

## Illegal Wildlife Trade: Half Year Report

(due 31<sup>st</sup> October 2016)

<b>Project Ref No</b>	IWT-01
<b>Project Title</b>	Building Capacity for Pro-Poor Responses to Wildlife Crime
<b>Country(ies)</b>	Uganda
<b>Lead Organisation</b>	IIED
<b>Collaborator(s)</b>	University of Oxford, Wildlife Conservation Society – Uganda, Uganda Wildlife Authority
<b>Project Leader</b>	Dilys Roe
<b>Report date and number (eg HYR1)</b>	HYR 3 October 2016
<b>Project website</b>	<a href="http://www.iied.org/building-capacity-for-pro-poor-responses-wildlife-crime-uganda">http://www.iied.org/building-capacity-for-pro-poor-responses-wildlife-crime-uganda</a>

### 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:***

As previously reported this output has now been completed and the evidence review is available at <http://pubs.iied.org/17576IIED>. A final presentation of the evidence review was made at a project workshop held in Uganda in May 2016 where all the research findings were presented. The report of the workshop is currently being finalised and will be available on the project website by mid November.

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

As previously reported, this output has also been completed to the extent possible. Highlights from the analysis were presented at the research workshop in May 2016 and we are currently working with Uganda PCLG to explore options for data collected online.

#### ***Output 3: Spatial analysis of wildlife crime indicators***

As previously reported the fieldwork for this output has been completed and this last 6 months has focussed on data analysis and review. The findings were presented at the research workshop in May and are currently being written up for the final research report. Analysis of SMART data in a collaboration between York University and WCS has allowed predictions of the probabilities of different illegal activities across protected areas. These predictions were tested in 2015 and a paper published in Conservation Letters (Critchlow et al. 2016)\* showing that deploying ranger patrols to predicted hotspot areas led to increases in detection of illegal activities by patrols.

#### ***Output 4: Local perceptions of wildlife crime and crime responses***

As previously reported, fieldwork has been completed and the last 6 months have focussed on writing up the results of the research. Detailed presentations were made by Geoffrey Mwedde and Henry Travers at the research workshop in May and generated a lot of interest. The presentations highlighted how the current focus on law enforcement is insufficient (the chance of an encounter with a law enforcement official in either of the case study parks is very low and most of the wildlife crime is driven by a lack of alternative income generating opportunities or frustration at a perceived lack of attention to human wildlife conflict. Discussions at the workshop following the presentations focussed on the potential for developing park-level action plans based on the research findings that could prioritise the most appropriate responses to wildlife crime – notably how to step up UWA's efforts on dealing with human

wildlife conflict and opportunities for developing alternative income streams.

Henry Travers and Geoffrey Mwedde subsequently held local stakeholder workshops in each of the two parks involving UWA staff, local community representatives and other conservation actors active in the location. The draft Action Plans for Murchison Falls and Queen Elizabeth were prepared in September. Both plans were presented to UWA senior management in October and were very positively received. The interventions identified in the action plans are now being integrated into next year's annual operational plans at each park.

Also in September, UWA hosted a side event at CITES to present the research findings and to discuss their responses. Dilys Roe gave a presentation on the research, on behalf of the research team and Aggrey Rwetsiba gave a presentation on the draft Murchison Falls Action Plan, as a key element of UWA's response. The UWA executive director, conservation director and community conservation director all participated in a panel discussion, confirming their support for the research recommendations and the action planning process.

#### **Output 5: Wildlife crime database**

UWA staff at all protected areas were trained on the use of the wildlife crime database in May 2015 and it is now in use in most sites. WCS established a demonstration site of the database to enable online training and demonstration of the database outside Uganda. A Workshop held on 26-27th April 2016 demonstrated and provided training in the software to five other African countries (Malawi, Congo Republic, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Rwanda) as well as some other NGOs (RSPB, Eagle Network, Uganda Conservation Foundation). A total of 23 people were trained (5 women) at this workshop. This led to considerable interest in the database and the Malawi Protected Area Authority (DNPW) has already agreed to establish the database in their country. The Fingerprint module was completed by OSSCube and a training workshop on its use held on 22-23<sup>rd</sup> June 2016 and to also provide follow-up training in the use of the Offenders database. A total of 19 UWA staff and 2 WCS staff were trained at this meeting (5 women). The trainees were provided 14 fingerprint readers for each conservation area together with 14 laptops for the management of the Online Offender's Database at each site.

#### **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.**

Commitment by UWA to policy/practice change while strong in theory (eg as voiced in project workshops and at the CITES side event) has been weak in practice (eg in terms of changes in internal resource allocations, willingness to trial new approaches without them having to be donor-funded "projects"). This is partly because the ideas we are proposing are new to them and it will take some time to internalise them in their operations and partly because of a lack of capacity – UWA have requested extra guidance on how to implement the various activities identified in the plans. It is also because their budgets are restricted and were planned for this year (2016) and they therefore couldn't implement our suggestions. They have expressed a willingness to include greater funding in the FY2017 budget for what we are proposing and at least test them at QENP and MFPA. Hence we have focussed our activities for the last year of the project on developing the two park level action plans – with active support of the park-based UWA staff as opposed to the HQ based senior staff – as the most tangible forms of policy change that seem achievable within the time available. This focus will not affect the budget or timetable for the project but it is unlikely that there will have been any significant impacts by the end of the project resulting from the implementation of these plans because UWA funding will only be available for the activities from January 2017. Nevertheless we anticipate that these will provide an appropriate enabling framework for improvements in practice going forward and we have submitted an IWT Fund proposal to pilot some of the activities that have been laid out in the plans.

#### **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 in this report.