



IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

Project Reference	IWT 018
Project Title	Developing long-term law enforcement capacity to protect the Mali elephants
Country/ies	Mali, Burkina Faso
Contract Holder Institution	The WILD Foundation
Partner institutions	The Mali Government: Ministry of the Environment - La Direction Nationale des Eaux et Forêts (DNEF). The US Embassy to Mali.
IWT Grant Value	£300,000
Start/end dates of project	1 st February 2015 – 31 st March 2018
Reporting period (e.g. April 2015-Mar 2016) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1,2,3)	April 2015 – March 2016 Annual Report 1
Project leader name	Dr Susan Canney
Project website	http://www.wild.org/mali-elephants/
Report author(s) and date	Dr Susan Canney, 29 th April 2016

Report prepared by Dr Susan Canney (Project Leader); Dr Louis Phipps (Project UK Assistant); Nomba Ganamé (Field Manager); Idrissa Ganamé (Field Manager’s Assistant); Ibrahima Maiga (Field team’s Book-keeper); Alassane Maiga (Advisor, Government Liaison)

1. Project Rationale

The migratory desert elephants of central Mali (see map in annexe 4.1) are under severe threat from networks of international traffickers working together with local accomplices. During the conflict of 2012-2013 the elephant range was under the control of armed groups and experienced its first incidences of poaching, and post-conflict residual insecurity presents an ongoing danger.

For the first 3 years, the project was able to contain the poaching through the mobilisation of the local communities, however the ongoing insecurity required a government anti-poacher ranger force who could act on the substantial local intelligence.

Unfortunately Mali has very few foresters, training standards are poor, capacity to deal with elephant poaching is non-existent, and they have no training in working with local communities. There are few agents covering hundreds of square kilometres, living at home with no means of displacement. This is compounded by low morale and lack of belief in the value of their work, an antagonistic relationship with local communities, and a complete lack of synergy with other agents, fuelling the isolation that makes them susceptible to corruption.

Terminology

Foresters – Mali does not have a separate conservation agency and so this responsibility falls to **forestiers**, government paramilitary agents mostly occupied with regulating tree use and hunting.

Anti-poaching rangers, or “**Gardes Forestieres**” are part of the forestry service but tasked to protect the Gourma elephants.

Brigades de surveillance - 600+ young, local men recruited by the project to assist in CBNRM, and report information about elephants. At the onset of conflict, their role included the detection of poaching and gathering intelligence. They are unarmed and are not salaried but rewarded with “recognition payments”.

This initiative aims to develop effective anti-poaching operations at field level by building on existing tried and tested approaches to create an integrated government-community anti-poaching operation. IWT funds provide this linkage through the provision of communications, transport, and training for the ranger force; plus contribute to existing initiatives in supporting the community in standing together against poaching and the insecurity that it fosters.

The approach involves community brigades working in tight collaboration with government foresters: the brigades providing intelligence information across the elephant range, “the eyes and ears of the bush”, while the foresters act on this intelligence. These brigades have proved enthusiastic and effective, discovering the identities of poachers and finding tusks and arms.

Community benefit is key to the success of this approach, and existing elephant-based CBNRM activities are crucial to the success of the IWT project and vice versa – they are inter-twined. As a result local communities understand well how their fate is linked to that of the elephants: "If the elephants disappear it means the environment is no longer good for us" and "If the elephants disappear it means our area will no longer be special".

All the communities using the resources of the elephant range are affected, both resident (around 259,000 people) and seasonal. In addition to the improved security in the strategically important central region of the country, Mali will benefit through increased capacity to assure the security of its unique herd of elephants, a source of national pride, and a greater ability to protect and regenerate its biodiversity and natural resources. The international community benefits from the protection of 12% of the West African elephant population, and one of only two populations of desert-adapted elephants that instils wonder at its ability to survive. It also benefits from an increase in security within the “arc of instability” across Africa’s Sahel.

2. Project Partnerships

The WILD Foundation cemented its relationship with the Malian Government by obtaining its “Accord Cadre” in April 2015, giving it official status as an international NGO. This is a demanding and lengthy process that takes a minimum of 3-4 years, requiring extensive evidence of effective operation in-country and is an endorsement of project-government relations.

At the launch of the IWT funding, there was a change in leadership at the head of the Direction National des Eaux et Forêts (DNEF) which posed significant challenges, however relationships with the Ministry of Defence and the Malian military have increased and resulted in a very fruitful collaboration, with the Prime Minister instructing the Minister of Defence to include elephant protection in their consideration and planning, and the Head of the Army taking a personal interest, visiting the project and pledging their support and collaboration.

Due to the increased co-ordination required between the project and various government departments, the project engaged a Bamako-based adviser who is responsible for project-government relations, and agreed a formal “protocol d’accord” directly with the Ministry.

The project continues to work with the US Embassy and has developed a highly productive relationship with MINUSMA, the UN peacekeeping force in Mali, who have undertaken patrols, engaged UN Police to pursue anti-trafficking, fed information from the ground to influence decisions regarding the re-integration of former fighters (thereby averting an exacerbation of the situation) and obtained \$ funding from their Trust Fund for additional anti-poaching measures including aerial surveillance.

The project’s modus operandi is to achieve its goals through working closely with local institutions. A good example is the community meetings described below and the letter their representatives delivered to the Prime Minister in person in annexe.

3. Project Progress

The project has continued to make progress despite the unpredictable and difficult operating environment. Several developments ramped up the challenges and meant the project had to rapidly adapt. These included a decrease in security (which prevents travel by anyone except the military and deters government presence); and a sudden escalation in poaching as international trafficking networks aggressively targeted the local people to recruit accomplices (see poaching graph in annexe 4.2). At the same time a personnel changes at the DNEF delayed the deployment of the rangers by over a year.

The administrative issues within the DNEF meant that the rangers' military training was delayed; the determination and confirmation of their legal status had not been addressed; and neither fire-arms nor ammunition required for training in firing live ammunition had been procured. These are all routine tasks but on discovery that they had not been addressed, the project had to once again take on the responsibility for moving the situation forward. It did this in several ways: (a) wrote a series of alerts which it discussed with the Minister to demonstrate that if nothing was done, the elephants could be gone in two years if the rates of poaching witnessed in 2015 continue unchecked (see November alert in annexe 4.3 and population projections in annexe 4.4) (b) liaising with the Parliamentary working group for wildlife to raise the issues in Parliament and directly to the Prime Minister (c) taking advantage of a period when all the Mayors were present in the elephant range to hold two meetings with the local government agencies and community representatives which resulted in the delegation to the Prime Minister (described in section 3.1) and therefore to the Ministry of Defence (d) working with allies within DNEF (e) speaking to Reuters about the problem (<http://uk.reuters.com/article/us-mali-elephants-idUKKCN0V62UW>) which prompted several online petitions addressed to the Minister, the Prime Minister and the President eg <http://www.ifaw.org/international/news/petition-save-mali%E2%80%99s-300-remaining-elephants-has-topped> (f) recruiting a special adviser with responsibility for the interface with government, advising the Minister on elephant issues and ensuring that the elephant dossier is pursued within DNEF. He is a previous Director, highly respected and highly competent, and originally responsible for the creation of the ranger force. His first task was to ensure the administrative blocks to the ranger deployment are removed as soon as possible, and this occurred in March 2016.

