



Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund Final Report

To be completed with reference to the “Writing a Darwin Report” guidance:
(<http://www.darwininitiative.org.uk/resources-for-projects/reporting-forms>). It is expected that this report
will be a **maximum** of 20 pages in length, excluding annexes.

IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

| | |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Project reference | IWT 046 |
| Project title | Enhancing Enforcement to End Tiger Trade in South East Asia |
| Country(ies) | Lao PDR, Thailand, Vietnam, China |
| Lead organisation | Environmental Investigation Agency UK |
| Partner institution(s) | Education for Nature Vietnam (ENV) and Wildlife Friends Foundation Thailand (WFFT) |
| Total IWT grant value | £302,193 |
| Start/end dates of project | 01 June 2017 to 31 May 2019 |
| Project leader’s name | Debbie Banks |
| Project website/blog/social media | www.eia-international.org |
| Report author(s) and date | EIA with inputs from ENV and WFFT |

1. Project Summary

The project addresses the role of transnational criminal networks engaged in tiger trade between Thailand, Lao PDR (hereafter referred to as Laos), Vietnam and China, and how members of these networks are exploiting weak laws and governance in Laos to avoid detection, apprehension and prosecution. Trade in tiger parts and products is the primary threat to the survival of wild tigers and the anticipated impact of the project.

In 2007, Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), agreed that tigers should not be bred for trade in their parts and derivatives. It was recognised that such trade perpetuates demand for tiger parts and undermines enforcement efforts. Despite this, tiger ‘farms’ have proliferated across South East Asia and China. In flagrant disregard for the 2007 CITES decision, licensed domestic trade and exports of tiger parts in Laos continued up until 2016, while the law in China allows domestic trade in parts of captive bred tigers. There have been numerous examples of illegal trade from captive tiger facilities in Thailand, Laos, China and Vietnam. Tiger farming and trade in captive tiger specimens stimulates demand for tiger parts and undermines enforcement efforts to combat tiger trafficking. With some consumers preferring wild tiger parts, poaching pressure on wild populations continues; wild tigers are functionally extinct in Laos and Vietnam, are perilously close to extinction in China and are restricted to a small population of 150-200 tigers in Thailand.

Demand is such that wild tigers are poached from South and South East Asia and trafficked to trade hotspots for Chinese and Vietnamese consumers, including via Myanmar’s notorious

Mong La market, to Laos Golden Triangle Special Economic Zone (GTSEZ), Nghe An Province in Vietnam. Work by EIA and partners prior to, and during, this project indicates that parts and derivatives of wild tigers and other big cats are sold alongside those of captive tigers along the trade chain between Thailand, Laos, Vietnam and China. Individuals associated with some of the captive tiger facilities in Thailand, Laos and Vietnam are part of transnational criminal networks involved in tens of millions of USD worth of international illegal trade in several wildlife species.

The degree of criminality surrounding these criminal networks, facilitated by weak government policy and in some instances corruption, is not only a threat to the biodiversity of the project countries but to tiger and other wildlife populations across Asia and to wildlife in Africa.

The cycle of criminality and corruption affects communities since it undermines the rule of law, perpetuates weak governance and undermines development in Laos. This in turn impacts negatively on the prospects of wild tiger population recovery and the accompanying livelihood potential around ecotourism in Laos, depriving rural communities of the prospects or potential to derive income.

Maps of key locations are provided in Annex 4.1.

2. Project Partnerships

The partnerships in this project evolved from previous on-the-ground and desk-based collaboration between EIA and ENV (see [Sin City](#)), and desk-based consultation with WFFT, including as members of the Species Survival Network. These partnerships stemmed from the recognised need to address trade in and through Laos to neighbouring countries and the role of tiger farming in this trade (as demonstrated in the [Cultivating Demand](#) report and previous co-authored reports presented for CITES, e.g. [Caged Assets: Tiger Farming and Trade, 2014](#)). The grant award from DEFRA has enabled the partnership to develop from collaborative desk-based activity with ad-hoc collaborative field-based activity to a more coordinated approach with increased funding available for the partners.

Through face-to-face meetings, all partners have been involved in the problem analysis, strategic and operational priority setting regarding particular companies, locations and persons of interest, with some activities being the focus of the individual partners and some activities being conducted collaboratively as appropriate. For example, WFFT were the lead on addressing Thai legislation issues, documenting the location and ownership of captive tiger facilities in Thailand, and liaising with Thai law enforcement authorities. ENV have led on field missions in Vietnam, liaising with Vietnamese law enforcement over the disruption of two major tiger trade networks. EIA has collaborated on field missions in Thailand and Laos with WFFT, coordinated with ENV over the submission of intelligence to a US law enforcement initiative, led on advocacy related to China and international campaign communications from the project.

All partners were involved in providing information for this and previous reports and in reviewing this final report. One of the strengths of this partnership is that it is trust-based with a long-term commitment to common objectives. This enables the sharing of often sensitive information and combined efforts at a field level, drawing on different language skills and experience. All the partners are relatively small organisations with minimal bureaucracy, enabling us to adapt to external circumstances and respond to external events.

The partners have and will continue to maintain the relationship following the official end of the project date. Another source of funding enabled a follow-up field mission in Thailand by EIA and WFFT, and funding is available to potentially secure critical video evidence of the expansion of one of the Laos tiger farms prior to the 71st meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC71), and the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP18).

Unfortunately, not all partners have the funding to attend the CITES meetings, but EIA will coordinate with both partners over messaging and content for a side event proposed for the 19th August 2019. One of the major achievements of the project has been the arrest of a key figure in the Laos – Vietnam tiger trade. This was initiated by ENV during the project period, coming to fruition in July 2019 (see section 3.2), and ENV is liaising with EIA over the most effective way to ensure this influences SC71 and CoP18 decisions.

With hindsight all partners have found that the project duration (2 years) was too short, with the regional partners having to delay the start of their activities until end of 2017 / beginning of 2018 (as approved in an Oct 2017 change request). New leads continued to emerge up until the end of the project, with new key persons of interest, captive tiger facilities of concern, and cross-border routes identified.

Field activity for EIA will be diminished until new sources of income are secured but our Field Operatives are still generating information through their online activity. We will continue however with desk-based research, analysis and information dissemination related to the work of the project partnership. As appropriate, and in consultation with the partners, we will prepare and release information publicly on the findings of the project, some of which are still subject to law enforcement attention and can't be disclosed at this moment.

WFFT have interim funding to secure the post of the Field Operative for 12 months (from May 2019) and still have target facilities they want to document (there are far more than anticipated at the beginning of the project). ENV has funding to maintain their tiger crime activity in Vietnam, including monitoring the prosecution of a key figure associated with one of the Laos farms, who was recently arrested as a result of the project.

