife Authority
Project Leader	Dilys Roe
Report date and number (eg HYR1)	HYR 2 October 2015
Project website	http://www.iied.org/building-capacity-for-pro-poor-responses-wildlife-crime-uganda

---

1. Outline progress over the last 6 months (April – Sept) against the agreed baseline timetable for the project (if your project has started less than 6 months ago, please report on the period since start up to end September).

Output1: Evidence review of drivers and impacts of wildlife crime:

The evidence review was launched on 8th July 2015 in Kampala at an event attended by around 70 representatives of conservation organisations, Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) staff, members of the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group, lecturers and students from Makerere University, and journalists. A presentation summarising the report was given by Dilys Roe on behalf of the project team and then a panel discussion was held with the project team and UWA staff. The report was formally launched at the end of the evening by Andrew Seguya, Executive Director of UWA and received a high level of press attention including a 5 minute slot on the evening news. Presentations were also made at the Uganda Poverty and Conservation Learning Group (U-PCLG) meeting in Kampala in July[1], and by Dilys Roe at the International Congress for Conservation Biology held in Montpellier in August[2]. The Evidence Review is available to download here: http://pubs.iied.org/17576IIED..

Output 2: Analysis of conservation – development – wildlife crime interactions

Information gathered from UWA's conservation areas managers was compiled into an Excel spreadsheet and a draft report produced, which summarised the findings and also gaps in the data. This was shared with UWA staff at Headquarters and in the field in order to help interpret trends in the data; this is on-going and the report is being updated. We also began discussions with UWA and U-PLCG members on the details of the format of this resource – what would be easiest and most useful for them, and how best to access it. Initial ideas are being developed to test and then refine with their feedback; all agreed that a launch event would be held at the Research Workshop planned for March 2016. The results from both Outputs 1 and 2 will be integrated into a manuscript for publication in a scientific peer-reviewed journal (Activities (1.6 and 2.6) and will be presented during the Research Workshop to be conducted in Year 3 (Activities 1.5 and 2.5).

Output 3: Spatial analysis of wildlife crime indicators

The collection of data at both study sites (Activity 3.2) has been completed, with 1968 households interviewed as part of the wider socio-economic household survey. Work is progressing for Activity 3.4. The prevalence of household involvement in the extraction of four different resources from the two study areas has been calculated at the district level, using the results of an unmatched count technique (UCT)

---

[1] http://povertyandconservation.info/sites/default/files/U-PCLG_Minutes_10_July2015_Final.pdf
[2] http://conbio.org/images/content_conferences/WebView-ICCB-ECCB2015Program.pdf

component of the household survey. This will provide the basis for the comparative analysis of prevalence to be conducted in collaboration with Dr. Colin Beale at the University of York. This analysis will give a comparison between prevalence rates of illegal activities estimated for households living adjacent to the two parks through the UCT with those calculated within the parks by Dr. Beale's group using wildlife crime incidence data. Comparing these two datasets will provide information on the correlation between areas of high household involvement in wildlife crime with areas of high crime incidence within the two parks, which can in turn be used to improve the efficiency of patrols and other law enforcement activities. Statistical models are in the process of being developed to build up socio-economic profiles of households engaged in illegal resource harvest.

WCS worked with UWA and International Gorilla Conservation Program (IGCP) and African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) to establish the Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART) software across all protected areas in Uganda and also migrate all MIST databases into SMART. A training course was run by WCS staff in May 2015 to train 60 UWA staff in the use of SMART. As such all sites in Uganda have moved over to SMART and no longer use MIST. SMART has many more capabilities than MIST particularly in the ways of analyzing the data. WCS also continued to work with Colin Beale and Rob Critchlow at University of York to analyse the spatial distribution of threats based on the MIST/SMART data for Murchison Falls National Park, showing that the main threats are snaring and bushmeat hunting across the park. Their analyses also show a recent increasing trend in snaring in the park.

Output 4: Local perceptions of wildlife crime and crime responses

The fieldwork (Activity 4.2) was completed in July and results are now being analysed. Both of the Imperial College MSc students have completed their projects and their theses, containing initial analyses and results, will shortly be made available online on the ICCS website. Further analyses for both components (choice experiments and scenario interviews; Activity 4.3) is ongoing and on course for completion by Quarter 4 of Year 2. Henry Travers also completed 54 key-informant interviews with current or convicted poachers (including prisoners incarcerated for wildlife related crimes), providing an important perspective for understanding the local drivers of wildlife crime and perceptions of possible policy or intervention responses.

In order to start building awareness amongst UWA staff of the preliminary research findings and of the need to identify opportunities where these findings can help shape new policy and practice at the case study sites, a 2-day workshop was held in July in Kampala and attended by senior managers from UWA Headquarters, and Chief, Community and Law Enforcement Wardens at our two national park study sites. Presentations were given by the project team on the different activities of this project. Group sessions were then held to explore the views of UWA headquarters and Park Wardens on engaging with local communities to reduce wildlife crime. Interventions discussed were the same as those used by the research team in the choice experiments and scenario interviews, and debates included the likely effectiveness of the interventions as well as practicalities of implementation. The final session was based on collaborative planning, where all identified the actions needed to achieve the Park-based project outcomes by project end. From this key opportunities for influencing policy and practice were identified. These included UWA's planned development of a human wildlife conflict mitigation strategy; the mid-term review of the ten year management plan for Queen Elizabeth National Park; and new national species-specific action plans to tackle wildlife crime.

Output 5: Wildlife crime database

UWA staff at all protected areas were trained on the use of the wildlife crime database in May and it is now in use in most sites. A total of 1658 arrests have been entered into the database (representing arrests made during the period February 2012 to October 2015). The data before July 2014 are all from a database for Queen Elizabeth National Park. Unfortunately the ability of the database to store fingerprint information has been constrained due to this function not being compatible with the version of Windows being used by UWA but other than this the database appears to be functioning well. We aim to have the fingerprinting component programmed by the end of this fiscal year (March 2016) and have identified a software company to provide us with the expertise to complete what has already been developed.

2a. Give details of any notable problems or unexpected developments that the project has encountered over the last 6 months. Explain what impact these could have on the project and whether the changes will affect the budget and timetable of project activities.

Since our last report, EJ Milner-Gulland has accepted a new position at Oxford University. Consequently the project partnership with Imperial College will be transferred to Oxford (Henry Travers will continue to be supervised by EJ M-G and so will also move Oxford). We will be submitting a change request in the next month to address this.

2b. Have any of these issues been discussed with LTS International and if so, have changes been made to the original agreement?

Discussed with LTS:	No
Formal change request submitted:	No
Received confirmation of change acceptance	No

3a. Do you currently expect to have any significant (eg more than £5,000) underspend in your budget for this year?

Yes ☐ **No** ☒ Estimated underspend: £

3b. If yes, then you need to consider your project budget needs carefully as it is unlikely that any requests to carry forward funds will be approved this year. Please remember that any funds agreed for this financial year are only available to the project in this financial year.

If you anticipate a significant underspend because of justifiable changes within the project and would like to talk to someone about the options available this year, please indicate below when you think you might be in a position to do this and what the reasons might be:

4. Are there any other issues you wish to raise relating to the project or to IWT challenge Fund management, monitoring, or financial procedures?

Nothing so far thank you. No issues were raised in the annual report that require a response.