This has meant the project has had to find other ways to contain the escalation in threat, working closely with the local population to monitor poaching, gather intelligence, and build solidarity against poaching and the insecurity. It has also meant forging multiple new partnerships, particularly with the Ministry of Defence, the Head of the Malian army and local military bases to conduct patrols; and MINUSMA, the UN peacekeeping force in Mali. Some of these partnerships have enabled securing new funds that have an impact on how the IWT funds are best used in the future, most particularly the \$ MINUSMA funding and the \$ over 5 years of a GEF project which will support both anti-poaching and community-based natural resource management (CBNRM).

The result is that the future looks different from where it did in 2014 when the proposal was written. It poses a problem for the reporting of progress as the original activities require more funding to cope with the heightened challenges, particularly in outputs 1 and 2; while outputs 3 and 4 have been funded by other partnerships. All these outputs and activities feed into each other, and feed into the CBNRM activities of the wider project which in turn contributes to the effectiveness of the IWT grant. In particular IWT funding provided the infrastructure that attracted additional funders and partners. While output 3 is directly pertinent to the IWT funding, output 4 has been removed (subject of a change request), as it concerns the project's CBNRM activities.

3.1 Progress in carrying out project activities

THE FUNDING SOURCE FOR EACH ACTIVITY IS INDICATED BY “IWT” OR “OTHER”

Output 1: DNEF field foresters able to work with local community brigades to mount anti-poaching patrols, respond to poaching incidences, collect and report required evidence.

- *Activity 1.1. Construction, equipment and establishment of 10 additional forester posts - OTHER*

The new forester posts – 5 fixed and 5 mobile - were completed on schedule by the end of June 2015, however the deterioration in security means that the five fixed posts will require reinforcement and additional funds have been secured from MINUSMA for this; and the mobile posts will not initially be used until the security situation improves.

- *Activity 1.2. Deployment of 2 vehicles plus protocols of use and responsibility, under the control of the project's field manager working in conjunction with the chefs de service - IWT*

Two vehicles were procured and in place by the end of June 2015, as scheduled. Funds for an additional two vehicles for anti-poaching missions have been secured through MINUSMA and the African Elephant Fund. After much discussion and consultation between partners, an innovative MOU and vehicle-use protocol (annexe 4.5) was agreed and signed between the WILD Foundation and the DNEF, and data sheets designed to record vehicle use and driver accountability (annexes 4.5.1 and 4.5.2). These will enable the anti-poaching rangers to patrol, initially with support from the Malian military until the security situation improves, as well as conduct other anti-poaching operations.

- *Activity 1.3. Installation of a military state-of-the-art secured radio-communications system in the most vulnerable parts of the elephant range - IWT*

This is thought by all partners to be a game-changer and has greatly encouraged others to support the project (see photos in annexe 4.6). The installation of the radio communications system was delayed primarily due to administrative issues within the DNEF, specifically that the project had been told the paperwork for the assignment of radio-frequencies was in process through the various government departments when in reality it had never left the desk, and ultimately fell to the project team to write the required letters, get them signed, and pursue them through the system. The equipment could not be sent before the radio-frequencies were allocated because it required calibration, by which time the supplier had to re-order. Due to the threat of kidnap Kinetic 6, the suppliers, were unable to safely visit the project area and in November their experts travelled to Mali to train Malian military personnel on installation and operating procedures (see annexes 4.7.1 and 4.7.2), however a key piece of equipment (that establishes the micro-wave connection between repeaters at the masts) had been sent to Malawi instead of Mali and so this part of the training could not take place.

The two radio masts were installed successfully and a mission is planned for April 2016 whereby MINUSMA will helicopter the two UK technicians directly to the repeater sites to establish the repeater connection in one day. This will also enable the United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's Deputy Special Representative at MINUSMA to view the area and the elephants. He is newly appointed and a great supporter of the fight against wildlife trafficking, and of the project.

Preliminary indications suggest that when operational there will be radio communications system covering the entire elephant range and beyond from the vulnerable border with Burkina Faso in the south nearly to Timbuktu and Ber in the north, and most importantly to the remote areas outside of mobile phone coverage where most of the poaching has occurred (annexe 4.8)

- *Activity 1.4. Training course and field visit to Nazinga Game Ranch in Burkina Faso for field foresters in anti-poaching procedures. OTHER*

In March 2016 25 of the 50 foresters travelled to Nazinga Game Ranch, Burkina Faso, and 25 travelled to Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal. These one-week training visits provided the foresters with valuable insights into practical challenges and anti-poaching strategies from rangers who were “homologues” in that they were of similar ethnicities, operating in similar administrations, dealing with poaching in areas who were also working with local informants.

This was particularly valuable for the rangers who are illiterate, or don't speak French (and yet are some of the best rangers) and so can't read the anti-poaching manual. The visits were delayed from the original schedule because the official status of the foresters was not approved by the DNEF.

- *Activity 1.5. Training of field foresters in working with local communities as part of community activities and ongoing monitoring of performance. OTHER*

This has not yet occurred because the foresters are not yet officially deployed, however there have been several training course with local communities covering the contents of the Chengeta anti-poaching manual to prepare them for working with the foresters, and the project developed a training manual for communities based on this manual (annexe 4.9).

- *Activity 1.6. Subsequent training courses in 2016 and 2017 based on needs assessed through ongoing monitoring of performance. OTHER*

Additional training activities were provided in 2016 by the Malian military in the firing of live ammunition and bush manoeuvres. The assessment of training requirements has been ongoing since the completion of basic military training in September, and their passing out parade in October (attended by the Heads of Mali's armed forces and shown in annexe 4.10). Funds have been secured for additional training specific to anti-poaching operations which will be delivered by a specialist training outfit in 2016-17. The training provider has been selected – Chengeta Wildlife - due to the value that they place upon effective community engagement and organised, disciplined operational procedures.

Output 2: DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels able to support ground operations, deliver effective anti-poaching and trafficking operations, collect and keep required data.

The delay in ranger deployment, the escalation in poaching from the beginning of 2015 and the dysfunction in DNEF meant that none of the activities associated with this output were appropriate as all focus had to be on the deployment of rangers (output 1) and the containment of the poaching through the means available i.e. local communities and local military bases.

