



## Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund Final Report

### IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

Project reference	IWT024
Project title	Counter-Poaching Training Programme for Sub-Saharan Africa
Country(ies)	South Africa, Malawi, DR Congo, Rwanda, Chad, Zambia & Republic of Congo
Contract holder institution	Tusk Trust
Partner institution(s)	African Parks
Total IWT grant value	£421,275
Start/end dates of project	01/04/2016 to 31/03/2018
Project leader's name	Dan Bucknell
Project website/blog/social media	<a href="https://www.tusk.org/projects/counter-poaching-training-programme-for-sub-saharan-africa/">https://www.tusk.org/projects/counter-poaching-training-programme-for-sub-saharan-africa/</a>
Report author(s) and date	Dan Bucknell

### 1. Project Summary

The project's aim was to help reduce poaching of elephant and rhino across sub-Saharan Africa, from well-documented statistics of approximately 25,000 African elephants still being killed each year for their tusks, and more than 1,000 rhino killed in South Africa each year for the past five years, up from just 13 in 2007. As such, the project set out to significantly improve the law enforcement capacity within 14 protected areas across seven countries.

Activities were planned to follow the recommendations of a 2014 fact-finding mission to assess how information gathering is supporting anti-poaching operations across seven well-known protected areas in four countries (South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia and Tanzania). This was led by Corporal Luke Townsend of the British Army, who led the project's Counter-Poaching Coordination Team (CPCT). Among other things, this concluded that: 1) while rangers in many protected areas are highly skilled at monitoring animals, the majority do not have the capacity to track and successfully intercept poachers; and 2) too much information on poaching activity is trapped at reserve level, yet information sharing between protected areas is critical. The mission meanwhile found that small, highly trained and motivated interception tracking units were proven to significantly reduce the number of animals poached, and that the gathering and sharing of information can have a similar impact.

Subsequent trial projects in 2015 and early 2016 not only demonstrated the viability of the approach, but also that it can have a game-changing impact in reducing poaching.

The project has therefore introduced this approach to the target protected areas to have a similar impact there, not just to benefit elephant and rhino, but all illegally hunted and traded wildlife. Training was provided to rangers in proven interception tracking tactics, to arrest poachers and reduce the number of poaching incidents. Additional training in information gathering and analysis – and the establishment of an information network between protected areas – is improving to disrupt illegal wildlife trade.

Since poaching also has a negative impact on sustainable livelihoods and economic development in the areas affected, this project helped establish some of the pre-conditions necessary for livelihood enhancement, by helping reduce crime in the areas surrounding the protected areas.

Following approved changes to some of the locations, the project reached 15 different protected areas across seven African countries, as shown on the map below:



## 2. Project Partnerships

African Parks (AP) was the main project partner: ten of the target protected areas are managed by them and much of the training (seven interception tracking training courses and four information gathering and analysis courses) took place within their park network, and has benefitted their rangers. It is also through the AP Network that the information network has been developed through the project.

The relationship between Tusk, AP and the CPCT became very strong throughout the project, and at times the CPCT felt like full members of AP's operational team. The CPCT members joined AP's information and analysis advisory board during the project.

AP was early to realise that it needed the training on offer and so engaged from the earliest stages of the project development. AP's Law Enforcement team helped identify the most appropriate rangers and park officers for the training courses. For the courses held within AP parks, they prepared the locations for the training and supported the logistics. As they began feeling the benefits of the training, so too AP's overall demand for these training courses grew. Some of this is now being met through a subsequent IWT Challenge Fund supported initiative led by the British Ministry of Defence that was inspired by this project, and on which both AP and Tusk are partners (see <https://www.tusk.org/news/22-nov-2017-british-army-helps-reduce-poaching-in-malawi/>). AP has also already extended the training in information gathering and analysis by utilising those to have been trained by the CPCT to train others. Tusk and AP

also submitted a second-stage application to IWT Challenge Fund Round 5, to develop their partnership further within Zambia, although this was not successful.

Southern African Wildlife College (SAWC) are a longstanding project partner of Tusk's and became involved early on in the implementation of the project. While not a formal partner to this project, they were immensely helpful in organising introductions, permissions and logistics in the Joint Protection Zone (former Game Reserves United) around Kruger National Park, as well as in Kruger National Park itself. This was largely through the efforts of Ruben de Kock, SAWC's Business Unit Manager. They also hosted a three-day Tracking Symposium in January 2017 to create a standardised best practice approach to training and tactics among tracking instructors, as a result of (and benefit to) this project (but kept external to the grant – see Section 10 below).

### 3. Project Achievements

#### 3.1 Outputs

**Output 1:** Against the target of at least 100 rangers qualified as basic level interception trackers (from 120 trained) from 14 protected areas, 138 were assessed to have qualified (from 144 trained) from 12 protected areas, as follows:

- Zakouma National Park (Chad) – 4 rangers qualified
- Garamba National Park (DRC) – 44 rangers qualified
- Majete Wildlife Reserve (Malawi) – 4 rangers qualified
- Liwonde National Park (Malawi) – 6 rangers qualified
- Nkhotakota National Park (Malawi) – 2 rangers qualified
- Akagera National Park (Rwanda) – 20 rangers qualified
- Kruger National Park & Joint Protection Zone (South Africa) – 22 rangers qualified to a basic-intermediate level\*
- Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa) – 23 rangers qualified
- Bangweulu Wetlands (Zambia) – 5 rangers qualified
- Liuwa Plain National Park (Zambia) – 7 rangers qualified
- Kafue National Park (Zambia) – 1 ranger qualified

These figures have been verified and reported by the CPCT, and are backed up by the course reports completed by the trainers (Annex 3 files), as well as the reporting forms from each of the protected areas (Annex 4 files – N.B. figures in some of these include those trained under the trial projects).

Rangers from Kwazulu-Natal Protected Areas were assessed to already possess basic interception tracking skills, and were therefore trained straight at intermediate level. Rangers from other areas were reassessed to not be of a sufficient standard, and some target protected areas were subsequently changed.

**Output 2:** Against the target of at least 90 rangers qualified to an intermediate level (from 120 trained), 109 qualified from 11 protected areas as follows:

- Garamba National Park (DRC) – 16 rangers qualified
- Majete Wildlife Reserve (Malawi) – 4 rangers qualified
- Liwonde National Park (Malawi) – 6 rangers qualified
- Akagera National Park (Rwanda) – 3 rangers qualified
- Kruger National Park & Joint Protection Zone (South Africa) – 22 rangers qualified to a basic-intermediate level\*
- KwaZulu-Natal Protected Areas (South Africa) – 24 rangers qualified
- Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa) – 24 rangers qualified
- Bangweulu Wetlands (Zambia) – 4 rangers qualified
- Liuwa Plain National Park (Zambia) – 4 rangers qualified
- Kafue National Park (Zambia) – 2 rangers qualified

These figures have likewise been verified and reported by the CPCT, and are backed up by the course reports completed by the trainers (Annex 3 files), and the reporting forms from each of the protected areas (Annex 4 files).

\* The 22 rangers that were trained and qualified from Kruger National Park and the surrounding Joint Protection Zone (former Game Reserves United) had already received a basic introduction to interception tracking, and the training they received was therefore pitched at a level between basic and intermediate. The totals for Outputs 1 and 2 therefore include them in both.