All partners agreed to submit an application to DEFRA IWT Challenge Fund to be able resume a high level of collaborative field activity. We will also continue to seek other sources of funding.

3. Project Achievements

3.1 Outputs

The contents of the following sections and associated Annexes contain confidential information not for further distribution. Particularly sensitive information is highlighted in red with an explanation for the caution required.

4. Monitoring of assumptions

Outcome Assumptions:

Assumption 1: Multiple initiatives to strengthen wildlife law enforcement capacity in Lao PDR are successful.

This is a valid assumption and it was reasonable to expect that the combination of the World Bank-funded LENS projects, IGO and NGO capacity building and training programmes, and the scrutiny that Laos has been subject to under CITES, would have resulted in a more determined and effective law enforcement response to date. Especially since some of these initiatives are several years old. The Laos response to illegal logging and timber trafficking has been more effective than the response to wildlife crime. Provincial-centre politics and who benefits from timber and wildlife trade may be relevant factors. The projects response has been to turn to US law enforcement to target the most serious transnational criminal networks.

Assumption 2: Governments in the region remain committed to ending illegal trade in tigers, their parts and products.

Generally yes, governments remain committed on paper to ending illegal trade, but this position can be undermined by moves to maintain a legal market. This was evident in China in October 2018 (see Section 3.1 Output 2) (ref State Council decision) and reflected the outcome of a meeting between the Chinese Government and representatives of the wildlife breeding industry in March 2018, during which it emerged that some individuals within relevant Chinese Government departments remain committed to the promotion of commercial trade in parts and derivatives of protected species. The project's response was to continue advocating for the closure of domestic markets in tigers (and other big cats), including through CITES (see Annex 4).

Governments in project countries have also generally committed to applying anti-money laundering and anti-corruption legislation in wildlife crime cases. Research by the [UNODC](#) in 2017 and [RUSI](#) in 2018, reports that these measures were not widely applied. There are a handful of examples e.g. in China, India, Thailand, the USA but they not linked to this project

and are not specifically on tigers. The project attempted going through the UNODC to share information with the Laos FIU, but the FIU was unresponsive. The UNODC advises this is in part, but not wholly, a capacity issue. Beyond the project period, the partners will engage with [ECOFEEL](#), the Egmont Centre of FIU Excellence and Leadership. EIA has been liaising with the [UK-funded UNODC](#) project and under a separate IWT Challenge Fund Project (IWT 059), will prepare a regional tiger typology. It is anticipated that as these initiatives to engage the financial sector and FIUs expand and are sustained we will see more instances of ancillary laws being applied to tiger crime.

Assumption 3: Law enforcement agencies respond positively to independent findings.

Information provided to law enforcement in Lao PDR prior to and during the project has not resulted in targeted law enforcement. There have been seizures of tigers where trafficking was intercepted, and the project partners are aware of a flurry of activity in Luang Prabang to seize ivory in 2018, but no action taken against persistent ivory traders in Vientiane. There have not been any seizures or proactive investigations to target tiger bone wine manufacture and sale, or the trade in tiger, teeth, claw, bone, skin and meat from retail outlets or online. These targets are what the project partners consider “low hanging fruit”. With a lack of response to these targets careful consideration was given to sharing information with Laos authorities on some of the more significant transnational networks, including the networks run through and by the tiger farmers. The project researched linkages (confidential and sensitive report available upon request), between organised networks of tiger farmers and traders to politicians and bureaucrats and determined that the most secure option and the one most likely to lead to network disruption, was to share information with US law enforcement agencies (see Output 1.1 and Annex 4.3).

In Vietnam, response rates on cases reported by ENV are reasonable with a reduction in consumer crime reported to authorities averaging between 60-89%, where response rates are evaluated. For more serious cases, police partners tend to be responsive, though consistency of response remains a problem.

Thailand has not proven responsive to the sale of tiger bone glue at a tourist attraction targeted at Chinese and Vietnamese tour groups. The project response after continued enquiry with Thai authorities, was to release the information publicly (see Section 3.1, Output 1.1). This will be pursued beyond the project period, especially during CITES CoP18.

Assumption 4: Law enforcement agencies have the political support to take enable them to take action, including ensuring businesses comply with revised laws and regulations regarding keeping and breeding of tigers.

One particular area where this emerged as a significant challenge is in the Vietnamese Province of Nghe An. This Province is almost a secure hotspot for illegal wildlife traders and home to hundreds of households involved in keeping tigers for slaughter (see Output 1.1). A number of individuals considered pivotal to the tiger and other illegal wildlife trade are from there or have well-established connections there. Authorities in Vietnam have long been appraised regarding the continued trade in parts and derivatives of captive bred tigers in [Nghe An Province](#).

In September 2018, ENV held a series of meetings with leadership within the Province including with the People’s Committee and relevant agencies to address the issue. Subsequent communications were also initiated with the Secretary of the Provincial Communist Party aimed at promoting and mobilising Provincial authorities to actively enforce the law in the affected district; “lifting the protective veil” over tiger traffickers in three districts where there are a reported 100 or more tigers from Laos being raised by individual households.

It is however an area where police have struggled to operate and take action against wildlife criminals, partly because of social tensions and sensitivities, but also because of mob violence. Beyond the project period, the partners will seek alternative channels to engage with community leaders.

The project partners have received information from confidential but reliable sources about the hesitant and long-delayed approach being taken by Laos authorities to the tiger farm preliminary inspection, the full audit and establishing an independent expert advisory committee. Officials appear reluctant to conduct a thorough job and are reportedly overly

deferential to the tiger farm owners and managers. Given the associations with high ranking politicians, the history of government permission for breeding and trading tigers, and the criminality associated with the tiger farms, this has proven to be a long-term problem. The project has attempted to address this through exposes and challenges at CITES meetings and will continue to do so beyond the project period. It is likely this will only change if it receives Prime Ministerial attention and it may require calls for CITES trade suspensions to get on his radar.

Output Assumptions:

- Output 1:

Assumption 1: Governments are genuinely committed to ending illegal wildlife trade and will respond appropriately to the independent research findings from the project.

See no.1 above

Assumption 2: The influence to date of foreign government and IGO delegations and donors continues and is strengthened

With regard to Laos, the project partners believe foreign government representatives and IGO delegations continue to have a critical role in engaging the Laos government, but we are aware of the greater financial influence of China and suspect this may be a factor in impeding law enforcement and policy relating to tiger farms. The project partners response has been to continue to use CITES as an open forum to address Laos obligations and poor performance against CITES adopted resolutions and decisions.

- Output 2:

Assumption 1: The influence to date of foreign government and IGO delegations and donors continues and is strengthened

See above (Output 1, Assumption 2)

Assumption 2: Existing affordable technology behind DNA and stripe pattern profiling databases is shared.