- *Activity 2.1. Training course and field visit to Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal for DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels in supporting the field operations.*

replaced through a Change Request by:

- *Activity 2.1. Two large community meetings (one for each cercle) of all the mayors, security forces, local government and administration to gather and share information on the poaching issue, create community solidarity around the poaching issue and make a public declaration that will be disseminated locally and by national media. IWT*

In response to the sudden reappearance of poaching in November 2015 after a lull since June, the project convened two big community meetings to gather information, reaffirm the links between poaching, banditry and insecurity, assess local perspectives and promote solidarity to counter these forces. These had not been planned but took advantage of all the mayors being present in the Gourma for the first time since the conflict began. It was therefore an important opportunity to unite them in a common cause, and for them to assert this publicly in front of high levels of government and security forces, as well as to elicit information about social relations throughout the elephant range. These meetings were attended by DNEF representatives at commune, cercle and regional levels, and are an effective training to support ground operations.

A three minute "TV Spot" on the big community meetings was aired on prime time national TV just before the 8pm news for a week, raising its national profile (available).

The outcome was that a delegation of 5 mayors was selected to travel to Bamako for an audience with the Prime Minister, requesting that the whole elephant range was officially designated as a zone of high priority for security, and that government act to prevent poaching. The project helped draft a letter (annexe 4.11) describing community concerns that was delivered to the Prime Minister at the same time. He said that he now understood the links between elephant conservation, local livelihoods and security, and directed the Minister of Defence to take this on board as a priority. The Head of the Armed Forces visited the field

manager in the Gourma to discuss the issues at first hand and welcome the collaboration to contain elephant poaching. He was particularly impressed by the co-operation between local intelligence and the military, and in the installation of the radio-communications system.

Activity 2.2 . Ongoing monitoring of performance to assess take-up and identify further training needs. UNDER REVIEW

- *Activity 2.3. Subsequent training courses in 2016 and 2017 based on needs assessed through ongoing monitoring of performance. UNDER REVIEW*
- *Activity 2.4. Trialling the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic toolkit, and the CITES and EIA guides for enforcement officers to determine the best way for enforcement officers to make use of these tools. UNDER REVIEW*

Subsequent activities and training needs at this level, as well as the best mode of delivery, will be reviewed and assessed during 2016-17 by the trainer in conjunction with the project, MINUSMA and the DNEF, and during the process of writing the GEF project.

Output 3: Effective forester presence throughout the elephant range working in concert with homologues in Burkina Faso.

- *Activity 3.1. Meeting, training course and exchange to establish community-forester anti-poaching systems with cross-border co-operation and integration of poaching response. OTHER*

An initial cross-border community meeting was convened by the project between the 3rd and 6th of April 2015, in Mondoro attended by Malian and Burkinabe representatives of government administration and technical services (that includes foresters); elected and traditional community leaders of villages in the border zone; representatives of project brigades de surveillance and of those concerned with the management of the protected areas on the Burkina side of the border. At the last minute this was held in conjunction with PARCC West Africa (a full-size GEF project focusing on the impacts of climate change on protected areas). Because of this engagement IWT funds were not required for this activity, and were used instead for activity 2.1.

- *Activity 3.2. Follow-up meetings to assess progress, learn lesson - OTHER*

A follow-up meeting with 55 community representatives from four Malian villages (Kobou, Boulikessi, Soum, Toussougou) in the cross-border region enabled the exchange of information about elephant presence in the area. This supports the series of meetings and training in CBNRM to consolidate the support of the communities in protecting the elephants during their stay in this vulnerable part of the elephant range. No elephants were killed during this time (1st July – 27th October 2015), and poaching returned once the elephants had left this area and were moving into the northern part of their range. A second large cross-border community meeting was convened between the 6th and 10th of July, 2015, identical to that described above but held in Djibo, Burkina Faso.

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Output 1: DNEF anti-poaching rangers able to work with local community brigades to mount anti-poaching patrols, respond to poaching incidences, collect and report required evidence.

Although the administrative issues within the DNEF delayed the deployment of the foresters, the project continued to galvanise the support of the local communities to protect the elephants, and the brave commitment by brigade members, despite the ongoing security issues, is illustrated by the recovery and submission of 17 tusks from dead elephants to the DNEF, rather than seeking to benefit from tempting financial rewards. The project also worked with the Malian military who undertook interim patrols (photos in annexe 4.12) in the elephant range, which appeared to act as a deterrent to poachers. Particular efforts were made in the south of the elephant range and no poaching occurred. It only resumed when the elephants turned north.

- Indicator 1.1. Number of manned forester posts in the elephant range (baseline = 4; end point = 14). *5 new fixed forester posts constructed and 5 mobile posts established (though not operational until the security situation improves).*
- Indicator 1.2. Number of foresters deployed throughout the elephant range (baseline = 4; endpoint = 30). *50 rangers recruited, with official status, license to operate and fire-arms, although still undergoing anti-poaching training and not yet deployed to the elephant range.*
- Indicator 1.3. Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = zero). *The 50 rangers received 13 weeks government military training in 2015; 2 weeks training in working with communities in anti-poaching; 2 weeks training in firing live ammunition and bush manoeuvres; 1.5 weeks training visits. Government foresters already in the elephant range accompanied the military during the 8 week-long patrols providing experiential training in patrolling.*
- Indicator 1.4. Number of incidences of poaching detected (baseline = 12 in six months; DNEF response mounted (baseline = 7 in six months), arrests follow (baseline = 7 in six months), information about instigator/trafficker obtained (baseline=7 in six months). *73 elephants were killed from the beginning of the project to the end of 2015 and 16 in the first three months of 2016 (all in the first two weeks of January). No operational DNEF anti-poaching capacity means there were zero arrests or confirmation of information (information remains within the community)*

Output 2: DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels able to support ground operations, deliver effective anti-poaching and trafficking operations, collect and keep required data.

- Indicator 2.1. Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = zero). *1 week through attending community-government high-level meetings (see section 3.1).*
- Indicator 2.2. Number and percentage of poaching incidences that result in arrest in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = 4, 33% in six months). *Zero*
- Indicator 2.3. Number and percentage of poaching incidences that result in prosecution in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline=zero). *Zero*

Output 3: Effective forester presence throughout the elephant range working in concert with homologues in Burkina Faso.

Local and regional DNEF representatives participated in the three-day Mali-Burkina Faso cross-border community meetings but follow-up activity fell to the communities – the management committees and particularly the brigades who proved to be very active in gathering intelligence, CBNRM and increasing awareness among their communities.

- Indicator 3.1. Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 provided to community brigades and foresters from the south of the elephant range and Burkina Faso (baseline=zero). *456 person days for Malian foresters, Malian and Burkinabe brigades and Burkinabe rangers*
- Indicator 3.2. Number of incidences of coordinated action (baseline=zero). *8 although the action was between existing foresters and the Malian military.*

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

Intended outcome: Mali has an improved capacity to co-ordinate activities in tracking and tracing elephant poaching, bringing poachers to justice and enforcing poaching laws. This will halt the current escalation of poaching by severely impeding the operation of elephant poaching and ivory trafficking networks in Mali, and thereby maintain elephant numbers. The increased government capacity will feed in to support local systems of resource management that improve livelihoods and make space for elephants, while increasing security.