**Output 3:** Against the target of at least 18 rangers qualified to an advanced level of interception tracking, and able to train others as a co-benefit of the project (from 36 trained), 40 rangers qualified from seven protected areas, as follows:

- Garamba National Park (DRC) – 16 rangers qualified
- Majete Wildlife Reserve (Malawi) – 4 rangers qualified
- Liwonde National Park (Malawi) – 7 rangers qualified
- Nkhotakota National Park (Malawi) – 2 rangers qualified
- Akagera National Park (Rwanda) – 3 rangers qualified
- Bangweulu Wetlands (Zambia) – 4 rangers qualified
- Liuwa Plain National Park (Zambia) – 4 rangers qualified

Again, the figures have been verified and reported by the CPCT, and are backed up by the course reports completed by the trainers (Annex 3 files), and the reporting forms from each of the protected areas (Annex 4 files).

Of these trained, 4 were assessed to have achieved tracking instructor status, 14 to have reached potential assistant instructor status, and 11 to be able to run continuation training in their own parks (Annex 5a).

**Output 4:** Against a target of a minimum of 13 protected area staff trained in information gathering and analysis, 16 were trained from 9 protected areas, as verified by the CPCT.

In Rwanda's Akagera National Park, the Park Manager had a clear idea of what he wanted in addition to the training provided by the CPCT, and so as well as the 4 operators trained in full there, extra trainees were brought in for two specific sessions. Three extra participants joined the training on using informants, and these and 8 more on the interviewing of suspected poachers, so the total given some level of information and analysis training at Akagera was 15.

The following table summarises this output for the protected areas, together with the outputs 1-3:

Country	Protected Area	Trackers Qualified (trained)			Inf. Officers Trained
		Basic	Int.	Advanced	
Chad	Zakouma National Park	4			3
DRC	Garamba National Park	44	16	16	
Malawi	Majete Wildlife Reserve	4	4	4	2
Malawi	Liwonde National Park	6	6	7	2
Malawi	Nkhotakota National Park	2		2	1
Malawi	Lake Malawi National Park				1
Rep. Congo	Odzala-Kokoua National Park				1
Rwanda	Akagera National Park	20	3	3	4
South Africa	Kruger National Park	22			
South Africa	Joint Protection Zone (former Game Reserves United)				
South Africa	KwaZulu-Natal Protected Areas		24		

South Africa	Waterberg Biosphere Reserve	23	24		
Zambia	Bangweulu Wetlands	5	4	4	1
Zambia	Liuwa Plain National Park	7	4	4	1
Zambia	Kafue National Park	1	2		
7	15	138	109	40	16

**Output 5:** Against the target of establishing an information network across at least 15 protected areas, an effective and formal communications network was strengthened between the 10 protected areas within the AP Network. This includes the use of *Geosuite* information analysis software, the customisation of which for protected area usage was achieved externally to the grant. *Geosuite*'s deployment coincides with that of other platforms that are being developed and deployed in this space (e.g. Vulcan's Domain Awareness System – or DAS – and Symantec). *Geosuite* is therefore being used to differing degrees between the protected areas, and is showing promising signs so far at park level in the early days of full implementation. AP is also in the process of hiring a specialist to administer *Geosuite* and support the information network.

Since the training of information officers did not extend to the five protected areas that are not managed by AP, the information network has not formally extended to them. Communications between all of them was nevertheless enhanced, including through the CPCT.

### 3.2 Outcome

**Outcome 1: Decrease in the number of rhino and elephant poached in each protected area and a stabilisation in their population size (target >25% reduction)**

*PLEASE NOTE THAT MUCH OF THE INFORMATION BELOW (THROUGHOUT SECTION 3.2) IS SENSITIVE DATA AND NOT FOR PUBLICATION WITHOUT APPROVAL.*

### 3.3 Impact: achievement of positive impact on illegal wildlife trade and poverty alleviation

The higher-level impact that the project has contributed towards is a “reduced illegal wildlife trade [that] will see rhino and elephant populations stabilise and start recovering within target protected areas, and will also create improved security as a pre-condition for poverty alleviation”.

As reported in section 3.2 the 12 protected areas where the project made a significant contribution to law enforcement have either recorded a significant reduction (> 25%) in poaching of elephant and/or rhino between 2015 (before the intervention) and the end of 2017, or have maintained low levels or zero poaching from previously high levels (outcome 1). Six of the parks have also reported increased arrests of poachers over the course of the project, and for at least three of them, increased arrests of illegal traders.

As stressed in section 3.2, the training under this project was both preceded by, and coincided with, considerable investment in other aspects of law enforcement within the target protected areas. However, all Park Managers have reported that the training's contribution to their overall results and impact has been significant.

Meanwhile, where the project has helped contribute towards improved levels of security and reductions in overall crime, or the maintaining of both at low levels, it has helped support the pre-conditions for poverty alleviation.

## 4. Monitoring of assumptions

### Outcome Risks and Assumptions

**Assumption 1:** Poaching is the main threat to elephant and rhino in the target protected areas, and a reduction in poaching will therefore halt any decline in their populations and allow them to recover.

Comments: This assumption remains unchallenged by our subsequent experience throughout the project, for the target protected areas. While elephant poaching has dropped from its peak in 2011, poaching remains high across the continent, and the greatest threat to populations in the target protected areas (see <https://cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/com/sc/69/E-SC69-51-01-A.pdf>). Where poaching has been largely overcome as the main threat to elephants (e.g. Kenya), it is being replaced by human-elephant conflict, but this has yet to become the case for the areas covered under this project. Meanwhile, in 2017, for the fifth year in a row, more than 1,000 rhino were poached for their horn (see <https://www.savetherhino.org/rhino-info/poaching-stats/>).

**Assumption 2:** There is a finite number of poachers operating in each protected area, and a small number of groups that they work for. Arrests and disruption of poaching networks will therefore significantly reduce the levels of poaching.

Comments: This assumption still stands and has been demonstrated in Malawi in particular by the substantial reduction in poaching recorded there. The arrest of a small number of poachers or traders has significantly contributed to some of the game-changing results recorded.

**Assumption 3:** Protected areas are prepared to share information in the interests of preventing poaching.

Comments: The information network established throughout the AP Network demonstrates parks' willingness to cooperate in preventing illegal wildlife trade beyond their boundaries. The desire to collaborate beyond the AP Network was also clearly expressed to the CPCT, as well as to the Project Leader when in discussions with other NGOs about the potential for linking this information network with similar networks (which was outlined in an unsuccessful concept note submitted to Round 3 of the IWT Challenge Fund). Nevertheless, because of the sensitive nature of the information and the risk of it getting into the wrong hands in the process, there are still challenges that have prevented the full widening of the information as originally envisaged.

**Assumption 4:** Evidence gathered by the interception trackers and the information network is sufficient to support the judicial process and secure convictions against poachers.

Comments: The protected areas have reported high conviction rates relative to their number of arrests, suggesting that this assumption remains unchallenged. It was also witnessed to be true by the CPCT on at least one occasion at a sentencing hearing for a poacher at Majete National Park, who received a 1-year sentence for poaching antelope. This conviction was initially based on information from an informant and developed into a case.

## **Output Risks and Assumptions**

**Assumption 1:** Target protected areas already have sufficient competent and incorrupt rangers from which trainees for the interception tracker training can be selected

Comments: Some of the target protected areas have not had as many sufficiently competent rangers to undertake the training as was believed to have been the case when the proposal was developed. This is particularly so for Niassa National Reserve and Odzala-Kokoua National Park. As reported in a February 2017 change request, Niassa's new Field Operations Manager reviewed the existing capacity of the park's rangers, and felt they were not yet ready to undertake interception tracker training, needing more basic field ranger training first. Training was therefore relocated. The situation at Odzala was much the same.