Freely available stripe pattern profile analysis software is available and Microsoft AI technology for snow leopard could be amended but not within the project period or, given resources, within project control. Towards the end of the project, TRACE Forensics notified the project partners and other stakeholders of the limitations on the application of DNA forensics to assist in fighting tiger crime, in part due to the absence of a global standardised protocol for tiger DNA testing and profiling, and an insufficient tiger DNA reference database (in turn related to government willingness to DNA inventory, monitor and inspect captive tiger facilities). The project partners response within the project period has been to promote the use at the very least, of stripe pattern profiling. Beyond the project period, we would be happy to act as supporters for funding applications by TRACE Forensics to address this.

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

The project raises awareness of the criminality and corruption fuelling tiger and other wildlife trade and the harmful impacts of such trade not only on biodiversity but also on governance, civil society and economies. Thus, the project contributes towards all four IWT Challenge Fund objectives and commitments under the London Declarations and Kasane Statement with a particular focus on strengthening law enforcement and ensuring effective legal frameworks. EIA has provided the UK Government with briefings and recommendations to tackle tiger farming, trade and other wildlife trade, including comprehensive recommendations for the [2018 London IWT Conference](#) and key briefings to high-level UK Government representatives (see Annex 4.18).

6. Impact on species in focus

The project focused on conserving wild tiger populations which are under extreme pressure due to demand for tiger parts and products and the profitability of these parts and products for criminal networks, traders and corrupt actors involved in the trade. There are no species/population-based indicators in the logframe as the project's activities do not directly focus on wild populations, and EIA, as an organisation, is not involved in any species monitoring. However, it is presumed that, since poaching and trafficking pose the primary threat to the survival of wild tigers, mitigating this threat by sharing information on regional criminal networks involved in the trade with enforcement authorities, as well as addressing the role of captive tiger facilities in the illegal trade, is essential to the conservation of the species.

Welcome news in India regarding a higher population of tigers counted, whilst encouraging, requires tempering against the fact that wild tiger populations in south east Asia have declined as a result of poaching for body parts. In January 2019, Cambodia confirmed all their tigers have been wiped out, Vietnamese poachers and traffickers have rampaged across Malaysia, while Myanmar has reported a significant decline.

The call for the closure of domestic markets, the destruction of stockpiles and the phasing out of tiger farms that stimulates demand is all the more urgent.

7. Project support to poverty alleviation

The main beneficiaries of the project are government agencies in the project countries responsible for law enforcement and criminal justice.

Since the project is not working directly with communities, the poverty impacts are anticipated as being indirect through reduced corruption, improved rule of law and good governance. The project impact in this regard has not yet been realised but has been activated through the submission of information on the dynamics of transnational criminal networks involved in tiger and other wildlife crime to law enforcement, primarily to agencies external to Laos. There is low expectation of Laos national law enforcement agency responses to disrupt the networks involved because key actors in the trade have political patronage and are associated with serious criminality. The Laos law enforcement agencies do not currently appear empowered or able to combat them (reference Output 1). The targets 16.4 and 16.5 under Sustainable Development Goal 16 reflect the relationship between combating illicit financial flows, organised crime, corruption and bribery as critical to peaceful and inclusive societies for sustainable development.

8. Consideration of gender equality issues

There are not expected to be any direct gender equality impacts from this project and there are no gender related indicators in the logframe. We advocate for intelligence led enforcement to tackle those involved in tiger trade regardless of gender. Throughout the project both men and women have been identified as involved in tiger farming, tiger and other associated wildlife trade.

One of the open markets identified for tiger and wildlife crime, the GTSEZ, is known to be where women and girls are [trafficked for prostitution](#) in the region. Where these crime types overlap elsewhere, it is hoped that the exposure of criminal networks for their role in wildlife crime would bring attention to other activities, positively impacting on women and girls by curtailing their operations. We have not uncovered this crime type being perpetrated by other wildlife crime networks we are currently looking at, but if we do we will report it to law enforcement.

9. Lessons learnt

The primary lesson learned is that a two-year project timeframe is insufficient to see the desired Outputs and Outcomes achieved to their full extent. This is often due to the time between submission of intelligence and law enforcement response. If the intelligence is feeding into an existing law enforcement investigation, even receptive law enforcement agencies will take time to build their case before issuing arrest warrants. Longer project timeframes support a

sustained and continuous feed of information generated by the project and long-term relationship building with responsive and potentially responsive law enforcement. Where possible in future, the partners will seek longer-term funding, and in the event we are only able to access short-term funding we would ensure the project plan re-evaluates expectations of law enforcement responses within the project period.

The start-up period and recruitment for the project was longer than anticipated, which we addressed through an early change request, but the knock-on effects of that were intensified project activity in the subsequent year and only two months to focus on activity delivery. All partners have commented on how they feel we were all just building momentum under the project, generating new leads and gaining deeper insights into the networks, legislative loopholes and government complicity, when the project came to an end. In practice we will continue to work together (see the Section on Project Partnerships) and in the future we would build in a project start up period. This would include bringing all partner Finance Officers to an initial face-to-face meeting to streamline as much as possible budget reforecasting, so that change request applications if required could be submitted in a fashion.

EIA and WFFT needed greater human resources than budgeted for to deliver activity and had to draw on staff time from other projects. In future applications, to DEFRA or other donors, we would include at least one member of staff in the lead organisation at 100% on the project, covering advocacy and project administration. We would also seek funding for two fulltime Field Operatives for Wildlife Friends Foundation Thailand and a fulltime Field Operative for Education for Nature Vietnam.

9.1 Monitoring and evaluation

There were no major changes in the project design. The M&E system was converted into a questionnaire used to guide partners information delivery for the purposes of reporting.

During the project period, EIA personnel met face-to-face with the partners bilaterally on seven occasions, and where applicable conferenced the other partner in by Skype. Given the requirement for joint field missions with WFFT and information sharing between all three partners, the partners corresponded regularly, particularly the Field Operatives. Communication of information on persons and companies of interested was conducted through secure means e.g. Virtru and encrypted social media platforms.

All three partner organisations met face-to-face once to discuss operational progress and tactics. The priority topic of deliberation was to reevaluate who the best law enforcement stakeholders were for different packages of information, and the best means of disrupting the criminal networks and activities in the event of a lack of response from national law enforcement e.g. liaising with US law enforcement instead, deciding what information could be released publicly, when and how. Correspondence between the partners was otherwise via Skype / WhatsApp calls to consult on progress and planning around field missions, dissemination of information to law enforcement and communications materials to CITES and other stakeholders.

As per the Section on Project Partnerships, the partners will maintain a working relationship and have prepared an application for further funding. Irrespective of the success or otherwise with a new application to DEFRA, EIA will meet with partners in the autumn of 2019 to evaluate the project, using that opportunity to refine any application to be submitted to DEFRA or other donors.

