



Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund Half Year Report

(due 31st October 2019)

Project reference:	IWT 036
Project title:	Implementing park action plans for community engagement to tackle IWT
Country(ies):	Uganda
Lead organisation:	IIED
Collaborator(s):	Uganda Wildlife Authority, Wildlife Conservation Society, Village Enterprise, Uganda Conservation Foundation
Project leader:	Dilys Roe
Report date and number (e.g. HYR1):	31 st October 2019, (HYR3)
Project website/blog/social media:	https://www.iied.org/park-action-plans-increasing-community-engagement-tackling-wildlife-crime

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

Output 1 Existing wildlife scouts programmes in human wildlife conflict and IWT hotspots around Murchison Falls National Park are improved.

Our support for the Scout programme continued and, in July 2019, Geoffrey Mwedde (WCS-Uganda) visited the Scouts. He distributed 35 bicycles and equipment (e.g. rain coats, gum boots etc) to the Scouts during meetings that were attended by local community leaders. The bicycles and equipment had been purchased with budget savings from IIED consultancy staff time, as reported in our annual report of Year Two. Geoffrey also reviewed progress with the Scouts: their feedback included the benefits this project is generating for their communities beyond HWC mitigation (eg using the bicycles to transport people to hospitals) and an improvement in their personal status within the communities. Geoffrey also reviewed the Scout's HWC data collection (as reported in our Year Two annual report, there were issues with the uploading data from mobile phones). Now when the Community Conservation (CC) Rangers visit the Scouts every month, they collect the Scout's HWC data on a memory stick and pass this to Geoffrey. While initially this was an issue, this arrangement is helping to build good relations between the Scouts and the CC Rangers.

During the July trip, Geoffrey worked with the CC Wardens and Rangers who had recently been transferred to the Park, introducing them to the Scouts and work undertaken so far.

On 14th and 15th August 2019, UWA ran training for the 50 Scouts in our programme, as well as local leaders. UWA funded and undertook the training themselves, which illustrates both the value UWA places on this Scout programme and the achievements of the Scouts. The training was held inside the Park, on request from the Scouts who wished to see the Park, and it helped

our efforts to establish close relations between the Scouts and UWA staff: during the training, the Scouts informed UWA staff of poaching routes into the Park. UWA rangers patrolled these routes after the training and reported arresting four poachers. Please note that UWA's funds and in-kind contribution for this training totalled Uganda Schillings.

Overall, our progress towards improving the Scout programmes is well on track – the Scouts themselves talk about the benefits of the programme and UWA Park staff funded their own training for the Scouts. While the Scouts are active however, in some instances they cannot fully protect crops from elephants– please see our note on this in Section 2a.

During the April to September 2019 period, we consolidated our baseline data collection as follows:

Human Wildlife Conflict

The Scouts' HWC data from August 2018 to July 2019 forms our baseline: there were 229 separate incidents of HWC recorded in the nine villages involved with our Scout programme. While the amount of HWC data collected by Scouts is sufficient for analysis, there are missing data on the actual responses to HWC incidents. Also, Scouts' estimates of the extent of crop damage seemed disproportionate when compared against their photographs of the damage. Both issues will not significantly affect our planned analysis, although WCS-Uganda will hold refresher training for the Scouts on these aspects during their next visit.

Poaching encounters by law enforcement patrols

We have UWA law enforcement patrol data on poaching encounters from 2013, which means we have a baseline from before our project started. While this timeline boosts the data we have, there were fewer law enforcement patrols within Karuma Wildlife Reserve (which borders the nine villages of our project) during 2014 and 2015, compared with patrols in our 'control' areas within Murchison Falls National Park. There is also greater variation in the 'catch per unit effort' within Karuma Wildlife Reserve compared with the control areas. Patrol decline was likely because of the West African Ebola virus epidemic, and since then, the number of patrols has increased. These factors might reduce confidence in our estimated change in poaching over time, although we have identified ways to control for these factors within the final analysis.

Tip off reporting (local communities reporting illegal activities to Park staff)

As reported in our Year Two annual report, even though we developed an ODK form for Park staff to record tip-offs on illegal activities that they receive from local communities, only one staff recorded tip-off reports and then was transferred to another station. Consequently, we do not have sufficient data to establish a baseline. Furthermore, the new CC staff assigned to the Park are just starting to form relations with neighbouring villagers and build the trust necessary for villagers to report tip offs.

Our original log-frame indicator was "by the end of the project the number of tip-offs regarding illegal activities received by UWA from participating villages increases by 20% relative to control villages". We propose to change this to a qualitative indicator whereby we will interview the CC staff during Year 4 Q4, to gather their views on the likelihood of receiving tip-offs in project villages compared with similar villages neighbouring KWR but located outside the project area. These other villages will be selected with assistance from the previous CC warden at KWR (please see Section 2a and our change request).