In Kruger National Park, rangers were reported to have had greater ability than later became apparent, hence why the training was delivered at a level between basic and intermediate. At Garamba National Park, the tracker trainers reported that they had to start their basic level training from a lower starting point of experience and knowledge than they would have expected. However, this reality has been addressed by the project's added unexpected result, of both African Parks and Southern African Wildlife

College agreeing to incorporate an introduction to interception tracking in their basic field ranger training courses (see section 10).

**Assumption 2:** Trainees for the interception tracker training can obtain the necessary visas and permissions for travelling to participate in the training.

Comments: While there have been restrictions on which training courses participants can attend, the geographical spread of training courses has ensured that almost all trainees can attend, even though the ultimate spread between protected areas has not been as even as originally intended. However, in Zambia, changes in legislation saw the Department of National Parks and Wildlife qualify all rangers as “wildlife police officers”, which require per diems for training outside the country. Lower Zambezi National Park therefore determined that it would not be cost-effective to send rangers elsewhere for training, and had to be dropped from the programme, as approved following the February 2017 change request.

**Assumption 3:** Training at each stage will result in a high pass rate and cultivate a strong desire in rangers to advance to the next stage of the training

Comments: The pass rate from all training courses has been higher than the minimum targeted, and as the project has progressed demand for the training has grown.

**Assumption 4:** Protected areas predominantly recruit locally, and once trained, interception trackers and information officers are not likely to move elsewhere

Comments: Changes at the senior level of park management has impacted the project, but changes and movement of trackers and information officers (operators) has not been witnessed, other than for Odzala-Kokoua National Park where the information analyst may be transferred.

**Assumption 5:** APN [African Parks Network] headquarters staff have the capacity to assume responsibility for coordinating the information network, which will extend beyond the 8 parks covered under the project.

Comments: AP has assumed responsibility for coordinating the information network established under the project, although at present this only formally covers the ten protected areas under their management.

## **5. Project support to the IWT Challenge Fund Objectives and commitments under the London Declaration and Kasane Statement**

This project has made a significant contribution to a strengthening of law enforcement (objective 2) in the target protected areas and the illegal wildlife trade that stems from them. This has been achieved by substantially enhancing the capacity of rangers to track and intercept poachers, from a starting point that in many areas has shown itself to be even more basic than revealed during the 2014 fact-finding mission. It has also been achieved by introducing the skills and connections for parks to share information on poachers and their networks, which had previously been limited. As such, the project has directly contributed towards the fulfilment of Actions XIII, XIV, XV and XVI of the London Declaration on the Illegal Wildlife Trade, and Actions 7 and 12 of the Kasane Statement.

## **6. Impact on species in focus**

As reported in section 3.2, 9 of the 12 protected areas where the project made a significant contribution to law enforcement have recorded an increase or stabilisation in their elephant and/or rhino populations. The reasons the other three did not are also outlined in section 3.2.

Akagera National Park’s elephant population increased by 11% and Eastern black rhino were reintroduced in 2017. Majete National Park reported an increase in their Southern white rhino population

of 25% (from 16 to 20 individuals), and an increase in the elephant population of approximately 16% (from 389 to c. 450) before 150 were translocated to Nkhotakota National Park. At the same time, 366 elephant were translocated from Liwonde National Park, skewing figures that otherwise show a 7% population increase over the two-year period.

Although sensitive figures were not provided, Kruger National Park reported that Southern white rhino poaching is still thought to be outstripping the birth rate, because of the scale of the challenge there. However, they also reported an 8% increase their elephant population.

As noted in section 3.2, this project has been one of a number law enforcement interventions for the protected areas concerned, all of which have contributed to the overall impact achieved. However, all Park Managers have reported that the training's contribution to their overall results and impact has been significant.

## **7. Project support to poverty alleviation**

The primary focus of this project has been to reduce poaching and illegal wildlife trade. Any impact on poverty alleviation has therefore been indirect. However, for the target protected areas, this project has contributed to just one aspect of their comprehensive park management strategies, all of which incorporate local community engagement and support.

This project indirectly benefitted the rural community members living on the periphery of the targeted protected areas – estimated at more than 1,500,000 in total – many of whom suffer high levels of poverty, by helping to establish the pre-conditions for livelihood enhancement. As noted in section 3.2 (outcome 4), some of the protected areas have reported that enhancing the capacity of their rangers and helping to reduce wildlife crime has helped reduce crime more widely.

Meanwhile, the project has also directly benefitted the rangers undertaking the interception tracker training, the colleagues they work with, and by extension all their families. The International Ranger Foundation has reported the loss of 1,000 in the line of duty over a ten-year period. Many of these lives will have been lost because rangers have not been trained how to avoid an ambush by poachers or to protect themselves in a contact situation with poachers. By introducing these skills, rangers' lives have been saved, and to date none of the rangers trained have been killed in a confrontation with poachers.

## **8. Consideration of gender equality issues**

Despite an increasing number of women entering the profession, rangers in sub-Saharan Africa are still predominantly men, and while the CPCT encouraged the target protected areas to put female rangers forward for training, those that proved to be at a sufficient level of skill and experience to participate in the interception tracker training were all men. The CPCT otherwise recognised the social and cultural norms in place in the target countries, and were conscious not to interfere in them. However, in Rwanda, which has taken a very progressive stance on gender equality over the past two decades, the CPCT successfully trained a female information operator at Akagera National Park, and she is now in a very important role within their anti-poaching operations.

The need for gender equality was meanwhile stressed through the training, while at Garamba National Park, one of the tracker trainers (Tom Fleetwood) chaired a discussion with the Congolese Rangers about the treatment of women and rape in war, which is particularly pertinent as Garamba is in the middle of a high conflict area.

The Annual Review recommended consulting with a gender expert to advise on how to mainstream gender in training and/or through community interactions, so as to benefit the project. At that stage of the project almost all of the training had already been conducted, and all of the basic level interception tracker training and the information gathering and analysis training had been completed. Consulting a gender expert at that stage would therefore have had little impact on the current project.

Nevertheless, both Tusk and AP acknowledge the importance of the issue and the value to be had from consulting a gender expert. The two organisations had submitted an application to the IWT Challenge



Fund Round 5, which was selected for the second stage, and in which – following the recommendations of the annual report review – a gender expert was to have been hired at the start of the project to advise on how to mainstream gender in training and through community interactions to benefit the project and other initiatives. This application (Ref No. 375: Enhancing counter poaching capacity and mitigating HWC in Zambia) was unsuccessful, but both organisations will look for future opportunities for this to still happen.

## **9. Lessons learnt**

All the interception tracker training and the information and analysis training courses have proven themselves to be well designed in terms of content, duration, number of participants and relevance. However, in order to reach as many protected areas and rangers as possible in the most cost-effective manner, the project had proven itself to have been very ambitious. The limited time between training courses and the lack of flexibility in the original plan was challenging, especially with so many countries, changing politics, and changing personalities in play. This forced a number of changes to the project, particularly in terms of the locations for training and protected areas targeted, and the main recommendation would be to incorporate greater flexibility in similar future programmes.

As noted above, while many protected areas expressed interest in the training in the development of the proposal, when it came to implementation, many of the rangers were not at a standard required to take on a specialised counter poaching tracking course. This is difficult to mitigate against without considerable further investment to select and train individuals ahead of a basic tracking course. Therefore more basic tracking courses are required to produce the requisite number of good quality rangers for intermediate and advanced training. The commitments from both AP and SAWC to incorporate an introduction to tracking in their basic field ranger training will also mitigate against this (see section 10).