Progress towards outcome during Year 1, 2015-2016: Despite the worsening security situation (as measured by indicator 6) and the dysfunction within DNEF, the project has managed to find ways to reduce the escalation in poaching through working with communities, the military and forging new partnerships. Mali has an improved capacity to co-ordinate anti-poaching and elephant protection measures, but the government rangers are not yet operational. The improved capacity is measured by the provision of elements of an anti-poaching response that are in place: rangers, ranger posts, vehicles, state of the art communications system, training, and the funds for additional needs that include another 2 vehicles and aerial surveillance, as described previously. The process of rendering these elements operational is ongoing.

The brigades continue to work closely with the local youth and management committees, including with villages close to the border in Burkina Faso, to fight against poaching, collect intelligence, trace ivory and promote awareness among the villagers of the benefits that result from collective CBNRM. Unfortunately they are acting without any forester back-up as government agents fear the lack of security outside the towns.

The project has a good chance of achieving this outcome at field level and reducing poaching, although action at higher government levels is likely to require continued engagement beyond the project period. This will be assured by a 5-year GEF project due to start in 2017, in which 75% of Mali's GEF funding has been secured to support anti-poaching/trafficking and elephant based CBNRM in the Gourma, building on and continuing the work started by this project.

Indicators:

- Indicator 1. Number of elephant illegally killed and rate of increase/decrease in killings compared to existing rate, aiming for no further increase within the project period (baseline = 12 in six months). *See graph in annexe for elephants killed since poaching began in 2012. Total number of elephants killed April 2015 – June 2015 = 41. Total elephants killed following project's urgent response to gain support of communities, build cross-border anti-poaching networks and arrange military patrols while awaiting forester deployment: July – September = 0. Total elephants killed while in areas of high insecurity in the north of the range, October – January 2016 = 35; Feb – Mar 2016 = 0.*
- Indicator 2. Number of illegal killings for which the perpetrators are arrested, and brought to justice, the instigator identified and arrested, the trafficker identified, and the tusks recovered, in order to map out the existing trafficking network within the project period (baseline = 4 arrests and prosecutions in six months of individuals thought to be responsible for several killings; instigator, informant and suspected trafficker identified). *Zero because the rangers are not yet deployed and local foresters are too frightened to leave the towns*
- Indicator 3. Extension of forester field presence – the creation and equipment of 10 additional forester posts throughout the elephant range. *Achieved and additional funds for their reinforcement*
- Indicator 4. Development of a cross-border capacity for co-operation in anti-poaching operations. *The project's approach has been extended to the transboundary area where particular efforts are being made to detect ivory smuggling across the border*
- Indicator 5. Increased support to local communities in resource management (baseline = 1 per annum). *Not applicable – this indicator relates to output 4, which has been removed subject to a change request*

- Indicator 6. A reduction in number of hijackings and robberies assumed to be correlated with number of attacks to government targets. The Long War Journal records the following number of attacks to government targets: 2014=0; 2015=4; 2016 to March =7

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Outcome assumptions still hold true despite a series of unforeseen consequences. Although the rangers are not yet deployed military patrols working in conjunction with communities, supported by the building of community solidarity, have reduced the rate of poaching. The assumption is that Mali remains committed at high levels and while there are enormous challenges in one part of the Malian government, the project retains many diverse allies elsewhere that can be mobilised to mitigate this issue as described above.

Output level assumptions still hold true. It seems unlikely that civil war will reoccur although how the resurgence of jihadist activity will develop remains an unknown that depends on international resolve. The degree of engagement of DNEF can change dramatically as much depends on the Minister and the Director, and these can change at any time in the unsettled government environment, however the overall consensus is strong and tirelessly supported by the Parliamentary group on wildlife. Greater capacity to respond appears to have deterred poaching.

4. Impact: achievement of positive impact on illegal wildlife trade and poverty alleviation

Original impact stated in logframe: A reduction in elephant poaching, an increase in security, and poverty alleviation in the Gourma region of Mali.

Impact on illegal wildlife trade: The project is putting in place the capacity to prevent the illegal trade in ivory in Mali through establishing government-community enforcement capacity that can deter poaching through patrols; as well as detect poaching, gather intelligence (through local community brigades of young men) and transmit this to government enforcement agencies (without putting the informants in danger); who can then act on this information in conjunction with UN and other international agencies. Once the ground system is in place, the project will work to ensure that the gendarmes, police, judiciary, customs officers are engaged to identify poachers and traffickers, bring them to justice, achieve prosecutions and enforce ivory laws. The project will also work with the parliamentary working group on wildlife to ensure that Mali has adequate laws in place.

Impact on poverty alleviation: The IWT project not only directly improves the physical security of the approximately 259,000 population of the elephant range and immediate hinterland. Engaging international and national partners has brought more attention to the needs of the area and the key role of conservation in promoting stabilisation.

The IWT project is inextricably mutually interlinked and supported by elephant-based CBNRM that provides multiple benefits to local communities for protecting elephants. It provides an integrated and holistic model that engages communities and government in protecting and living with wildlife in a way that resolves conflict and brings benefits to both. It also provides the foundation for the vital community engagement in anti-poaching, without which government would be ineffective. Please see section 7 for further details.

5. Project support to the IWT Challenge Fund Objectives

The project contributes to:

1. Developing sustainable livelihoods for communities affected by illegal wildlife trade, as described in sections 4, 7, 8.
2. Strengthening law enforcement and the role of the criminal justice system through the creation of a government anti-poaching system, beginning with an anti-poaching ranger force in the elephant range before moving on to other government enforcement agencies.

6. Impact on species in focus

The number of elephants poached increased dramatically from the baseline of 12 in the six months previous to the start of the project to 64 in the first half year of the project, but then decreased to 19 in the second half year of the project, while no elephants were poached in the remaining 2 months (Feb-Mar 2016) as shown in the graph created from project database in annexe. So far the project has prevented the complete decimation of this population by braking the sudden escalation witnessed in 2015 that resulted from a decrease in security and a new targeting of the local population by international trafficking networks, through the multiple efforts to engage partners and work simultaneously at international, national and local levels, while the rangers are being prepared for deployment.

7. Project support to poverty alleviation

The IWT project not only directly improves the physical security of the 165,650 population of the elephant range, but also those in the surrounding hinterland. This is required for the local people to conduct their lives without threat of theft or attack, and to enable them to travel without fear of hijack . By supporting the return of government the security of all will improve, which will further facilitate anti-poaching efforts. Engaging international and national partners has brought more attention to the needs of the area and the key role of conservation in promoting stabilisation.