9.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

Reference to the project was included on a relevant page of the EIA website as per the suggestion, <https://eia-international.org/wildlife/saving-tigers/tiger-farming/>, and in the [Eradicating the market for big cats](#) briefing prepared for the 2018 London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade.

For the other review comments related to M&E, see above.

10. Other comments on achievements not covered elsewhere

Through the course of the project, EIA investigators have provided training for the Field Operative recruited by WFFT under this project, through dedicated training sessions and through shadowing and support during field investigations. The Field Operative already had extensive experience in the management of captive wildlife, conservation policy and practice, and can now add field mission practice and security, and open source intelligence gathering to their skill set. This new capacity with a Thai speaker has proven hugely beneficial to the project and to WFFT, who will maintain the post beyond the project period.

In January 2019, EIA travelled to Thailand primarily for the purposes of download and analysis of information from investigations with project partners. The opportunity arose to take part in a workshop on investigating wildlife trade online, attended by Thai and Laotian enforcement agencies, as well as a number of NGOs from across South East Asia. EIA gave a presentation and ran a workshop on investigating wildlife trade on WeChat, and were assured by several attendees, including from Laos enforcement, that they would continue to use the tool in their work.

The findings of research under Activity 3.2 not only led to the preparation of bilingual briefings for the seven major Chinese tourism companies and forums, and to online commentary and information dissemination on the websites and online forums question, (see Section 3.2, Output 3.2 and Annex 2, Activity 3.2), it uncovered adverts for tours to Russia and North Korea. The geographic scope and scale of “tiger trade tourism” is far greater than previously documented. The project was not able to cover all of this within the project period but is an aspect that EIA will continue to work on.

11. Sustainability and legacy

The project partners in Thailand and Vietnam have an established profile with national authorities, UK and US Embassies and NGOs in-country and their activity on the issues and project objectives are well-known. EIA has engaged with the UK and US in Laos, as well as with Technical Law Enforcement Advisors to the Laos government, NGOs in Laos and IGOs with projects in Laos. Activity at CITES and other international conferences ensures global coverage of the issues, objectives and project activity and outputs.

Project partners reports, maps of seizures and tiger farm locations are available on the lead organisations website, and clearly indicate that the data behind the maps is available for anyone seeking to conduct further research and analysis.

The achievements around Output 1 in particular are likely to endure as the partners continue to liaise with law enforcement and policy makers beyond the project period. Responsive law enforcement agencies now have a greater understanding of tiger crime and the networks involved. WFFT will continue with farm visits and in-depth research to monitor activities in and from facilities in Thailand. ENV will continue with field and desk research and their increasingly productive relationship with Vietnamese law enforcement agencies. EIA is committed to continuing to investigate tiger crime in the Mekong and is currently seeking new funding for this work

12. IWT Challenge Fund Identity

Regarding advertising the IWT Challenge Fund as a UK Government funding stream see Section on Actions taken in response to annual report reviews.

The funding and project were recognised as a stand-alone project but as reflected above has resulted in the continued interest in the partners in regional collaboration.

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 (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here)

To be forwarded in a subsequent communication.

14. Finance and administration

14.1 Project expenditure

| Project spend (indicative) since last annual report | 2019/20 Grant (£) | 2019/20 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) | | | | |
| Audit costs | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | |

| Staff employed 2019/2020 (Name and position) | Cost 2019/2020 (£) |
|--|--------------------|
| Campaign Leader (Debbie Banks) | |
| Senior Field Operative (Name Withheld) | |
| Senior Crime Analyst (John Broome) | |
| Senior Wildlife Campaigner (Shruti Suresh) | |
| Visual Media Editor (Chris Milnes) | |
| Field Operative (Name Withheld) | |
| Senior Technical Advisor (Douglas Hendrie) | |
| Field Operative (Name Withheld) | |
| Analyst (Name Withheld) | |
| Director (Edwin Wiek) | |
| Field Operative (Name withheld) | |
| | |
| | |
| TOTAL | |

| 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 (£) |
|---|---------------------------------|
| | |
| TOTAL | |

| Other items – description <i>Please provide a detailed breakdown for any single item over £1000</i> | Other items – cost (£) |
|---|-------------------------------|
| | |
| TOTAL | |

| Project spend (indicative) since last annual report | 2018/19 Grant (£) | 2018/19 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) | | | | |
| Audit costs | | | | |
| TOTAL | | | | |

| Staff employed (Name and position) | Cost (£) |
|--|-----------------|
| Debbie Banks- CAMPAIGN LEADER (TIGERS & WILDLIFE CRIMES) | |
| John Broome- SNR INTELLIGENCE OFFICER | |
| Chris Milnes- VISUAL COMMS LIBRARY OFFICER | |
| Shruti Suresh- SNR WILDLIFE CAMPAIGNER | |
| SENIOR FIELD OPERATIVE (Name Withheld) | |
| FIELD OPERATIVE (Name Withheld | |
| Director (Edwin Wiek) | |
| Field Operative (name withheld) | |
| Senior Technical Advisor (Douglas Hendrie) | |
| Field Operative (Name Withheld) | |
| Analyst (Marin Tournier, Eric Ortiz Blanco) | |

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| TOTAL | |
| 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 (£) |
| | |
| TOTAL | |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Other items – description <i>Please provide a detailed breakdown for any single item over £1000</i> | Other items – cost (£) |
| | |
| TOTAL | |

14.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

| Source of funding for project lifetime | Total (£) |
|--|-----------|
| S RHODES | |
| Ernest Kleinwort Charitable Trust | |
| Adessium Foundation | |
| BELLANDI | |
| Anonymous | |
| RUFFORD | |
| ANTHONY RAE | |
| TOTAL | |

| Source of funding for additional work after project lifetime | Total (£) |
|--|-----------|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| TOTAL | |

14.3 Value for Money

Where possible the partners combined travel for M&E purposes with travel for advocacy purposes to gain value for money spent on international flights. As much as possible, travel was planned in advance in order to reduce costs. Design and production costs were reduced as EIA had recruited an in-house designer during the project. Translation costs were reduced by going through in-country translators rather than translation providers based in the UK.