The project design deliberately did not specify the tracker training consultant, and initial over reliance on a single specialist tracking training provider did prove to be difficult to sustain, especially for the scheduling of the training courses. The CPCT successfully identified a number of other training providers, and a tracker symposium in January 2017 (see directly below) ensured they are all following the same course, enabling the work to be shared among a number of different providers for concurrent training courses.

Finally, as elaborated further below in section 9.1, because this project coincided with many other law enforcement interventions, it has proven difficult to disaggregate its direct impact, and further thought needs to be given to M&E systems to overcome this.

### **9.1 Monitoring and evaluation**

There were no major changes to the project design over the two years, although some of the training had to be relocated in August 2016, as five of the interception tracker training courses were originally due to have been conducted in Zimbabwe, which became increasingly politically volatile in the early stages of the project.

In a February 2017 change request, there were also some changes to the protected areas being targeted, with five of the original protected areas being removed because of changes in their senior management and/or reassessment of their readiness or practical ability to participate in the training. Liwonde and Nkhotakota National Park were added, and the training of an information officer from Lake Malawi National Park was added. Odzala-Kokoua National Park in the Republic of Congo was one of the parks where it was felt that the rangers were not up to a sufficient standard to participate in the interception tracking, but by then an information officer from there had already been trained. These changes resulted in slightly modified targets as represented in the final log-frame, from 16 protected areas originally, to 14. The change request also approved a greater variation in the quantity of rangers to be trained in interception tracking according to the local need and context.

The project's logical framework has been used as the main tool for monitoring the project's progress. The key impact indicators on which information was collected were:

- Number of rangers trained and qualified
- Number of information analysts trained
- Number of elephant & rhino poached
- Number of poaching attempts
- Number of poachers disrupted and arrested
- Number of snares (and other traps) recovered
- Number of firearms confiscated
- Ranger patrol duration and length
- Number of illegal wildlife trade operations disrupted
- Number of illegal wildlife traders arrested

These indicators were the most suitable for measuring the project's impact, and a reporting form (completed versions of which have been provided as Annex 4) based on these was used to collate the key information from the protected areas. These were not requested from Odzala-Kokoua National Park, Lake Malawi National Park, or Kafue National Park, because the limited extent of the training there (see section 3.2) would not have had a significant impact on overall poaching or animal population statistics. Anecdotal information was instead requested on direct impact of the training.

Some difficulty was encountered in getting accurate information from the South African protected areas – e.g. Kruger National Park / Joint Protection Zone, Kwazulu-Natal Protected Areas and Waterberg Biosphere Reserve – that cannot release information on rhino populations or specific information on poaching because it is classified. They have however provided some figures or percentage changes where they can. (N.B. other protected areas, especially Garamba, have also stressed that their information is classified, but have provided it for the purposes of this report.)

The tracker trainer consultants meanwhile completed reports on each of the courses that they have delivered, which were submitted to the CPCT, who collated the information and relayed that to Tusk.

The CPCT has also maintained regular communications with the managers and/or heads of security (or the equivalent) in each of the target protected areas. Much of their feedback, together with the completed reporting forms, has contributed to this report through personal communications with the CPCT.

The project has been evaluated internally by Tusk, AP and the CPCT based on this information, and from end of grant assessment visits. These were carried out to the South African protected areas by the CPCT Coordinator, and to Akagera National Park by the Project Leader. The AP Head of Law Enforcement coordinated much of the end of grant reporting, and supplied further information from his routine visits to the protected areas. Finally, having rejoined the British Army on completion of his role in the grant, the CPCT Coordinator was deployed to Malawi in June 2018 as part of the MOD's project there, and he has therefore been able to provide further information from the Malawian protected areas.

The only significant shortcoming of this M&E system in providing useful feedback has been that it has been difficult to disaggregate the impact and achievements that can be directly attributed to this project from the many other law enforcement interventions that have coincided with it, other than from some very specific anecdotal information. Much of this would be unavoidable, but alternative methods of measuring directly attributable impact will be sought for future similar interventions.

## **9.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews**

### **How is African Parks (AP) collaborating with government agencies in the different countries?**

AP pioneered the concept of Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs) in protected area management and to date remains the single entity successfully securing and carrying out management agreements with governments on the continent. Central to the concept of a PPP is a separation of responsibilities between the State and AP. The State is the owner of the park and is responsible for legislation and policy. AP is responsible for the execution of management functions and is accountable to the State for performance. The separation of function is essential for producing results.

## **How is AP collaborating with other stakeholders working in the parks who may be involved in habitat protection, or the improvement of community livelihoods?**

As mentioned in section 7, this project has just been initiative for AP within their comprehensive management plans for each protected area. Law enforcement is just one of the five key pillars of their work, the other four being: management and infrastructure; biodiversity conservation; economic impact; and community development. AP enhances economic impact through tourism and enterprise development ensuring revenues go back to the park and communities to aid economic development. Meanwhile, AP are working to improve the lives of surrounding communities through food security, education, job creation and health benefits. All of this is planned and implemented in partnership with government agencies, as outlined above.

### **Have communities been involved in the project?**

While there is widespread engagement with communities in the development of the conservation strategies for each protected area, it has been less relevant to involve communities in this specific project. Nevertheless, the information gathering and analysis training includes a large focus on how to involve local communities in law enforcement, especially when it comes to providing information on illegal activity. Many of the positive results reported would not have been achieved without the information supplied and the support of the local communities, as a result of the strong relationships and engagement with them.

### **The poverty alleviation aspect is weak. Consider collaboration with other partners working in the protected areas who can assist with this aspect.**

AP and the management of the other protected areas covered do already work with other partners on poverty alleviation initiatives. With a very specific focus on the training of rangers and information officers, it has otherwise remained a challenge to link this project to poverty alleviation, other than indirectly as outlined in section 7.

### **Consulting with a gender expert to advise on how to mainstream gender in training and/or through community interactions may be beneficial to the project.**

As outlined in Section 8, this recommendation came too late to make a difference for this project, but was nevertheless acknowledged by Tusk and AP, who included the hiring of a gender expert in a subsequent IWT Challenge Fund application.

## **10. Other comments on achievements not covered elsewhere**

There have been two initiatives that have been implemented independently of the IWT Challenge Fund grant that have been directly inspired by it, and have subsequently been of great benefit to the project.

The first was the customisation of the *Geosuite* analysis software for use in protected areas. This software was developed for military (e.g. counter-insurgency) use, and while this is just as relevant for counter-poaching exercises, as many of the principles remain the same, developing the software for protected areas (e.g. adapting the terminology used so that it is more applicable and can be widely understood) has and will make the sharing of information through the information network far easier to understand.

The other initiative was a tracking symposium that was organised by the CPCT with funding from Tusk (and the Prince of Wales's Charitable Foundation) and held at the Southern African Wildlife College in January 2017. The objective was to create a standardised best practice approach to training and tactics among tracking instructors hired under this initiative (and subsequently for an initiative with the British Army).

The Symposium was, in summary, a great success. Consensus was reached on all major points discussed and continuity of training between the tracking training service providers was achieved. The

reassuring finding was that there was less divergence in approach than anticipated. Among other things, the symposium created a common curriculum for the basic tracker courses, common field signals for interoperability, and a common "lost spoor procedure". A further important outcome was that SAWC committed to introduce a tracking or a "Ground Sign Awareness" (GSA) aspect to their basic ranger course. AP made a similar commitment to double the amount of time spent on GSA on their Basic Ranger courses with the eventual goal of including the entire three-week basic course, as their instructor capability grows.