As a result the military patrols and advent of the new ranger force have been greatly welcomed by local communities (see photos in annexe 4.12). In this model the targeting of government enforcement activities is achieved through the engagement of local youth. By providing an occupation with local status it tackles youth unemployment and has been shown to reduce radicalisation, thereby contributing to improving physical security

The IWT project is inextricably mutually interlinked and supported by elephant-based CBNRM that provides benefits to local communities for protecting elephants. These are multiple (see <http://www.wild.org/blog/why-do-the-local-people-protect-the-elephants/>). Elephants provide a vital value-based focus for these activities that applies to all regardless of power or wealth. Protecting the elephants ensures the continuation of the elephant-based CBNRM that improves local livelihoods, food security, and well-being by empowering local communities (through improved local governance) to come together to control over-exploitation and reverse degradation that has resulted from a lack of commonly-agreed and respected systems of resource management. Improved ecosystem services and resilience result in more and better pasture and forest resources. The project also engages communities to rationalise water management to improve water security in key areas and reduce the incidence of water-borne disease where this is an issue. It also builds social cohesion which is not only vital for effective resource management but also for healing the social wounds opened up by the conflict and promoting social resilience.

8. Consideration of Gender equity issues

This IWT project impacts gender equity issues indirectly through supporting the security required for local livelihoods; and its CBNRM activities, some of which are particularly targeted at helping women with the marketing of NTFPs which provide more income than forest cutting and clearance for charcoal (the subject of a Darwin Initiative project).

9. Monitoring and evaluation

Protecting a population of elephants from traffickers requires engagement through the elephant range at once. It is a big undertaking for an NGO project that must be delivered rapidly and requires the engagement of many partners all with their own specific reporting and administrative procedures. This creates a large administrative burden and the demands of a

satisfactory M&E plan are therefore inevitably large, particularly when working remotely due to the high threat of jihadist kidnap.

Ensuring that the required evidence is collected when working remotely is a challenge particularly when the local team have to work round an ever-changing security situation to achieve their goals, and when many of their partners are illiterate.

A plan is in place with monitoring forms designed for when the rangers are deployed to monitor their activity (annexe 4.5). Their training will include the collection of these data.

The project has an extensive network of over 600 brigade members throughout the elephant range who regularly provide vital information about the location of elephants and any poaching activities, and this has enabled the maintenance of a project database on elephant deaths (annexe 4.13). Very few carcasses are visited by government foresters due to the security situation and their fear of hijack/attack. The project has submitted proposals to trial the use of a Cybertracker system to enable brigades to collect data.

10. Lessons learnt

Things that have worked well include: engaging local communities and their delegation to the Prime Minister; developing partnerships with MINUSMA, the Malian army and the Parliamentary working group; finding appropriate partners to provide ranger training and an aerial surveillance package.

Things that did not work well include the slow process of ranger deployment due to circumstances outside the project's control.

The project would not have offered to help with the organisation and logistics of the elephant census, but would have recommended the use of a logistics company, as this proved to be time- and resource-consuming at a critical time. Otherwise it is difficult to think of anything we could have done differently given the unknowns, however advice to other projects would be to develop as many partnerships with local actors as possible to help work through difficult times.

Additional effort will be required to avoid continuing difficulties with DNEF into the future.

11. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable) N/A

12. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

13. Sustainability and legacy

The project's profile has been greatly raised both in country and internationally. Internationally through the Reuters article and subsequent petitions, and nationally through the prime time national TV and radio coverage associated with the big community meetings; and the subsequent engagement of the Prime Minister, the Minister of Defence and the Head of the Army; and the projects engagement with MINUSMA.

The exit strategy is more valid than ever, given the GEF project described in section 3.3. which will take forward this project for 5 years from 2017.

14. IWF Challenge Fund Identity

The project acknowledges the contribution of the IWT Challenge fund and uses the UK Government Aid logo on all presentations and papers, and in all engagements with the Malian government and international agencies in particular. It is listed as a major donor/partner. It requests this acknowledgement in all media pieces although this is not always respected. The logo was going to be painted on the doors of the anti-poaching vehicles although this was not thought to be a good idea as it might attract jihadist attack.

15. Project Expenditure

Table 1 Project expenditure during the reporting period (April 2015-March 2016)

Project spend	2015/16 Grant (£)	2015/16 Total actual IWT Costs	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs UK Project Officer Mali Project Officer				
Consultancy costs				
Overheads				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items				
Others				
TOTAL				

16. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the reporting period (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes

I agree for the IWT Secretariat to publish the content of this section (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

Outstanding achievements include being able to mobilise a rapid response to the escalation in poaching posed by aggressive targeting of the elephants by international traffickers over this vast area, despite dysfunctional government, insecurity and the risk of jihadist attack.

Also astounding is the performance of the network of 600+ brigade members, local young men that collect intelligence on poaching incidents, as well as conduct resource protection activities and act as extension agents spreading the message of the importance of solidarity and collective action in the face of banditry and insecurity.

Unlike many projects who are seeking to include communities as part of their enforcement activities, this project has a well-established base of local trust and is seeking to build the government enforcement capacity that can use this local engagement to target its efforts and resources.

The project has shifted the attitude of the military from regarding the local people as a threat through harbouring bandits and outlaws, it now regards them as allies who can greatly increase their effectiveness

By framing elephant conservation within the wider well-being of local communities and geo-political challenges, it has forged partnerships with international actors in promoting the case for stabilisation through conservation.

It has led the creation of a governmental anti-poaching capacity from scratch in a country where conservation is of the lowest priority, and in the process developed a model of wider applicability for wildlife and humans to live together for mutual benefit.