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 |
|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Impact: The disruption of organised wildlife crime networks and the reduction of corruption as an impediment to the recovery of wild tiger populations, effective governance and sustainable development in Lao PDR.</p> | | | |
| <p>Outcome: Increased cooperation between law enforcement agencies in all project countries (Lao PDR, China, Vietnam, Thailand) involving increased use of specialised investigation techniques leads to seizures, arrests and prosecutions against wildlife criminals operating in and through Lao PDR.</p> | <p>0.1 By June 2019, information generated by the project partners prompts an increase in prosecution of major criminals and businesses involved in wild and captive tiger trade in and through Lao PDR and their associates in the other project countries (Vietnam, Thailand, China) from zero prosecutions of major criminals in project countries (between 2010 and 2016) to 5 arrests leading to prosecutions</p> <p>0.2 By June 2019, engagement with relevant agencies in the project countries leads to increased application of ancillary laws, including anti-corruption and anti-money laundering legislation, against major criminals engaged in tiger crime from one case in one project country (Thailand in 2014) to 3 cases in the project</p> | <p>For all indicators 0.1 to 0.3: Video stills and notes from field research by project partners Reports from INTERPOL Project Predator Reports to CITES Secretariat (as per Resolutions, Decisions & Article XIII requirements) Court case records where available. Correspondence between project partners and law enforcement personnel in police, customs, forest agencies, anti-corruption and financial investigation units and members of the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) (INTERPOL, WCO, CITES Secretariat, UNODC) Reports and correspondence with other stakeholders in the region such as other relevant NGOs, the SDG 15.7 Working Group in Lao PDR and foreign government delegations</p> | <p>Multiple initiatives to strengthen wildlife law enforcement capacity in Lao PDR are successful.</p> <p>Governments in the region remain committed to ending illegal trade in tigers, their parts and products.</p> <p>Law enforcement agencies respond positively to independent findings.</p> <p>Law enforcement agencies have the political support to take enable them to take action, including ensuring businesses comply with revised laws and regulations regarding keeping and breeding of tigers.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | <p>countries (including Lao PDR, Vietnam, Thailand and China).</p> <p>0.3 By June 2019, law and policy changes lead to a 20% decline in the population of captive tigers in the region that are bred for trade in their parts and products from a baseline of estimated 2,329 in Thailand, Lao PDR and Vietnam in 2016 to 1,865 tigers.</p> | | |
| <p>Outputs:</p> <p>1. Independent information, analysis and regional criminal network maps using intelligence analysis software are shared with the law enforcement community, including specialist investigation agencies, prosecutors and with key international stakeholders, enabling improved collation, analysis and sharing of information on regional tiger crime networks, to secure prosecutions and recover assets.</p> | <p>1.1 By June 2019, an increase in the number of regional tiger crime networks that will be mapped by project partners from a baseline of 2 in 2016 to a target of 4.</p> <p>1.2 By June 2019, an increase in the number of tiger crime networks that will come under investigation by financial investigation units and anti-corruption units in the project countries from a baseline of 1 in 2016 to a target of 4.</p> <p>1.3 By June 2019 an increase in the number of tiger crime cases involving transnational networks where prosecutors and the judiciary in the project countries treat wildlife crime as a serious crime facilitating mutual legal assistance under the UN Convention on Transnational Organised Crime and supporting the imposition of deterrent sentencing, including the recovery of proceeds of crime. Baseline to be established in project first quarter following</p> | <p>For all indicators 1.1 to 1.3: Government reports to CITES INTERPOL Project Predator reports Court records Project partner correspondence with law enforcement (police, customs, forest, border), financial investigation units, anti-corruption units, ICCWC members Video, stills and notes from field research by project partners Reports and correspondence with other stakeholders in the region such as other relevant NGOs and foreign government delegations, including the SDG 15.7 Working Group in Lao PDR Media reports</p> | <p>As implementation rests with government agencies assumes that governments are genuinely committed to ending illegal wildlife trade and will respond appropriately to the independent research findings from the project. Assumes the influence to date of foreign government and IGO delegations and donors continues and is strengthened</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | <p>consolidation and analysis of incidents and case files by partners. Target to be determined accordingly.</p> <p>Based on review of cases, propose that target be set at by June 2019, an increase from 1 tiger case to 4.</p> | | |
| <p>2.</p> <p>Advocacy leads to changes in national laws and regulations in Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam, governing captive tiger facilities, disposal of specimens, methods of auditing and monitoring captive specimens, facilitating law enforcement investigations and prosecutions.</p> | <p>2.1 By June 2019, increase in number of countries preparing amendments to national laws and regulations to restrict the keeping and breeding of tigers from a baseline of 0 in 2016 to a target of 3.</p> <p>2.2 By June 2019, the number of project countries declaring the volume of stockpiles of tiger parts and products, consolidating and destroying them, increases from 0 in 2016 to 3.</p> <p>2.3 By June 2019, the number of DNA and/or stripe pattern profiles databases in the project countries that are operational and used for law enforcement increases from a baseline of 2 fledgling databases in 2016 to a target of 3 fully functional databases</p> <p>2.4 By June 2019, there is an increase in the number of occasions where stripe pattern profiles of tigers seized in the project countries are cross-referenced against databases of wild and captive tigers across all tiger range countries, for law</p> | <p>For 2.1 Government announcements, and amendments tabled for consideration in Parliament / Assembly</p> <p>For all indicators 2.1 to 2.6: Government reports to CITES INTERPOL Project Predator reports, Strategic Review Local NGO and media reports Correspondence with law enforcement agencies and forensic specialists</p> | <p>Assumes the influence to date of foreign government delegations and donors continues and is strengthened</p> <p>Assumes existing affordable technology behind DNA and stripe pattern profiling databases will be shared.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | enforcement purposes, from a baseline of 1 reported analysis in 2015, to 10. | | |
| <p>3. Compelling campaign materials raise global political, public and NGO awareness of criminality and corruption associated with the trade in wild and captive source tigers, thereby mobilising support from a wide range of stakeholders for law and policy reform to phase out tiger farms and strengthen enforcement.</p> | <p>3.1 By June 2019, an increase in global media posts quoting officials linking tiger crime to serious organised crime and corruption from a baseline of an average of 5 officials quoted per year in 2010-2016, to 15.</p> <p>3.2 By June 2019, an increase in NGO public appeals such as sign-ons and campaign alerts, and demand reduction campaigns that call for an end to tiger farming and trade in captive bred tiger parts from 5 public appeals and 1 demand reduction campaign in 2016 to 10 and 4 respectively.</p> <p>3.3 An increase in tour operator and travel forums that discourage tourists from visiting facilities where tigers are suspected to end up in trade for parts and products in 2018 and 2019 from one major targeted campaign in 2016 to 3 by June 2019, including in all relevant languages</p> | Mainstream and social media reports and forums | |
| <p>Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)</p> <p>1.1 Collation (desk-based and field), and analysis of existing tiger crime incidents, trade observations, profiling of individuals and companies, captive tiger facilities, role of corruption and status of any court cases across the project countries.</p> <p>1.2 Undertake field research principally in Lao PDR, but as necessary in the other project countries, to document tiger crime incidents, captive tiger facilities, and associated criminal networks operating across the region.</p> <p>1.3 Prepare tactical and strategic analytic products, problem and subject profiles, typologies, transnational criminal network maps for national law enforcement agencies, ICCWC members, specialist investigators and prosecutors, where appropriate containing nominal information.</p> | | | |