No major difficulties were encountered beyond those described in section 9, but one very positive, unexpected result from the project has been an increase in the levels of morale, motivation and professionalism from the rangers that participated in the interception tracker training. This is demonstrated by the following quotes from some of the protected areas covered:

- *"One of the most significant outcomes has been increased motivation within the rangers, with greater value on their profession. Rangers from other parks are now eager to be transferred to Akagera."* Park Manager, Akagera National Park
- *"Training has definitely been beneficial to rangers, both in their skills and knowledge, but also has provided opportunities for growth and development which is very motivating."* Park Manger, Majete National Park
- *"This excellent training program is one amongst many law enforcement interventions that have taken place since August 2015 when we took over. It has helped in building the confidence of our Rangers and the skills acquired have added significantly to the results achieved."* Park Manager, Liwonde National Park

Following the first basic tracker training courses it was reported to the CPCT that rangers achieved an immediate increase in patrol distance covered, contributing to the subsequent decreases in poaching.

## **11. Sustainability and legacy**

Almost as soon as the project got underway it attracted a great deal of interest from other protected areas and conservation organisations, as well as the British High Commissions and embassies in the target countries. In September 2016, and coinciding with the CITES Conference, the project received a high profile visit from UK Minister Thérèse Coffey to the training course at Kruger National Park. Unfortunately senior rangers at KNP were held responsible for not observing protocols and ensuring that the South African Government was also involved, and this had an adverse effect on some of the relationships for the project.

The project's sustainability is meanwhile being secured at an individual level by the rangers and information operators, who are now practising the new skills as part of their routine activities. AP has taken responsibility for coordinating the information network established through the project, and is investing in a specialist to administer the *Geosuite* software and the information network. *Geosuite* remains the best software available for park-level analysis of information gathered on poaching – even more so now that it has been customised – and can work in tandem very well with some of other platforms (such as DAS) that have been introduced, and which operate at a different level. Even if *Geosuite* comes to be replaced in a few years' time, the practices and principles of information gathering and analysis that have been introduced through the training can be applied on any platform, and will thus endure.

Meanwhile the 40 rangers from AP managed protected areas that completed and qualified through the Advanced Level interception tracker training, have ensured that AP has embedded the training capacity within its workforce so that it can extend (or at least reinforce) the training beyond the lifetime of the project (see Annex 5a). This extension training was not part of the existing project, but was always intended as a co-benefit, and two rangers in particular – Mike Polela and Clement Thunanyi – have emerged through the project as very competent trainers of others. The pair of them were not only assistant instructors for the final Advanced Level tracker training course that took place at Liwonde in August-September 2017, but prior to that were also assistant trackers for the training of British soldiers at the British Army Training unit in Kenya (BATUK) in May-June 2017. This extra hands-on experience

has left them very well-equipped to conduct training under their own steam, and they will meanwhile continue to support the lead trainers in future British Army deployments.

The UK Ministry of Defence's initiative, "Counter Poaching Tracker Training to African Parks" – also funded by the IWT Challenge Fund – replicates both the interception tracker training and information gathering and analysis components of this project. As a partner to the MOD initiative, together with AP, Tusk has freely shared details of this project and lessons learned to make the MOD initiative as effective as possible. It reflects the MOD and Defra's ambition to support anti-poaching efforts in Africa, as well as to develop the training capability within the British Army. The first – highly successful – deployment was to Liwonde National Park in September 2017. This, and future deployments, also help secure and reinforce the project's legacy.

## **12. IWT Challenge Fund Identity**

This project has been clearly recognised and promoted by Tusk as a stand-alone project that has been funded by the UK Government through the IWT Challenge Fund.

Tusk has promoted it over its website and social media pages. In particular, the project has been documented on the following pages of Tusk's website (which have been linked to from social media):

- Counter-Poaching Training Programme for Sub-Saharan Africa: <https://www.tusk.org/projects/counter-poaching-training-programme-for-sub-saharan-africa/>
- British Army Helps Reduce Poaching In Malawi: <https://www.tusk.org/news/22-nov-2017-british-army-helps-reduce-poaching-in-malawi/>
- UK Government Invests in Tusk's Anti-Poaching Efforts: <https://www.tusk.org/news/3-mar-2016-uk-government-invests-in-tuskas-anti-poaching-efforts>

Tusk has also featured the project in the following printed publications:

- Tusk Trust Spring Newsletter 2017
- *Tusk Talk* (Tusk's annual magazine) 2017 (pages 34-35): [https://issuu.com/tusktrust/docs/tusktalk2017\\_web](https://issuu.com/tusktrust/docs/tusktalk2017_web)
- Tusk Trust Spring Newsletter 2018
- *Tusk Talk* 2018 (page 28): <https://issuu.com/tusktrust/docs/tt18-issuu-all>

In November 2016 Project Leader Dan Bucknell and CPCT Leader Luke Townsend participated in a live Twitter Q&A with the FCO, which included a focus on the project and the IWT Challenge Fund. This and an FCO blog post on the project coincided with the Hanoi Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade.

## **13. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements of your project during the (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**

The Counter-Poaching Training Programme for Sub-Saharan Africa exceeded many of its targets, contributing significantly to reducing poaching. The programme has already been a factor in some significant successes.

Between 2016-2018, 138 rangers qualified at a basic level of interception tracking, 109 to an intermediate level, and 40 to an Advanced Level. Meanwhile, 16 information officers from nine protected areas have received expert training in information gathering and analysis, and a network was established for sharing information between them.

Among its many achievements, the programme made a substantial contribution towards a 100% reduction in elephant and rhino poaching in Malawi's Liwonde National Park, down from two elephant a week and on average one rhino per month. Meanwhile, in South Africa's Kruger National Park, an unprecedented 48 poacher arrests were made in the month immediately after the training.

The project has directly influenced the Ministry of Defence's engagement in anti-poaching, which is replicating much of the training and deploying British soldiers directly to protected areas to support anti-poaching operations, in partnership with both Tusk and African Parks.

The project's impact is otherwise best expressed by the protected area managers:

*"The ranger training in interception tracking has been one of the most critical trainings our team has had over the 8 years of operation. It has enabled the rangers to do a far better job in the field and the few who did intermediate and advanced are truly skilled rangers who will take Akagera forward as mentors to others. It has brought in great morale and professionalism."* Park Manager, Akagera National Park

*"A very useful part of this training has been the cross pollination between Rangers from Malawi, Zambia and Rwanda as well as the exposure to Trainers from Zimbabwe, the UK and South Africa. This is made Rangers feel part of a Pan African team of enforcers for conservation."* Park Manager, Liwonde National Park

*"The tracking training proved to be a popular series of courses with the Rangers. For those who achieved 'Expert', it was a mark of distinction that boosted self-esteem and self-confidence. Although representing less than 1% of the total Law Enforcement effort at GNP, this core skill has assisted in honing natural instincts and awareness in their surroundings. The 'Expert' Rangers were as good as the instructors by the end of the training. It was very worthwhile."* Park Manager, Garamba National Park

## 14. Finance and administration

### 14.1 Project expenditure

Project spend (indicative) since last annual report	2017/18 Grant (£)	2017/18 Total actual IWT Costs (£)	Variance %	Comments (please explain significant variances)
Staff costs (see below)				
Consultancy costs				
Overhead Costs				
Travel and subsistence				
Operating Costs				
Capital items (see below)				
Others (see below)				
<b>TOTAL</b>				

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
Dan Bucknell, Project Leader	
Kurt Steiner, African Parks - local coordination and liaison	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

Capital items – description <i>Please detail what items were purchased with fund money, and where these will remain once the project finishes</i>	Capital items – cost (£)

N/A	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

<b>Other items – description</b> <i>Please provide a detailed breakdown for any single item over £1000</i>	<b>Other items – cost (£)</b>
Monitoring & Evaluation: Communications, report production and dissemination	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

#### 14.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

<b>Source of funding for project lifetime</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>
Rufford Foundation	
Tusk Trust	
<b>TOTAL</b>	

<b>Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime</b>	<b>Total (£)</b>
N/A	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>

#### 14.3 Value for Money

In contributing to the anti-poaching and anti-trading efforts of 15 protected areas, making a significant contribution to marked reductions in poaching in many, the project has proved extremely cost-effective because of the scale on which it has operated.

