



Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund Annual 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)

Submission Deadline: 30th April 2019

IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

Project reference	IWT 060
Project title	LeAP: Learning and Action Platform for Community Engagement Against IWT
Country/ies	Global + Tanzania, Zambia, Namibia
Contract holder Institution	IIED
Partner institution(s)	IUCN SULI, Tanzania Natural Resources Forum; Zambia CBNRM Forum, Namibia Nature Fund
IWT grant value	£ 388,888
Start/end dates of project	1.6.18 – 31.3.21
Reporting period (e.g. April 2017-Mar 2018) and number	June 2018 – March 2019, (Annual Report 1)
Project leader name	Dilys Roe
Project website/blog/social media	https://www.iied.org/learning-action-for-community-engagement-against-wildlife-crime
Report author(s) and date	Dilys Roe, Rodgers Lubilo, Pauline Carron, Sophia Masuka, Francesca Booker, Fiona Roberts April 2019

1. Project rationale

Responses to IWT in Africa have focussed on increasingly militarised approaches state-led law enforcement. It is clear, from the continuation of poaching, that enforcement approaches are not enough on their own. Furthermore, such approaches have resulted in some reported cases of heavy-handedness and even human rights abuses. In these cases poverty has been exacerbated by deliberate destruction of property and livestock, as well as death, injury or imprisonment of key household members (often income earners). In less extreme cases, poorly targeted enforcement activities have undermined local confidence in conservation authorities, resulting in further disincentives for communities to cooperate with enforcement authorities and conserve or sustainably manage wildlife.

In a number of localities however, poaching has been reduced (even if not completely eradicated) through empowering communities to manage and protect wildlife including motivating or supporting them to be active partners in enforcement efforts. Such experiences

are, however, in danger of being overlooked in the rush to tackle IWT. In part this is because the current spate of poaching has put the conservation community into crisis mode and there is a scramble to find rapid-response solutions that can be rolled out at scale – a model that community-based approaches are perceived not to fit. But there is also a problem of a lack of knowledge as to different types of community-based approaches and the conditions under which they will and won't work. Furthermore, communities themselves are rarely consulted in IWT programme design processes and lack capacity and voice to engage in policy debate, meaning policies and programmes often do not reflect their priorities and views.

The Kasane Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade held in 2015 made a recommendation to “Establish, facilitate and support information-sharing mechanisms... to develop knowledge, expertise and best practice in practical experience of involving local people in managing wildlife resources, and in action to tackle IWT”. This project responds directly to that recommendation by establishing a “learning and action” platform which comprises 1) an online information portal and 2) an on-the-ground forum for locally-driven initiatives from different countries to meet, share lessons and inject community voices into IWT policy-making.

2. Project partnerships

The project builds on a partnership established between IIED and the IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group (SULI), following the London Conference on IWT in 2014. Recognising the lack of attention to community engagement in wildlife management and the importance of generating local benefits from wildlife as a conservation incentive; IIED and SULI collaborated to convene a series of “Beyond Enforcement” workshops (<https://www.iucn.org/commissions/commission-environmental-economic-and-social-policy/our-work/specialist-group-sustainable-use-and-livelihoods-suli/communities-and-illegal-wildlife-trade/beyond-enforcement-initiative>) which we intended to highlight the impacts of enforcement against IWT on local communities and to showcase examples of effective community engagement. IIED and IUCN-SULI also collaborated with the IUCN East and Southern Africa Regional Office (IUCN ESARO) on an IWT Fund Project (IWT 021) to test a frameworks for community engagement in tackling IWT in three sites in Kenya.


This new project also involves three national level organisations that represent, or support, local communities in conservation efforts and are well connected to government policy-makers – the Tanzania Natural Resources Forum (TNRF); the Zambia CBNRM Forum; and the Namibia Nature Foundation (NNF).

The project activities at the international level have attracted significant levels of co-funding. Specifically, the development and ongoing running of the online learning portal – www.peoplenotpoaching.org – has been co-funded by the German Government (BMU and BMZ)'s Partnership against Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade, implemented by GIZ and USAID (via the TRAFFIC -led Wildlife-TRAPS project). These donors also supported community representatives to participate in the first international learning exchange as did UN Environment. In addition, FFI and ZSL sponsored the participation of a number of community representatives they work directly with, as did IFAW, IUCN Netherlands Committee and African Wildlife Foundation, and DEFRA sponsored the participation of three community representatives who also spoke at the London Conference on IWT 2018.


We also partnered with a Masters student at the Durrell Institute for Conservation and Ecology (DICE) who helped identify relevant case studies for the online portal; a Masters student from Kings College who helped review other learning platforms and develop a design spec; and with Masters Student from Imperial College, London, who conducted an analysis of national level IWT policies and strategies.