- 1.4 Disseminate findings long-distance and during one-to-one meetings, with national law enforcement personnel, financial investigation and anti-corruption units, ICCWC members and key members of the SDG 15.7 Working Group.
- 1.5 Produce sanitised technical briefings profiling trade hubs and facilities complicit in illegal trade, trafficking routes and modus operandi, and disseminate to government, officials, donors and NGOs in the lead up to and during meetings of INTERPOL, the CITES Standing Committee, the 18th Conference of the Parties to CITES, the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ), United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime (UNTOC), United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), Global Tiger Initiative (GTI), the Asia Development Bank (ADB), and Illegal Wildlife Trade conferences.
- 2.1 Analyse legal frameworks governing tigers in captivity in Thailand (already completed for Lao PDR, Vietnam and China).
- 2.2 Prepare briefing documents to propose amendments to legislation regarding the regulation and monitoring of the keeping/breeding of tigers in captive facilities and the disposal of specimens in the interests of preventing illegal trade in captive-sourced specimens.
- 2.3 Liaise with the legislature, foreign government delegations, donors, local NGOs, private sector / industry and media to encourage adoption of proposed amendments
- 2.4 Collate and analyse information on facilities that keep or breed tigers, and/or launder illegally-acquired tigers.
- 2.5 Undertake field research to document illegal activity at captive tiger facilities in Thailand, Lao PDR, China and Vietnam and produce technical briefings as per Activities 1.3 and 1.5
- 2.6 Liaise with forensic specialists and donors to promote the completion and application of DNA and stripe pattern profile databases for registered captive tigers.
- 3.1 Prepare multi-lingual infographics, films and photo-stories for public distribution to share findings from field research and analysis.
- 3.2 Release profiles of captive facilities engaged in illegal trade in tiger parts and products, and circulate online, including on travel forums to target visiting public
- 3.3 Update existing publicly available interactive map on location and size of tiger farms in Asia including additional information and images as appropriate.

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>Impact</p> <p>The disruption of organised wildlife crime networks and the reduction of corruption as an impediment to the recovery of wild tiger populations, effective governance and sustainable development in Lao PDR.</p> | | <p>Action in Vietnam will disrupt activity of one Laos-based network beyond the project period. Ongoing investigations by US law enforcement will also impact another significant network that is operating out of Laos, again beyond the project period. Whether this will reduce corruption depends on the prosecution and the exposure of government complicity and corruption. If these cases are concluded and the networks disrupted, it will indicate a more genuine and sincere effort to treat wildlife crime as serious crime. The recovery of wild tigers in the project countries will also be dependent on government willingness to change policies and practice, to value wild tigers for their ecosystem value as opposed to the sum value of their body parts. The project highlights how the current policies, including farming tigers for their body parts, are incompatible with wild tiger population recovery and are therefore eliminating the possibility of potential benefits to future generations.</p> |
| <p>Outcome</p> <p>Increased cooperation between law enforcement agencies in all project countries (Lao PDR, China, Vietnam, Thailand) involving increased use of specialised investigation techniques leads to seizures, arrests and prosecutions against wildlife criminals operating in and through Lao PDR.</p> | <p>0.1 By June 2019, information generated by the project partners prompts an increase in prosecution of major criminals and businesses involved in wild and captive tiger trade in and through Lao PDR and their associates in the other project countries (Vietnam, Thailand, China) from zero prosecutions of major criminals in project countries (between 2010 and 2016) to 5 arrests leading to prosecutions</p> <p>0.2 By June 2019, engagement with relevant agencies in the project countries leads to increased application of ancillary laws, including anti-corruption and anti-money laundering legislation, against major criminals engaged in tiger crime from one case in one</p> | <p>Reliable and actionable information was generated and provided by the project to law enforcement agencies, but on the most part was not actioned by government agencies in the project countries with the exception of Vietnam. There was very little sign of real enforcement cooperation between agencies within the project countries, or between the project countries, over the project period. The gap between the commitment of project country governments to combat illegal wildlife trade on paper, and the implementation of those commitments in reality still appears to be too great.</p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | <p>project country (Thailand in 2014) to 3 cases in the project countries (including Lao PDR, Vietnam, Thailand and China).</p> <p>0.3 By June 2019, law and policy changes lead to a 20% decline in the population of captive tigers in the region that are bred for trade in their parts and products from a baseline of estimated 2,329 in Thailand, Lao PDR and Vietnam in 2016 to 1,865 tigers.</p> | |
| <p>Output 1.</p> <p>Independent information, analysis and regional criminal network maps using intelligence analysis software are shared with the law enforcement community, including specialist investigation agencies, prosecutors and with key international stakeholders, enabling improved collation, analysis and sharing of information on regional tiger crime networks, to secure prosecutions and recover assets.</p> | <p>1.1 By June 2019, an increase in the number of regional tiger crime networks that will be mapped by project partners from a baseline of 2 in 2016 to a target of 4.</p> <p>1.2 By June 2019, an increase in the number of tiger crime networks that will come under investigation by financial investigation units and anti-corruption units in the project countries from a baseline of 1 in 2016 to a target of 4.</p> <p>1.3 By June 2019 an increase in the number of tiger crime cases involving transnational networks where prosecutors and the judiciary in the project countries treat wildlife crime as a serious crime facilitating mutual legal assistance under the UN Convention on Transnational Organised Crime and supporting the imposition of deterrent sentencing, including the recovery of proceeds of crime. Baseline to be established in project first quarter following consolidation and analysis of incidents and case files by partners. Target to be determined accordingly.</p> <p>Based on review of cases, propose that target be set at by June 2019, an</p> | <p>Indicator 1.1 was appropriate, was within the control of the project and was completed. Evidence is provided in section 3.1 of the report with hyperlinks, and in Annexes 4.3 to 4.10</p> <p>Indicator 1.2 was appropriate if the commitments of project country governments were implemented. The US government took action against one network, see hyperlink in Section 3.1</p> <p>Indicator 1.3 was appropriate and partially completed in that 6 tiger cases resulted in more than 4 years jail term (the minimum under UNTOC definitions for serious crime), though there was no mutual legal assistance between countries to investigate the networks. See section 3.1 and Annex 4.11</p> |