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2015-2016

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2015 - March 2016	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact</p> <p>A reduction in elephant poaching, an increase in security, and poverty alleviation in the Gourma region of Mali.</p>		<p>(Report on any contribution towards positive impact on illegal wildlife trade or positive changes in the conditions of human communities impacted by illegal trade e.g. steps towards alternative and sustainable livelihoods)</p>	
<p>Outcome</p> <p>Mali has in improved capacity to co-ordinate activities in tracking and tracing elephant poaching, bringing poachers to justice and enforcing poaching laws. This will halt the current escalation of poaching by severely impeding the operation of elephant poaching and ivory trafficking networks in Mali, and thereby maintain elephant numbers. The increased government capacity will feed in to support local systems of resource management that improve livelihoods and make space for elephants, while increasing security.</p>	<p>Indicator 1. Number of elephant illegally killed and rate of increase/decrease in killings compared to existing rate, aiming for no further increase within the project period (baseline = 12 in six months).</p> <p>Indicator 2. Number of illegal killings for which the perpetrators are arrested, and brought to justice, the instigator identified and arrested, the trafficker identified, and the tusks recovered, in order to map out the existing trafficking network within the project period (baseline = 4 arrests and prosecutions in six months of individuals thought to be responsible for several killings; instigator, informant and suspected trafficker identified).</p> <p>Indicator 3. Extension of forester field presence – the creation and equipment of 10 additional ranger posts</p>	<p>Indicator 1. Total number of elephants killed April 2015 – June 2016 = 41.</p> <p>Total elephants killed following project's urgent response to gain support of communities, build cross-border anti-poaching networks and arrange military patrols while awaiting ranger deployment: July – September = 0.</p> <p>Total elephants killed while in areas of high insecurity in the north of the range, October – January 2016 = 35; Feb – Mar 2016 = 0.</p> <p>Indicator 2. No arrests directly linked to poaching incidents were made in 2015-2016, as the rangers were not yet deployed</p> <p>Indicator 3. The 10 additional ranger posts have been constructed and are awaiting the deployment of the foresters. MINUSMA have granted funds for the reinforcement of the permanent ranger posts.</p> <p>Indicator 4. The project has made significant progress in developing support and capacity for anti-poaching</p>	<p>Despite successes in the south of the range, the greatest poaching threat lies in the north, as evidenced by the poaching database. The community brigades in these areas are urgently awaiting support from the deployment of the rangers which remains the priority for the project.</p> <p>Key actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintain pressure on DNEF to ensure immediate, effective and safe deployment of the rangers in the elephant communities. • Provide additional, specialised anti-poaching training to the rangers. • Provide additional training to foresters to support communities in CBNRM and elephant protection activities. • Maintain momentum in the south of the elephant range and continue support to cross-border communities to keep poaching rates low in the region.

	<p>throughout the elephant range.</p> <p>Indicator 4. Development of a cross-border capacity for co-operation in anti-poaching operations.</p> <p>Indicator 5. Increased support to local communities in resource management (baseline = 1 per annum).</p> <p>Indicator 6. A reduction in number of hijackings and robberies assumed to be correlated with number of attacks to government targets</p>	<p>and CBNRM initiatives in the Mali-Burkina cross border region. An initial 3-day meeting was held in April 2015 with 80 community members from 12 Malian and 8 Burkinabe communities, who confirmed the formation of the “Egou-Kou-Na” (“keepers of the land”) association for CBNRM and elephant protection, involving more than 131 community members. Government officials from each side of the border were present and discussed future cooperation. Two follow up meetings (in May and June) in the region resulted in 110 young community members committing to act as members of the “brigades de surveillance” for CBNRM activities and to pass on information about elephant movements and poaching activity.</p> <p>Indicator 5. The communities are awaiting the active deployment of the rangers. Meanwhile the project has continued its regular activities in training communities in elephant-based CBNRM, particularly in the cross-border region to maintain community solidarity.</p> <p>Indicator 6. The security situation in central Mali has deteriorated during 2015-16. The Long War Journal records the following numbers of attacks to government targets: 2014=0; 2015=4; 2016 to March =7.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following ranger deployment, monitor and evaluate their progress and effectiveness through patrol effort monitoring and performance assessments.
<p>Output 1.</p> <p>DNEF field foresters able to work with local community brigades to mount anti-poaching patrols, respond to poaching incidences, collect and report required evidence.</p>	<p>Indicator 1.1. Number of manned forester posts in the elephant range (baseline = 4; end point = 14).</p> <p>Indicator 1.2. Number of foresters (including rangers) deployed throughout the elephant range (baseline = 4; endpoint = 30).</p>	<p>Indicator 1.1. 5 new fixed ranger posts constructed and 5 mobile posts established (though not operational until the security situation improves). Funds secured from MINUSMA for reinforcement of fixed posts. Total posts = 14.</p> <p>Indicator 1.2. 50 rangers recruited, with official status, license to operate and fire-arms, although still undergoing anti-poaching training and not yet deployed to the elephant range.</p> <p>Indicator 1.3. The 50 rangers received 13 weeks government military training in</p>	

	<p>Indicator 1.3. Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = zero).</p> <p>Indicator 1.4. Number of incidences of poaching detected (baseline = 12 in six months), DNEF response mounted (baseline = 7 in six months), arrests follow (baseline = 7 in six months), information about instigator/trafficker obtained (baseline=7 in six months).</p>	<p>2015; 2 weeks training in working with communities in anti-poaching; 2 weeks training in firing live ammunition and bush manoeuvres; 1.5 weeks training visits. Government foresters already in the elephant range accompanied the military during the 8 week-long patrols providing experiential training in patrolling.</p> <p>Indicator 1.4. 73 elephants were killed from the beginning of the project (February) to the end of 2015 and 16 in the first three months of 2016 (all in the first two weeks of January). No operational DNEF anti-poaching capacity means there were zero arrests or confirmation of information (information remains within the community).</p>
<p>Activity 1.1. Construction, equipment and establishment of 10 additional forester posts for use by anti-poaching rangers.</p> <p>Not funded by IWTC funds.</p>		<p>The new forester posts – 5 fixed and 5 mobile - were completed on schedule by the end of June 2015, however the deterioration in security means that the five fixed posts will require reinforcement and additional funds have been secured from MINUSMA for this.</p>
<p>Activity 1.2. Deployment of 2 vehicles plus protocols of use and responsibility, under the control of the project's field manager working in conjunction with the chefs de service.</p> <p><u>Funded by IWTC funds.</u></p>		<p><u>This is an activity funded by IWTC funds.</u> Two vehicles were procured and in place by the end of June 2015, as scheduled. After much discussion and consultation between partners, an innovative MOU and vehicle-use protocol was agreed and signed between the WILD Foundation and the DNEF, and data sheets designed to record vehicle use and driver accountability. The anti-poaching rangers will initially patrol with support from the Malian military until the security situation improves.</p>
<p>Activity 1.3. Installation of a military state-of-the-art secured radio-communications system in the most vulnerable parts of the elephant range.</p> <p><u>Funded by IWTC funds.</u></p>		<p><u>This is an activity funded by IWTC funds and is considered to be a game-changer which has stimulated the support of other partners including the Malian military and MINUSMA.</u> Following a training course delivered to Malian military specialists by UK military communications specialists (Kinetic 6), installation of the radio-communications masts was completed in December and the radio communications system is ready for use by the anti-poaching rangers, reaching across the elephant range, from the Mali-Burkina Faso cross-border region in the south, almost to Timbuktu and Ber in the north, including areas with limited mobile phone coverage.</p>
<p>Activity 1.4. Training course and field visit to Nazinga Game Ranch in Burkina Faso for field foresters in anti-poaching procedures.</p> <p>Not funded by IWTC funds.</p>		<p>In March 2016 25 of the 50 foresters travelled to Nazinga Game Ranch, Burkina Faso, and 25 travelled to Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal. These one-week training visits provided the foresters with valuable insights into practical challenges and anti-poaching strategies from rangers who were of similar ethnicities, operating in similar administrations, and dealing with poaching in areas who were also working with local informants. This was particularly valuable for the rangers who are illiterate, or don't speak French (and yet are some of the best rangers) and so can't read the anti-poaching manual.</p>
<p>Activity 1.5. Training of field foresters in working with local communities as part of community activities and ongoing monitoring of performance.</p>		<p>This has not yet occurred because the foresters are not yet officially deployed. However there have been three 3-day training course with local communities</p>