Attitudes

Village Enterprise (VE) undertook a baseline attitude survey of the Scouts and participants involved with the Enterprises in 2018. In the period of this report, they undertook a 'mid-line' attitude survey to assess progress, as part of our lessons learnt reviews. The mid-line survey revealed a greater mix of positive but also negative attitudes towards conservation compared with the baseline. We explored possible reasons for this:

- The attitude surveys revealed great frustration over the lack of benefits from UWA's tourism revenue sharing. While we assume that benefits from our project will improve Park-community relations, we recognise that frustration over revenue sharing is a long-standing issue. Also, VE and WCS had built good relations with the Scouts and Enterprises by the mid-line survey, so it is possible that people were more open with how they felt. Nonetheless, we have revised the conservation messages by the VE business mentors and WCS to emphasise the connections between this project and the Park, especially for VE's scaling up activities.
- Crop yields of some Enterprises were affected by prolonged drought and, as a result, they did not have as good a return on investment as other Enterprises, which likely affected their attitudes. VE was already supporting all Enterprises to be more resilient to such factors through diversification and will particularly focus on those participants.

While the mid-line survey showed mixed results, we have used this to re-focus our efforts and to inform VE's scaling up activities (see below).

Output 2 Small enterprises are developed in HWC / IWT hotspots for existing wildlife scout programmes as an alternative income source to poaching

The 1-to-1 mentoring for the enterprises continued with the monthly visits by the VE Business mentors. The mentors supported the enterprises to diversify their business by identifying other income-generating activities, especially for the Enterprises to be more resilient to drought and livestock disease. The mentors also supported the Business Savings Groups (BSGs) with decisions on how much income to save, how much to re-invest etc (which followed the second grant of \$that was disbursed in January 2019).

Peter Dema (VE) joined Geoffrey on the trip in July 2019; these joint visits had been identified during our lessons learnt review in January 2019 in order to emphasise connections between the Scouts, the Enterprises and the Park. Feedback was that the joint-trip worked well, especially as the Scouts had various questions about the Enterprises that Peter could answer directly.

In May 2019, VE undertook a mid-line attitude survey (as described above). VE also reviewed activities by the Enterprises. The findings included an increase in household savings from the baseline (2018), and that the average savings by each Business Savings Group to-date was \$. The full report will be included in our end-of-year report.

During July, August and September, the team held a series of Skype calls to review and discuss VE's scaling-up activity to "*provide technical support for scale up and roll out to other locations*" for Q3 and 4 of Year Three. We have discussed various options to increase our planned impacts of the project, including:

- Selecting income-generating activities that foster closer links between the Enterprises and the Park and UWA
- Strengthening pathways through which the enterprises can reduce illegal activities, ie increasing the time that people spend on the enterprises (rather than illegal activities); and increasing income and savings so that people are better able to cope in times of stress rather than having to rely on illegal activities

VE is drafting a proposal for the team to discuss during our next Skype call in November.

Overall, our progress towards developing small enterprises as an alternative income to poaching is on track. VE business mentors report individual stories of how people no longer seek income from poaching now that they have the enterprises (please see our note on this for Output 4). Also the mid-line financial review showed positive results, despite some enterprises being affected by drought. However, there are challenges to this task, namely: maintaining income-generating enterprises in rural areas, and UWA – Community relations being

dominated by long-standing issues including resentment over tourism revenue sharing. Through our team meetings and lessons learnt reviews, we have continually assessed whether we are taking the best approach to address these. In response, we are revising the conservation messages of VE and WCS and supporting the enterprises to be more resilient to challenging environmental and market conditions (ie through diversification and being able to adapt and change their enterprises). We are also planning the scaling-up activities for maximum impact specifically given these challenges.

Output 3 The capacity and profile of the UWA community conservation unit is developed

As reported in our year two annual report, we reviewed all of the training materials to date to publish them as an on-line resource. We originally planned to publish the materials in June 2019, but decided to restructure the materials into modules to produce an on-line training pack (rather than simply putting the powerpoint slides on-line). This is in progress and will be posted on the IIED project webpage as part of our Year 4 activities. In the meantime we have published

We continued our support for the CC Unit as the new CC policy went through the internal UWA process for approving the new CC policy, including by UWA Senior Management and the UWA Board. The policy has been approved and we discussed timing of the launch event with UWA. The Uganda Conservation and Poverty Learning Group (UPCLG) is now hosting an event on HWC during January 2020, and we agreed with UWA to hold the policy launch event during the same week to maximise coverage of both events. This is a change to our planned timetable (ie now hosting the policy launch event in Q3 of Year Two instead of Q1/2), although we consider that combing the events will have far greater outreach than holding each individually and they remain in the same project year.