| | | |
|--------------|---|---|
| | increase from 1 tiger case to 4 | |
| Activity 1.1 | Collation (desk-based and field), and analysis of existing tiger crime incidents, trade observations, profiling of individuals and companies, captive tiger facilities, role of corruption and status of any court cases across the project countries. | Completed |
| Activity 1.2 | Undertake field research principally in Lao PDR, but as necessary in the other project countries, to document tiger crime incidents, captive tiger facilities, and associated criminal networks operating across the region. | Completed (48 field missions of varying time periods in Thailand, Laos and Vietnam) |
| Activity 1.3 | Prepare tactical and strategic analytic products, problem and subject profiles, typologies, transnational criminal network maps for national law enforcement agencies, ICCWC members, specialist investigators and prosecutors, where appropriate containing nominal information. | Largely completed except for a financial typology (will be completed beyond project period). |
| Activity 1.4 | Disseminate findings long-distance and during one-to-one meetings, with national law enforcement personnel, financial investigation and anti-corruption units, ICCWC members and key members of the SDG 15.7 Working Group. | Completed direct disseminations to US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Drug Enforcement Agency, UN Office on Drugs and Crime (ICCWC member), Department of National Parks (Thailand), Department of Forestry Inspection (Laos), Police (Vietnam and Thailand), With the exception of the US DEA, disseminations included written and face-to-face briefings. Sanitised verbal, face-to-face briefing to non-enforcement personnel in the UK and US Embassy in Laos, and the UK Embassy in Thailand outlining findings. |
| Activity 1.5 | Produce sanitised technical briefings profiling trade hubs and facilities complicit in illegal trade, trafficking routes and modus operandi, and disseminate to government, officials, donors and NGOs in the lead up to and during meetings of INTERPOL, the CITES Standing Committee, the 18th Conference of the Parties to CITES, the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (CCPCJ), United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime (UNTOC), United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC), Global Tiger Initiative (GTI), the Asia Development Bank (ADB), and Illegal Wildlife Trade conferences. | Largely completed, examples include: Report released for 69 th Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in 2017: Cultivating Demand Briefing for the 70 th Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in 2018: See Annex 4.13 Briefings for the London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade in 2018: , Eradicating the market for big cats and All Eyes On London. Briefing for the 18 th Conference of the Parties to CITES: See Annex 4.17 Restricted distribution briefing for the Global Tiger Forum, see Annex 4.24, also distributed <i>Eradicating the market for big cats</i> at the Global Tiger Forum and Global Tiger Initiative meeting in January 2019 |