<p>Not funded by IWTC funds.</p>	<p>covering the contents of the Chengeta anti-poaching manual to prepare them for working with the foresters, and the project developed a training manual for communities based on this manual.</p>
<p>Activity 1.6. Subsequent training courses in 2016 and 2017 based on needs assessed through ongoing monitoring of performance.</p>	<p>Additional training activities were provided in January 2016 by the Malian military in the firing of live ammunition and bush manoeuvres. The assessment of training requirements has been ongoing since the completion of basic military training in September. Funds have been secured for additional training specific to anti-poaching operations which will be delivered by a specialist training outfit in 2016-17. The training provider has been selected due to the value that they place upon effective community engagement and organised, disciplined operational procedures.</p>
<p>Output 2. DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels able to support ground operations, deliver effective anti-poaching and trafficking operations, collect and keep required data.</p>	<p>Indicator 2.1. Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = zero).</p> <p>Indicator 2.2. Number and percentage of poaching incidences that result in arrest in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = 4, 33% in six months).</p> <p>Indicator 2.3. Number and percentage of poaching incidences that result in prosecution in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline=zero).</p> <p>During the first half of 2015 the DNEF was disrupted at all levels by multiple personnel changes and government reshuffles, which resulted in severe administrative delays, particularly in the training and deployment of the anti-poaching rangers.</p> <p>Indicator 2.1. 1 week through attending community-government high-level meetings.</p> <p>Indicator 2.2. Zero due to delayed deployment of anti-poaching rangers.</p> <p>Indicator 2.3. Zero due to delayed deployment of anti-poaching rangers.</p>
<p><i>Original: Activity 2.1. Training course and field visit to Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal for DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels in supporting the field operations.</i></p> <p>replaced through a Change Request, January 2016, by:</p> <p>Activity 2.1. Two large community meetings (one for each cercle) of all the mayors, security forces, local government and administration to gather and share information on the poaching issue, create community solidarity around the poaching issue and make a public declaration that will be disseminated locally and by national media.</p>	<p>Given the escalation in the poaching crisis and the lack of stability within the DNEF administration, a change request was submitted in March 2015 to replace the DNEF training visit to Niokolo-Koba with large community members to share information about the poaching issue, create community solidarity and make an official declaration locally and nationally about the poaching crisis. These meetings occurred in November 2015 and took advantage of the presence of all the mayors and council leaders to make a unanimous commitment to preventing elephant poaching, covered by national media and airing on prime time national TV. This resulted in 5 mayors meeting with the Prime Minister in December to deliver an official letter requesting assistance to increase security in central Mali and help the communities prevent elephant poaching and other illegal activities. Subsequently the head of the Malian Army was sent to the Gourma to assess the situation and has committed to providing additional support to secure the region. This will be critical to the effective deployment of the anti-poaching rangers who will initial patrol with the military until the security situation improves.</p>
<p>Activity 2.2. Ongoing monitoring of performance to assess take-up and identify further training needs.</p>	<p>Ongoing and under review. Subsequent activities and training needs at this level, as well as the best mode of delivery, will be reviewed and assessed during 2016-17 by the project, MINUSMA and the DNEF, and during the process of writing the</p>

		GEF project.
Activity 2.3. Subsequent training courses in 2016 and 2017 based on needs assessed through ongoing monitoring of performance.		Ongoing and under review, dependent on activity 2.2.
Activity 2.4. Trialling the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic toolkit, and the CITES and EIA guides for enforcement officers to determine the best way for enforcement officers to make use of these tools.		Ongoing and will become more integrated following the active deployment of the anti-poaching rangers.
Output 3. Effective forester presence throughout the elephant range working in concert with homologues in Burkina Faso	<p>Indicator 3.1. Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 provided to community brigades and foresters from the south of the elephant range and Burkina Faso (baseline=zero).</p> <p>Indicator 3.2. Number of incidences of coordinated action (baseline=zero).</p>	<p>Indicator 3.1. 456 person days for Malian foresters, Malian and Burkinabe brigades and Burkinabe rangers.</p> <p>Indicator 3.2. 8 co-ordinated military patrols, although the action was between existing foresters and the Malian military.</p>
<p>Activity 3.1. Meeting, training course and exchange to establish community-forester anti-poaching systems with cross-border co-operation and integration of poaching response.</p> <p>Not funded by IWTC funds.</p>		<p>An initial cross-border community meeting was convened by the project between the 3rd and 6th of April 2015, in Mondoro attended by Malian and Burkinabe representatives of government administration and technical services (that includes foresters); elected and traditional community leaders of villages in the border zone; representatives of project brigades de surveillance and of those concerned with the management of the protected areas on the Burkina side of the border. At the last minute this was held in conjunction with PARCC West Africa (a full-size GEF project focusing on the impacts of climate change on protected areas). Because of this engagement IWT funds were not required for this activity.</p>
<p>Activity 3.2. Follow-up meetings to assess progress, learn lessons.</p> <p>Not funded by IWTC funds.</p>		<p>A follow-up meeting with 55 community representatives from four Malian villages (Kobou, Boulikessi, Soum, Toussougou) in the cross-border region enabled the exchange of information about elephant presence in the area which helped to inform the planning of the military patrols. No elephants were killed during this time (1st July – 27th October 2015). A second large cross-border community meeting was convened between the 6th and 10th of July, 2015, identical to that described in 3.1 but held in Djibo, Burkina Faso.</p>

Annex 2 Logframe

Logical framework

Impact

A reduction in elephant poaching, an increase in security, and poverty alleviation in the Gourma region of Mali.

Outcome

Mali has an improved capacity to co-ordinate activities in tracking and tracing elephant poaching, bringing poachers to justice and enforcing poaching laws. This will halt the current escalation of poaching by severely impeding the operation of elephant poaching and ivory trafficking networks in Mali, and thereby maintain elephant numbers. The increased government capacity will feed in to support local systems of resource management that improve livelihoods and make space for elephants, while increasing security.