During Year Two, we collaborated with a Masters student, Michelle Anagnostou, at Durrell Institute for Conservation and Ecology (DICE) on her research to explore intelligence reporting by local communities to UWA at Murchison Falls NP. During the period of this report, we provided technical input into a manuscript that Michelle submitted to Conservation Biology. The journal rejected the manuscript but recommended that it be submitted to Conservation Science and Practice, which Michelle did. Michelle has had comments from reviewers and is currently revising the manuscript for re-submission. Please note that DICE are not a formal partner on this project; we just provided technical input and advice for Michelle's research.

Output 4 The lessons learned from the project are disseminated nationally and internationally

The activity for the April to September period was to disseminate project updates via the PCLG network and project partner networks.

During our project meetings, VE and WCS described feedback from Scouts and those involved with the enterprises on the benefits they have received from this project. VE also highlighted individuals who are no longer involved with poaching because they are involved with the enterprises. We wanted to capture these individual stories, especially to complement the attitude surveys that will present general trends. We developed a 'Stories of Change' form for WCS and VE to interview a small number of Scouts and individuals involved with the Enterprises. We are currently writing up the interviews as part of a series of communication outputs from the project, which we will formalise during Year 4.

IIED continued to work with UPCLG after their re-launch, as the group worked through their reorganisation. For us this has been an opportunity to check whether our original communication activities of newsletter articles are the most effective for disseminating project news and updates in Uganda. Colleagues in Uganda regularly use WhatsApp for social media posts and discussions, so we decided to communicate project updates through key WhatsApp networks. Each update will have a photo and a brief message with a link to a PDF article with more information. We are planning updates on our lessons learnt and the Stories of Change, and in our annual report will show screen-shots of the messages sent along with the PDFs.

Independently of this project, UPCLG are preparing an event on HWC during January 2020. This is an ideal opportunity to present the results of this project to-date, and we are working with UPCLG on the agenda.

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

Logframe indicator: tip off reporting

As noted above, we propose a change to our log-frame indicator on tip-off reporting, for which we will submit a change request. There is no anticipated change to our budget or programme. The only impact is a qualitative measure rather than a quantitative measure for this indicator. However, given the range of our other indicators on the project outcome (a reduction in poaching) we do not consider that this will be significant.

Output 1: The Scout Programme

As noted above, we considered that Output 1 is well on track. However there have been instances when the Scouts have not been able to fully protect crops against elephants. Despite the Scouts being well received by their communities, continued elephant crop damage could undermine our efforts to improve local attitudes towards UWA, which are central to our pathways to change for a reduction in poaching. WSC together with the Scouts continue to review the effectiveness of all possible HWC mitigation measures. They are also working with UWA, as UWA is constructing elephant trenches at key locations around the Park, and recently constructed a 3.5km trench along the Park border of two villages in our project area. There is no expected impact on our budget or timetable from this situation or any change request required. We note it because of the possibility that even with an improved Scout programme, continued elephant damage could fuel resentment towards the Park.

Output 2: Enterprises

Please see the notes above regarding our lessons learnt for this period. There is no expected impact on our budget or timetable, or any change request required.

Output 3: Community Conservation Unit

Note the change in timeline outlined above relating to the CC policy launch. It remains in the same project year so we do not plan to submit a change request.

Project coordination

Julia Baker has started to take a more prominent role coordinating the project partners and activities and we will be planning to continue with this arrangement. As well as altering roles this will alter spend between budget lines so we will include this in the change request that we will submit shortly.

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

Discussed with LTS:	No
---------------------	----

Formal change request submitted:	No
----------------------------------	----

Received confirmation of change acceptance	No
--	----

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

Yes No Estimated underspend: NA

3b. If yes, then you need to consider your project budget needs carefully. Please remember that any funds agreed for this financial year are only available to the project in this financial year.

If you anticipate a significant underspend because of justifiable changes within the project, please submit a rebudget Change Request as soon as possible. There is no guarantee that Defra will agree a rebudget, so please ensure you have enough time to make appropriate changes if necessary.

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

NA

If you were asked to provide a response to this year's annual report review with your next half year report, please attach your response to this document.

Please note: Any planned modifications to your project schedule/workplan can be discussed in this report but **should also be raised with LTS International through a Change Request. **Please DO NOT send these in the same email.****

Please send your **completed report by email** to IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk. The report should be between 2-3 pages maximum. **Please state your project reference number in the header of your email message e.g. Subject: IWT001 Half Year Report.**