To minimise costs and therefore secure best value for money, trainees of the interception tracker training had the costs of attending the training (including their accommodation, ongoing salary payments and other costs) covered by their employees and/or the hosts of the training (especially AP), reflecting the extent to which the protected areas covered by the project were committed to it. The information training was meanwhile conducted in situ by the CPCT, with further support from the protected areas to host them. This all enabled the grant to stretch much further than it might have done otherwise, providing further value for money. There were also no capital items required for the project.

One of the most significant costs was the consultancy fees for the trainers. Because they were each assured of several weeks' of work, they agreed to accept a highly competitive rate, which has since increased for subsequent training projects.

## Annex 1 Project's original (or most recently approved) logframe, including indicators, means of verification and assumptions.

**Note: Insert your full logframe. If your logframe was changed since your application and was approved by a Change Request the newest approved version should be inserted here, otherwise insert application logframe.**

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Impact:</b>			
Reduced illegal wildlife trade will see rhino and elephant populations stabilise and start recovering within target protected areas, and will also create improved security as a pre-condition for poverty alleviation.			
<p><b>Outcome:</b> Training provided to protected area staff to track and intercept rangers more effectively, and to disrupt their networks through information sharing across 14 separate protected areas in sub-Saharan Africa. This results in enhanced law enforcement to prevent illegal wildlife trade, leading to improved security and a direct reduction in poaching.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decrease in the number of rhino and elephant poached in each protected area and a stabilisation in their population size ( &gt;25% reduction)</li> <li>2. Increase in the number of poaching incidents disrupted and poachers arrested (Baselines available for each PA - end point &gt; 25% reduction)</li> <li>3. Increase in the number of illegal wildlife trading operations disturbed and traders arrested by PA ( &gt; 25% increase)</li> <li>4. Reduction in crime – wildlife-related and other – in the communities around the target protected areas</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Protected area management reports; poaching incident reports; project reports; CITES reports (esp. MIKE/ETIS reports)</li> <li>2. Interception / incident reports from protected area rangers (duplicate police reports from rangers); protected area management reports; project reports; CITES reports</li> <li>3. Incident reports compiled; project reports; CITES reports</li> <li>4. Protected area management reports; community interviews; local police statistics (if available)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Poaching is the main threat to elephant and rhino in the target protected areas, and a reduction in poaching will therefore halt any decline in their populations and allow them to recover.</li> <li>2. There is a finite number of poachers operating in each protected area, and a small number of groups that they work for. Arrests and disruption of poaching networks will therefore significantly reduce the levels of poaching.</li> <li>3. Protected areas are prepared to share information in the interests of preventing poaching.</li> <li>4. Evidence gathered by the interception trackers and the information network is sufficient to support the judicial process and secure convictions against poachers.</li> </ol>
<p><b>Output 1</b> At least 100 rangers (from 120 trained) from 14 protected areas qualified as basic level interception trackers, and able to join interception tracking units to more effectively interrupt and arrest poachers in their respective protected area</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Basic interception tracker training courses are completed with sufficient levels of participation</li> <li>2. A conservative estimate of 83% trainees pass the final assessment</li> <li>3. Qualified trainees form interception tracking units and conduct patrols</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPCT project reports; course attendance records</li> <li>2. Course assessment reports</li> <li>3. CPCT project reports; protected area management reports; patrol reports</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Target protected areas already have sufficient competent and incorrupt rangers from which trainees for the interception tracker training can be selected</li> <li>2. Trainees for the interception tracker training can obtain the necessary visas and permissions for travelling to participate in the training</li> </ol>



			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Training at each stage will result in a high pass rate and cultivate a strong desire in rangers to advance to the next stage of the training</li> <li>4. Protected areas predominantly recruit locally, and once trained, interception trackers and information officers are not likely to move elsewhere</li> <li>5. APN headquarters staff have the capacity to assume responsibility for coordinating the information network, which will extend beyond the 8 parks covered under the project</li> </ol>
<p><b>Output 2</b> At least 90 rangers (from 120 trained) qualified to an intermediate level of interception tracking and able to lead interception tracking units in their respective protected area</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intermediate interception tracker training courses are completed with sufficient levels of participation</li> <li>2. A conservative estimate of 75% trainees pass the final assessment</li> <li>3. Qualified trainees lead interception tracking units and conduct patrols</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPCT project reports; course attendance records</li> <li>2. Course assessment reports</li> <li>3. CPCT project reports; protected area management reports; patrol reports</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Output 3</b> At least 18 rangers (from 36 trained) qualified at an advanced level of interception tracking, and able to train others as a co-benefit of the project</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advanced interception tracker training courses are completed with sufficient levels of participation</li> <li>2. A conservative estimate of 50% trainees pass the final assessment</li> <li>3. Qualified trainees co-ordinate a number of interception tracking units and anti-poaching operations, and train further rangers within their protected areas</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPCT project reports; course attendance records</li> <li>2. Course assessment reports</li> <li>3. CPCT project reports; protected area management reports; patrol reports</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Output 4</b> A minimum of 13 protected area staff trained in information and analysis to develop a better understanding of poachers and their networks so as to disrupt them</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least one information staff fully trained in each of at least four protected areas, and one fully trained at APN headquarters</li> <li>2. Information staff actively share information on poachers and poaching activity between protected areas</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPCT project reports</li> <li>2. CPCT project reports; protected area management reports</li> </ol>	