Measuring outcomes - indicators

Indicator 1	Number of elephant illegally killed and rate of increase/decrease in killings compared to existing rate, aiming for no further increase within the project period (baseline = 12 in six months)
Indicator 2	Number of illegal killings for which the perpetrators are arrested, and brought to justice, the instigator identified and arrested, the trafficker identified, and the tusks recovered, in order to map out the existing trafficking network within the project period (baseline = 4 arrests and prosecutions in six months of individuals thought to be responsible for several killings; instigator, informant and suspected trafficker identified)
Indicator 3	Extension of forester field presence – the creation and equipment of 10 additional forester posts throughout the elephant range
Indicator 4	Development of a cross-border capacity for co-operation in anti-poaching operations
Indicator 5	Increased support to local communities in resource management (baseline = 1 per annum)
Indicator 6	A reduction in number of hijackings and robberies

Verifying outcomes

Indicator 1	DNEF database containing information about all known poaching incidences, and project reports
Indicator 2	DNEF database, and government records of prosecutions containing information about all known poaching incidences, and project reports
Indicator 3	Existence of forester posts – photographs – and government reports
Indicator 4	DNEF and project reports evaluating response to particular incidences
Indicator 6	Protocole d'accord and the number of joint operations as enumerated in DNEF database and reports of the DNEF and project
Indicator 7	Project reports
Indicator 8	Records held by the gendarmerie and project

Outcome risks and important assumptions

Assumption 1	Increased enforcement capacity leads to reduced poaching incidences.
Assumption 2	Mali remains committed to supporting the enforcement of its laws on poaching.
Assumption 3	Trafficking networks can be deterred from targeting ivory.

Outputs

Output 1	DNEF field foresters able to work with local community brigades to mount anti-poaching patrols, respond to poaching incidences, collect and report required evidence.
Output 2	DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels able to support ground operations, deliver effective anti-poaching and trafficking operations, collect and keep required data.
Output 3	Effective forester presence throughout the elephant range working in concert with homologues in Burkina Faso
Output 4	All field foresters working with local communities throughout the elephant range in such activities as fire-break construction and patrol back-up.

Measuring outputs

Output 1: DNEF field foresters able to work with local community brigades to mount anti-poaching patrols, respond to poaching incidences, collect and report required evidence.	
Indicator 1.1	Number of manned forester posts in the elephant range (baseline = 4; end point = 14).
Indicator 1.2	Number of foresters deployed throughout the elephant range (baseline = 4; endpoint = 30).
Indicator 1.3	Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = zero).
Indicator 1.4	Number of incidences of poaching detected (baseline = 12 in six months), DNEF response mounted (baseline = 7 in six months), arrests follow (baseline = 7 in six months), information about instigator/trafficker obtained (baseline=7 in six months).

Output 2: DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels able to support ground operations, deliver effective anti-poaching and trafficking operations, collect and keep required data.	
Indicator 2.1	Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = zero).
Indicator 2.2	Number and percentage of poaching incidences that result in arrest in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline = 4, 33% in six months).
Indicator 2.3	Number and percentage of poaching incidences that result in prosecution in 2015, 2016 and 2017 (baseline=zero).

Output 3: Effective forester presence throughout the elephant range working in concert with homologues in Burkina Faso	
Indicator 3.1	Number of weeks training in 2015, 2016 and 2017 provided to community brigades and foresters from the south of the elephant range and Burkina Faso (baseline=zero)
Indicator 3.2	Number of incidences of coordinated action (baseline=zero)

Output 4: Forester support to local communities throughout the elephant range in resource management for improvement of livelihoods and social and environmental resilience.

Indicator 4.1	Number of communities benefitting from forester support and training in habitat protection activities (baseline = 1 per annum)
---------------	--

Verifying outputs

Indicator 1	Timetable, reports, presentations (if appropriate), and photographs of training courses
Indicator 2	Records/reports/databases/photographs of activities held by DNEF and the project
Indicator 3	Database of poaching records and judicial progress held by DNEF and the project

Output risks and important assumptions

Assumption 1	That civil war does not reoccur and government remains in the elephant range
Assumption 2	That all levels of the DNEF remain committed to elephant protection
Assumption 3	Greater capacity to respond prevents an increase poaching incidents
Assumption 4	That DNEF contains staff turnover to ensure a corpus of personnel develop an elephant protection ethic that is strong enough to be transmitted to subsequent officers.

Activities

Output 1: DNEF field foresters able to work with local community brigades to mount anti-poaching patrols, respond to poaching incidences, collect and report required evidence.

Activity 1.1	Construction, equipment and establishment of 10 additional forester posts
Activity 1.2	Deployment of 2 vehicles plus protocols of use and responsibility, under the control of the project's field manager working in conjunction with the chefs de service
Activity 1.3	Installation of a military state-of-the-art secured radio-communications system in the most vulnerable parts of the elephant range
Activity 1.4	Training course and field visit to Nazinga Game Ranch in Burkina Faso for field foresters in anti-poaching procedures
Activity 1.5	Training of field foresters in working with local communities as part of community activities and ongoing monitoring of performance
Activity 1.6	Subsequent training courses in 2016 and 2017 based on needs assessed through ongoing monitoring of performance

Output 2: DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels able to support ground operations, deliver effective anti-poaching and trafficking operations, collect and keep required data.

Activity 2.1	<i>[Training course and field visit to Niokolo-Koba National Park in Senegal for DNEF at commune, cercle and regional levels in supporting the field operations] replaced through change request by:</i> Two large community meetings (one for each cercle) of all the mayors, security forces, local government and administration to gather and share information on
--------------	---

	the poaching issue, create community solidarity around the poaching issue and make a public declaration that will be disseminated locally and by national media.
Activity 2.2	Ongoing monitoring of performance to assess take-up and identify further training needs
Activity 2.3	Subsequent training courses in 2016 and 2017 based on needs assessed through ongoing monitoring of performance
Activity 2.4	Trialling the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic toolkit, and the CITES and EIA guides for enforcement officers to determine the best way for enforcement officers to make use of these tools

Output 3: Effective forester presence throughout the elephant range working in concert with homologues in Burkina Faso

Activity 3.1	Meeting, training course and exchange to establish community-forester anti-poaching systems with cross-border co-operation and integration of poaching response
Activity 3.2	Follow-up meetings to assess progress, learn lessons

Output 4: Forester support to local communities throughout the elephant range in resource management for improvement of livelihoods and social and environmental resilience.

Activity 4.1	Local foresters included in community meetings to establish systems of sustainable resource management to give advice and help in organising implementation.
--------------	--

Workplan with key milestones. Actual progress shown by “C”.

Activity	No of Months	FY 1	FY 2				FY 3				FY 4			
		Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4
Output 1														
1.1	4	x	x C											
1.2	3	x	x C											
1.3	4	x	x		C									
1.4	0.5	x				C								
1.5	ongoing		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1.6	1						x				x			
Output 2														
2.1	0.5		x		C									
2.2	ongoing		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
2.3	1						x				x			
2.4	ongoing		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Output 3														
3.1	0.5	x	C											
3.2	1			C			x				x			
Output 4														
4.1	ongoing	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Annex 3 Standard Measures

Annex 4 Onwards – supplementary material (optional but encouraged as evidence of project achievement)

Checklist for submission

	Check
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk putting the project number in the subject line.	√
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please discuss with IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the subject line.	N/A
Have you included means of verification? You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	√
Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report? If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	N/A
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	√
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	√
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	