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | | Briefings were not prepared for CCPCJ, UNTOC and UNCAC at this point but following anticipated US law enforcement actions, briefings will be prepared beyond the project period. |
| <p>Output 2.</p> <p>Advocacy leads to changes in national laws and regulations in Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam, governing captive tiger facilities, disposal of specimens, methods of auditing and monitoring captive specimens, facilitating law enforcement investigations and prosecutions.</p> | <p>2.1 By June 2019, increase in number of countries preparing amendments to national laws and regulations to restrict the keeping and breeding of tigers from a baseline of 0 in 2016 to a target of 3.</p> <p>2.2 By June 2019, the number of project countries declaring the volume of stockpiles of tiger parts and products, consolidating and destroying them, increases from 0 in 2016 to 3.</p> <p>2.3 By June 2019, the number of DNA and/or stripe pattern profiles databases in the project countries that are operational and used for law enforcement increases from a baseline of 2 fledgling databases in 2016 to a target of 3 fully functional databases</p> <p>2.4 By June 2019, there is an increase in the number of occasions where stripe pattern profiles of tigers seized in the project countries are cross-referenced against databases of wild and captive tigers across all tiger range countries, for law enforcement purposes, from a baseline of 1 reported analysis in 2015, to 10.</p> | <p>Indicator 2.1 is appropriate but only partially complete in Thailand and Laos, complete in Vietnam (but not well enforced), while the situation in China has not improved (see Section 3.1).</p> <p>Indicator 2.2. is appropriate and is a matter Parties to CITES have been asked to report to the CITES Secretariat. None of the project Parties have provided such information.</p> <p>Indicator 2.3 is appropriate based on claims and commitments that two project country governments have made. In fact, the Thai databases have not been completed, the Vietnamese ones are not being applied, Laos only began taking DNA and stripe patterns in 2019 and there is no transparency in China. (see Section 3.1)</p> <p>Indicator 2.4 is appropriate as it is a very low cost and low technology activity. There has been no progress.</p> |
| <p>Activity 2.1.</p> <p>Analyse legal frameworks governing tigers in captivity in Thailand (already completed for Lao PDR, Vietnam and China).</p> | | Completed. |
| <p>Activity 2.2</p> <p>Prepare briefing documents to propose amendments to legislation regarding the regulation and monitoring of the keeping/breeding of tigers in captive facilities and the disposal of specimens in the interests of preventing illegal trade in captive-sourced specimens.</p> | | <p>Partially completed.</p> <p>In Thailand founder and Director of WFFT (Edwin Wiek) sat on the Parliamentary Committee that drafted new legislation and will be advising on the associated Ministerial Regulations to implement it. This will be beyond the project period.</p> <p>A briefing document has been prepared for dissemination to CITES associated</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>with Laos new wildlife farming guidelines (based on an unofficial copy of the guidelines), outside of project period.</p> <p>EIA prepared three proposals to amend Chinese legislation on keeping/breeding of tigers in captivity, trade in such specimens and disposal of stockpiles, updated following the repeal of the ban on use of tiger bone in medicine (See Annex 4.19).</p> |
| <p>Activity 2.3</p> <p>Liaise with the legislature, foreign government delegations, donors, local NGOs, private sector / industry and media to encourage adoption of proposed amendments</p> | <p>Partially completed.</p> <p>EIA liaised with NGOs based in Laos regarding legislative amendments to the penal code and the CITES law.</p> <p>ENV and WFFT liaised directly with law makers in Vietnam and Thailand respectively.</p> <p>EIA liaised with the UK and US Embassies in China, and with members of the China's National People's Congress (NPC) via a third party.</p> <p>EIA liaised with the delegations of the UK, EU, USA and India ahead of the 69th and 70th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee.</p> <p>EIA has liaised with UK Parliamentarians over actions required primarily in China</p> <p>All project partners have liaised with the media. EIA had been briefing the Washington Post since Jun 2018 regarding the long-form article published in May 2019, and Grain Media since January 2017 (they are currently making a film for BBC on tiger trade in the project countries, scheduled for broadcast in early 2020). Examples of additional media coverage related to the need for legislative and policy reform is in Annex 4.2</p> |
| <p>Activity 2.4</p> <p>Collate and analyse information on facilities that keep or breed tigers, and/or launder illegally-acquired tigers.</p> | <p>Completed for Laos and Vietnam</p> <p>Largely completed for Thailand (there are more facilities than were documented at the start of the project).</p> <p>Completed from desk-based research for China</p> <p>See Annex 4.1 and Annex 4.21</p> |
| <p>Activity 2.5</p> <p>Undertake field research to document illegal activity at captive tiger facilities in Thailand, Lao PDR, China and Vietnam and produce technical briefings as per Activities 1.3 and 1.5</p> | <p>Partially completed.</p> <p>Field research conducted in Thailand, Laos and Vietnam (not China).</p> |
| <p>Activity 2.6</p> <p>Liaise with forensic specialists and donors to promote the completion and application of DNA and stripe pattern profile databases for registered captive</p> | <p>EIA provided a template spreadsheet confidentially to contacts involved in the Laos tiger farm audit, including fields to document information captured on stripe patterns and DNA. (see Annex 4.22 and Annex 4.23.)</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| tigers. | | The partners liaised with TRACE Forensics |
| <p>Output 3.</p> <p>Compelling campaign materials raise global political, public and NGO awareness of criminality and corruption associated with the trade in wild and captive source tigers, thereby mobilising support from a wide range of stakeholders for law and policy reform to phase out tiger farms and strengthen enforcement.</p> | <p>3.1 By June 2019, an increase in global media posts quoting officials linking tiger crime to serious organised crime and corruption from a baseline of an average of 5 officials quoted per year in 2010-2016, to 15.</p> <p>3.2 By June 2019, an increase in NGO public appeals such as sign-ons and campaign alerts, and demand reduction campaigns that call for an end to tiger farming and trade in captive bred tiger parts from 5 public appeals and 1 demand reduction campaign in 2016 to 10 and 4 respectively.</p> <p>3.3 An increase in tour operator and travel forums that discourage tourists from visiting facilities where tigers are suspected to end up in trade for parts and products in 2018 and 2019 from one major targeted campaign in 2016 to 3 by June 2019, including in all relevant languages</p> | <p>Indicator 3.1 was ambitious. There have been numerous media posts about tiger trade, tiger farming and several covering the links between tiger crime, serious crime and corruption. A notable example includes a longform article in The Washington Post (see Annex 4.2 and Annex 4.14), to which the project partners contributed anonymously. Though these do not necessarily quote officials, examples of high profile individuals drawing the connection between illegal wildlife trade in general, and corruption and serious crime is referenced in section 3.1</p> <p>Indicator 3.2 is appropriate and there has been progress with four major international NGOs launching or re-launching their tiger farm campaigns i.e. Born Free, WWF, World Animal Protection and 4PAWS. ENV has launched a demand reduction campaign, and USAID's Wildlife Asia programme has conducted preliminary research on consumer demographics. There has not been as much progress with public appeals with four appeals noted over the project period:</p> <p>https://ladyfreethinker.org/petition-stop-chinas-devastating-plan-legalize-tiger-bones-rhino-horns/</p> <p>https://secure.avaaz.org/campaign/en/tiger_farms_11/</p> <p>https://www.thepetitionsite.com/takeaction/900/013/141/</p> <p>https://focusingonwildlife.com/news/poll-should-chinas-shameful-tiger-farms-be-closed-down/</p> <p>Indicator 3.3 is appropriate and there has been some progress but not to the extent that there are three stand out campaigns in relevant languages. The World Travel and Tourism Council co-ordinated the 2018 Travel & Tourism Council Declaration on Illegal Trade in Wildlife, but one of the signatories was identified during the project as providing a platform for promoting travel to inappropriate captive tiger facilities (see Section 3.1. Neither C-Trip nor WTTC have responded adequately. Advocacy is ongoing beyond the project period.</p> |
| <p>Activity 3.1</p> <p>Prepare multi-lingual infographics, films and photo-stories for public distribution to share findings from field research and analysis.</p> | | <p>Partially completed due to request from US law enforcement not to disclose information that may jeopardise their ongoing investigations.</p> <p>In addition to outputs at Activity 1.5 (e.g. Cultivating Demand and Eradicating the market for big cats), EIA has presented on the demand drivers and the role of tiger farms at the Conservation Asia conference in 2018, and the Oxford Martin Wildlife Trade Symposia in 2017 and 2018.</p> <p>The partners released a Thai / English film exposing the role of a Thai tourist attraction in selling tiger bone glue (just beyond the project period as we had</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>expected a law enforcement response from Thailand). EIA released a news story to support the film release.</p> <p>A selection of website posts, briefings and media coverage is included in Annex 4.2</p> |
| <p>Activity 3.2</p> <p>Release profiles of captive facilities engaged in illegal trade in tiger parts and products, and circulate online, including on travel forums to target visiting public</p> | <p>Partially completed. Following the outcome of ongoing law enforcement investigations, additional profiles will be published beyond the project period.</p> <p>Locations of captive tiger facilities, including those implicated in trade are available on our interactive map, with further details in EIA publications such as Cultivating Demand, Eradicating the market for big cats, as well as historical EIA publications such as Hidden in Plain Sight (in English and Chinese)</p> <p>Comments were posted in Chinese to 70 web pages advertising tourist facilities which keep tigers highlighting to members of the public the lack of conservation value, welfare concerns and role of commercial captive facilities in trade (see Annex 4.20).</p> |
| <p>Activity 3.3</p> <p>Update existing publicly available interactive map on location and size of tiger farms in Asia including additional information and images as appropriate.</p> | <p>This was updated for Global Tiger Day in July 2017, July 2018 (expanded to include facilities in South Africa) and July 2019. See hyperlink under Activity 3.2 above</p> |

Annex 3 IWT Contacts

| | |
|-------------------------------|---|
| Ref No | IWT 046 |
| Project Title | Enhancing Enforcement to End Tiger Trade in South East Asia |
| Project Leader Details | |
| Name | Debbie Banks |
| Role within IWT Project | Tiger Campaign Leader for EIA, responsible for strategic and operational direction, project activity scheduling and budgeting for EIA, advocacy, intelligence dissemination and liaison with law enforcement (Laos and US), liaison with the partners lead personnel and other stakeholders |
| Address | |
| Phone | |
| Fax/Skype | |
| Email | |
| Partner 1 | |
| Name | Douglas Hendrie |
| Organisation | Education for Nature Vietnam |
| Role within IWT Project | Lead for ENV on field mission strategy and operational direction, field mission scheduling and budgeting, intelligence dissemination and liaison with law enforcement (Vietnamese and US) and other stakeholders in Vietnam. |
| Address | |
| Fax/Skype | |
| Email | |
| Partner 2 etc. | |
| Name | Edwin Wiek |
| Organisation | Wildlife Friends Foundation Thailand |
| Role within IWT Project | Lead for WFFT on field mission strategy and operational direction, budget decisions, intelligence dissemination and liaison with law enforcement (Thai), media and other stakeholders in Thailand. |
| Address | |
| Fax/Skype | |
| Email | |

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

Checklist for submission

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