<p><b>Output 5</b> An information network created across at least 14 protected areas and managed by African Parks Network (APN)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information network created and actively sharing information</li> <li>2. Trained information staff in African Parks Network headquarters assume overall coordination of the information network</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CPCT project reports; protected area management reports</li> <li>2. CPCT project reports; APN management reports</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Activities</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Output 1</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Selection of 120 rangers to participate in basic interception tracker training in five groups of 24 at a time</li> <li>1.2. Each group of 24 rangers is trained in basic interception tracking techniques during a 3-week course (of which there will be five in total), two of which will take place in Garamba National Park (DR Congo), and one each in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa), Akagera National Park (Rwanda), and Majete National Park (Malawi)</li> <li>1.3. On completion of the course, participants will be assessed as to whether they have acquired sufficient "basic" tracker competency</li> <li>1.4. Qualified trackers return to their respective protected areas to conduct interception tracking patrols, recording and reporting their progress to their park management and the CPCT</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>2. Output 2</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1. Selection of 120 rangers (from a pool of 131, being the 100 qualified rangers from activity 1.3, and 31 trained during the trial project) to participate in intermediate interception tracker training in five groups of 24 at a time</li> <li>2.2. Each group of 24 rangers is trained in intermediate interception tracking techniques during a further 3-week course (of which there will be five in total), one each of which will take place in Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa), Garamba National Park (DR Congo), Kruger National Park (South Africa), Liwonde National Park (Malawi) and KwaZulu Natal Protected Areas (South Africa)</li> <li>2.3. On completion of the course, participants will be assessed as to whether they have acquired sufficient "intermediate" tracker competency</li> <li>2.4. Qualified trackers return to their respective protected areas to lead interception tracking patrol units, recording and reporting their progress to their park management and the CPCT</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>3. Output 3</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3.1. Selection of 36 rangers (from the 90 qualified under activity 2.3) to participate in advanced interception tracker training in two groups of 18 at a time</li> <li>3.2. Each group of 18 rangers is trained in advanced interception tracking techniques during a final 3-week course (of which there will be two), one of which will take place in Majete National Park (Malawi), and one in Garamba National Park (DR Congo)</li> <li>3.3. On completion of the course, participants will be assessed as to whether they have acquired sufficient "advanced" tracker competency (a pass rate of 50% is a conservative estimate)</li> <li>3.4. Qualified trackers return to their respective protected areas to coordinate anti-poaching operations involving a number of patrol units, reporting their progress to their park management and the CPCT. They will also have the capacity to lead training in interception tracking techniques in their respective protected areas, as a potential future extension of this project</li> <li>3.5. The CPCT will maintain regular communication with the advanced level trackers (and their managers) to monitor and record progress, and offer further support and advice as required</li> </ol> </li> <li><b>4. Output 4</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4.1. The CPCT will visit APN headquarters in Johannesburg, Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, Game Reserves United (now known as the Joint Protection Zone), Garamba National Park and Akagera National Park, and others within the African Parks Network to provide training in basic information and analysis (including use of "Geosuite" software)</li> <li>4.2. The CPCT will spend the first week in each location in familiarisation and reconnaissance so that they can tailor their training to suit the location</li> </ol> </li> </ol>			

- 4.3. In the second week in each location, the CPCT will provide intensive training in information collection and analysis to a selected park officer and an understudy for them and/or their senior line manager (or in the case of APN headquarters 5 people that can rotate a 24 hr shift and manage crises). This training includes the creation of information networks and the engagement of local communities while emphasising the importance of community support.
- 4.4. In the final week in each location, the CPCT will provide personal mentoring and oversight of the initial implementation of the information collection and analysis while still in situ
- 4.5. The CPCT will maintain regular communication with those trained to monitor and record their progress, and offer further support and advice as required

**5. Output 5**

- 5.1. As the CPCT visit and train information officers in each location, the CPCT will connect them for the coordination of information between protected areas
- 5.2. Parks that have not received the information training (especially the others within the APN) will also be visited by the CPCT to establish contacts and facilitate the sharing of information between them, delivering high impact training on request as required
- 5.3. Once the information network is created between at least ten protected areas, the CPCT will pass over the overall coordination of the information network to those trained in APN headquarters

## Annex 2 Report of progress and achievements against final project logframe for the life of the project

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements
<p><b>Impact</b></p> <p>Reduced illegal wildlife trade will see rhino and elephant populations stabilise and start recovering within target protected areas, and will also create improved security as a pre-condition for poverty alleviation.</p>		<p>9 of the 12 protected areas where the project made a significant contribution to law enforcement have recorded an increase or stabilisation in their elephant and/or rhino populations. The main exception was Garamba National Park, which recorded an apparent decline of approximately 30% in its elephant population.</p>
<p><b>Outcome</b> Training provided to protected area staff to track and intercept rangers more effectively, and to disrupt their networks through information sharing across 14 separate protected areas in sub-Saharan Africa. This results in enhanced law enforcement to prevent illegal wildlife trade, leading to improved security and a direct reduction in poaching.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Decrease in the number of rhino and elephant poached in each protected area and a stabilisation in their population size ( &gt;25% reduction)</li> <li>2. Increase in the number of poaching incidents disrupted and poachers arrested (Baselines available for each PA - end point &gt; 25% reduction)</li> <li>3. Increase in the number of illegal wildlife trading operations disturbed and traders arrested by PA ( &gt; 25% increase)</li> <li>4. Reduction in crime – wildlife-related and other – in the communities around the target protected areas</li> </ol>	<p>All of the 12 protected areas where the project made a significant contribution to law enforcement have either recorded a significant reduction (&gt; 25%) in poaching of elephant and/or rhino between 2015 (before the intervention) and the end of 2017, or have maintained low levels or zero poaching from previously high levels.</p> <p>6 parks reported increased arrests of poachers over the course of the project (3 of them &gt;25%)</p> <p>3 parks have reported arrests of illegal traders outside park.</p> <p>Anecdotal reports of improved security. At least 2 parks reporting reduced crime.</p>
<p><b>Output 1.</b> At least 100 rangers (from 120 trained) from 14 protected areas qualified as basic level interception trackers, and able to join interception tracking units to more effectively interrupt and arrest poachers in their respective protected area</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Basic interception tracker training courses are completed with sufficient levels of participation</li> <li>2. A conservative estimate of 83% trainees pass the final assessment</li> <li>3. Qualified trainees form interception tracking units and conduct patrols</li> </ol>	<p>138 rangers qualified (from 144 trained) as basic level interception trackers from 12 protected areas.</p> <p>Trained participants put their training into practice in their respective protected areas.</p> <p>Evidenced in section 3.2, training course reports, and protected area management reports.</p> <p>Indicators deemed appropriate.</p>

Activity 1.1: Selection of 120 rangers to participate in basic interception tracker training in five groups of 24 at a time		Activity completed: 144 rangers selected for training, and six courses held (one at basic-intermediate level) to 144 participants
Activity 1.2: Each group of 24 rangers is trained in basic interception tracking techniques during a 3-week course (of which there will be five in total), two of which will take place in Garamba National Park (DR Congo), and one each in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa), Akagera National Park (Rwanda), and Majete National Park (Malawi)		Activity completed. 6 x 3-week training courses held: two in Garamba National Park (DR Congo), and one each in the Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa), Akagera National Park (Rwanda), and Majete National Park (Malawi). The basic-intermediate course was held at Kruger National Park.
Activity 1.3: On completion of the course, participants will be assessed as to whether they have acquired sufficient "basic" tracker competency		Activity completed: 138 participants assessed as having qualified (pass rate of 96%)
Activity 1.4: Qualified trackers return to their respective protected areas to conduct interception tracking patrols, recording and reporting their progress to their park management and the CPCT		Activity completed and ongoing: trainees conducting interception tracking patrols, contributing to the outcomes described above.
<b>Output 2.</b> At least 90 rangers (from 120 trained) qualified to an intermediate level of interception tracking and able to lead interception tracking units in their respective protected area	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intermediate interception tracker training courses are completed with sufficient levels of participation</li> <li>2. A conservative estimate of 75% trainees pass the final assessment</li> <li>3. Qualified trainees lead interception tracking units and conduct patrols</li> </ol>	<p>109 rangers qualified (from 120 trained) as intermediate level interception trackers from 12 protected areas.</p> <p>Indicators deemed appropriate</p> <p>Evidenced in 3.2 above and in course reports (selection submitted in annex)</p>
Activity 2.1: Selection of 120 rangers (from a pool of 131, being the 100 qualified rangers from activity 1.3, and 31 trained during the trial project) to participate in intermediate interception tracker training in five groups of 24 at a time		Activity completed: 120 rangers selected and five courses held (one at basic-intermediate level) to 120 participants
Activity 2.2: Each group of 24 rangers is trained in intermediate interception tracking techniques during a further 3-week course (of which there will be five in total), one each of which will take place in Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa), Garamba National Park (DR Congo), Kruger National Park (South Africa), Liwonde National Park (Malawi) and KwaZulu Natal Protected Areas (South Africa).		Activity completed: 5 x 3-week training courses held: one each held in Waterberg Biosphere Reserve (South Africa), Garamba National Park (DR Congo), Kruger National Park (South Africa) (= basic-intermediate level), Liwonde National Park (Malawi), and KwaZulu Natal Protected Areas (South Africa). (Final course at KZN held in 3 x 1 week courses, each to 8 participants)
Activity 2.3: On completion of the course, participants will be assessed as to whether they have acquired sufficient "intermediate" tracker competency		Activity completed: 109 participants assessed as having qualified (pass rate of 92%)
Activity 2.4: Qualified trackers return to their respective protected areas to lead interception tracking patrol units, recording and reporting their progress to their park management and the CPCT		Activity completed and ongoing: trainees conducting interception tracking patrols, contributing to the outcomes described above.
<b>Output 3.</b> At least 18 rangers (from 36 trained) qualified at an advanced level of interception tracking, and able to train others as a co-benefit of the project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Advanced interception tracker training courses are completed with sufficient levels of participation</li> <li>2. A conservative estimate of 50% trainees pass the final assessment</li> <li>3. Qualified trainees co-ordinate a number of interception tracking</li> </ol>	<p>40 rangers selected and two courses held to 40 participants</p> <p>Indicators deemed appropriate</p> <p>Evidenced in 3.2 above and in course reports (selection submitted in annex)</p>

	units and anti-poaching operations, and train further rangers within their protected areas	
Activity 3.1: Selection of 36 rangers (from the 90 qualified under activity 2.3) to participate in advanced interception tracker training in two groups of 18 at a time		Activity completed: 40 rangers selected for advanced level training
Activity 3.2: Each group of 18 rangers is trained in advanced interception tracking techniques during a final 3-week course (of which there will be two), one of which will take place in Majete National Park (Malawi), and one in Garamba National Park (DR Congo)		Activity completed: 1 course held at Garamba National Park (DRC) and 1 at Liwonde National Park (Malawi).
Activity 3.3: On completion of the course, participants will be assessed as to whether they have acquired sufficient "advanced" tracker competency (a pass rate of 50% is a conservative estimate)		Activity completed: 40 participants assessed as having qualified (pass rate of 100%)
Activity 3.4: Qualified trackers return to their respective protected areas to coordinate anti-poaching operations involving a number of patrol units, reporting their progress to their park management and the CPCT. They will also have the capacity to lead training in interception tracking techniques in their respective protected areas, as a potential future extension of this project		Activity completed and ongoing: trainees conducting interception tracking patrols, contributing to the outcomes described above.  Two trainees became assistants for the final advanced level tracking course, and have gone on to assist with other interception tracking courses. They are now competent enough to run their own training courses.
Activity 3.5: The CPCT will maintain regular communication with the advanced level trackers (and their managers) to monitor and record progress, and offer further support and advice as required		Activity completed and ongoing: CPCT and some of the training consultants have maintained contact with some of the advanced level graduates, especially those hired to assist in the training. Otherwise, AP Headquarters and each Park Manager continue to monitor their progress.
<b>Output 4.</b> A minimum of 13 protected area staff trained in information and analysis to develop a better understanding of poachers and their networks so as to disrupt them	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least one information staff fully trained in each of at least four protected areas, and one fully trained at APN headquarters</li> <li>2. Information staff actively share information on poachers and poaching activity between protected areas</li> </ol>	<p>16 information officers trained from 9 protected areas.</p> <p>Indicators deemed appropriate</p> <p>Evidenced in 3.2 above and in CPCT reports</p>
Activity 4.1: The CPCT will visit APN headquarters in Johannesburg, Waterberg Biosphere Reserve, Game Reserves United (now known as the Joint Protection Zone), Garamba National Park and Akagera National Park, and others within the African Parks Network to provide training in basic information and analysis (including use of "Geosuite" software)		<p>Activity completed: CPCT delivered training at APN headquarters in Johannesburg, Garamba National Park, Akagera National Park, Liwonde National Park and Majete National Park.</p> <p>CPCT also produced a report on status of information gathering and analysis at Kruger National Park</p> <p>16 protected area staff trained from 9 protected areas</p>
Activity 4.2: The CPCT will spend the first week in each location in familiarisation and reconnaissance so that they can tailor their training to suit the location		Activity completed: CPCT maintained original plan and schedule for information gathering.

<p>Activity 4.3: In the second week in each location, the CPCT will provide intensive training in information collection and analysis to a selected park officer and an understudy for them and/or their senior line manager (or in the case of APN headquarters 5 people that can rotate a 24 hr shift and manage crises). This training includes the creation of information networks and the engagement of local communities while emphasising the importance of community support.</p>	<p>Activity completed: CPCT maintained original plan and schedule for information gathering. N.B. Training of just one staff from AP HQ was approved in a change request, but not reflected in the final log-frame.</p>	
<p>Activity 4.4: In the final week in each location, the CPCT will provide personal mentoring and oversight of the initial implementation of the information collection and analysis while still in situ</p>	<p>Activity completed: CPCT maintained original plan and schedule for information gathering.</p>	
<p>Activity 4.5: The CPCT will maintain regular communication with those trained to monitor and record their progress, and offer further support and advice as required</p>	<p>Activity completed and ongoing: CPCT Coordinator maintains communications with information officers and continues to advise and support AP in this regard.</p>	
<p><b>Output 5.</b> An information network created across at least 14 protected areas and managed by African Parks Network (APN)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Information network created and actively sharing information</li> <li>2. Trained information staff in African Parks Network headquarters assume overall coordination of the information network</li> </ol>	<p>Information network established between the ten AP protected areas, and informal communications with the other protected areas enhanced. Indicators deemed appropriate Evidenced in 3.2 above and in CPCT reports</p>
<p>Activity 5.1: As the CPCT visit and train information officers in each location, the CPCT will connect them for the coordination of information between protected areas</p>	<p>Activity completed: CPCT visit APN headquarters in Johannesburg, Garamba National Park, Akagera National Park, Liwonde National Park and Majete National Park, and establish information network between them.</p>	
<p>Activity 5.2: Parks that have not received the information training (especially the others within the APN) will also be visited by the CPCT to establish contacts and facilitate the sharing of information between them, delivering high impact training on request as required</p>	<p>Activity completed, but mostly through remote communication with the information officers trained by the CPCT, rather than through physical visits.</p>	
<p>Activity 5.3: Once the information network is created between at least ten protected areas, the CPCT will pass over the overall coordination of the information network to those trained in APN headquarters.</p>	<p>Activity completed: AP manage the information network between their protected areas, with a specialist hired to administer it.</p>	

## Annex 3 IWT Contacts

<b>Ref No</b>	IWT024
<b>Project Title</b>	Counter-Poaching Training Programme for Sub-Saharan Africa
<b>Project Leader Details</b>	
Name	Dan Bucknell
Role within IWT Project	Project Leader
Address	
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
<b>Partner 1</b>	
Name	Jeremy Hancock (previously Kurt Steiner)
Organisation	Head of Law Enforcement
Role within IWT Project	Local Coordination & Liaison for African Parks
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
<b>Partner 2 etc.</b>	
Name	Luke Townsend
Organisation	Counter-Poaching Coordination Team – CPCT (now British Army)
Role within IWT Project	CPCT Leader - training & coordination of training
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	



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

### Checklist for submission

	Check
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk">IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk</a> putting the project number in the subject line.	✓
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk">IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the subject line.	X
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You need not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	✓
<b>Do you have hard copies of material you want to submit with the report?</b> If so, please make this clear in the covering email and ensure all material is marked with the project number.	X
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.	