3. Project progress

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

Year One Activities	Year One Progress
Output 1	
1.1 Develop web design spec for online portal – structure, functionalities etc	Completed. We developed a design spec for an online learning platform web portal based on a thorough review of other platforms. The Spec is attached in Annex 4. We put this out for quotes from three web design companies. We selected the IIED comms team to develop the portal, based on the quote and availability within the specified time period.
1.2 Construct and test web portal and import existing evidence	<p>Completed. The www.peoplenotpoaching.org web portal was designed and developed by the IIED Comms Team in consultation with the IIED an SULi project team. We were not able to directly import existing case studies from the Conservation, Crime and Communities database because these were written to a different structure, however we used this existing dataset to produce revised case studies.</p> <p>We hired a freelance platform coordinator based in Australia to help with the initial stages of the site development including writing text, testing case studies and generally coordinating with the IIED Comms Team.</p> <p>The site went live and was informally “launched” during the week of the London Conference 2018 including a preview on the IWT Challenge Fund stand at the Conference (photo shows outgoing Chair of SULi, Rosie Cooney, demonstrating the website at the London Conference).</p> 
1.3 Design evidence collection template to guide information collected in community consultations and desk review	Completed. We designed both a long and short version of the case study collection template. We tested this on a sample of case studies and then modified several times before finalising. We are now using both long and short versions to document case studies, depending on the amount of information we have available. Contributors are able to have the template sent to them to complete, or to enter information directly via the website (https://www.peoplenotpoaching.org/contribute). Copies of the templates are attached in Annex 4.
1.4 Inventory major IWT initiatives/funders etc and put out call for community-driven experiences	Completed. We conducted a review of IWT projects funded through the GEF, US Fish and Wildlife Service, IWT Challenge Fund, USAID and other sources, and identified those that included a major or minor focus on community engagement. We are in the process of collecting more details on these where possible in order to add them to the case studies database. In addition we have put out regular calls for community engagement examples via social media and through IIED and SULi mailing lists. We

		will continue to periodically feature the site in mailings and tweets and continue calling for relevant case studies.
1.5	Conduct desk review to collect documented case studies	Completed. We worked with a Master's student at DICE to conduct a desk based review to identify case studies as a complement to those already collected in the Conservation, Crime and Communities database and/or reviewed in an earlier report: https://pubs.iied.org/17591IIED/
1.6	Call for experiences via SULi, PCLG, ICCA Consortium	Ongoing: As noted under 1.4, we have put out call for case studies through SULi and IIED mailing lists, We have not yet targeted the ICCA Consortium specifically but will do in Year 2. We have also used opportunities at events and presentations to promote the web portal and encourage contributions.
1.7	In-country community consultations	Ongoing. In Zambia the CBNRM Forum have consulted with communities in four areas - Mumbwa, Chiawa, Mpika and Luangwa. 13 video interviews and 5 case studies have been collected and these are currently under review with the IIED team prior to uploading on the PeopleNotPoaching web portal. In addition 467 community representatives were consulted on their experiences of IWT. In Tanzania, TNRF administered a total of 726 questionnaires in eight villages - five from the Serengeti Ecosystem (northern zone) and three from Selous Ecosystem (Southern zone). Video case studies have been filmed for each area and these are currently being edited prior to uploading on the web portal but the progress report from TNRF in Annex 4 provides some insights into the material they are collecting.
1.8	Write up of case studies (based on community consultations and call out and desk review) against template	To date we have written up over 70 case studies from over 40 countries against our standard template. These include some case studies from project partner organisations in Tanzania and Zambia, based on community consultations although most are still under development as discussed above. A full list is provided in Annex 4.
Output 2		
2.3	Develop calendar of international and regional IWT policy forums and prioritise for community participation	Ongoing: We have developed an international calendar of events for internal use. We are still exploring with the web team how best to incorporate this into the web portal. The Tanzania and Zambia teams are in the process of developing national and regional calendars and we will incorporate all into the web portal in Year 2.
2.5	Community participation in at least two international events	Ongoing: We worked closely with the London Conference 2018 delivery team to integrate community voices into the Conference agenda. 32 community representatives from 15 countries attended a pre-conference Learning Exchange (see activity 3.3 below) and all also were able to register to attend the Conference. Three participants were part of a panel session on communities and rangers that was held in one of the plenary sessions of the conference and were able to present a statement to the conference (Photo shows the panel with Dickson Ole Kaeolo (Kenya), Clara Lucia Sierra Diaz (Colombia), and Khalil Kharimov (Tajikistan). Community representatives also participated in a side event alongside government representatives to discuss common challenges in tackling IWT and how best to collaborate.

	<p>Community representatives were also able to participate in Evidence to Action international research conference held two days before the London Conference – a summary of which is provided here: http://www.illegalwildlifetrade.net/iwt18event/</p>
<p>Output 3</p>	
<p>3.3 International South South Exchange events (dates tbc)</p>	<p>The project convened its first South South Exchange the day before the London Conference, at London Zoo in partnership with ZSL and FFI. 32 community representatives from 15 countries participated, alongside 79 participants from community support NGOs, donor agencies and academia.</p>  <p>The event was structured to allow the community representatives to present their experiences in tackling IWT to their peers and to the wider audience, but also allowed time for the community representatives to meet without an audience and to discuss the message they wanted to convey to the London Conference. A summary report of the event is provided in Annex 4. and video interviews with some of the community representatives (including project partners Rodgers Lubilo from Zambia and Sophia Masuka from Tanzania) are available on IIED's YouTube channel.</p> <p>We also established a Community Voices WhatsApp group following the London Learning Exchange. This group has enabled the participants (and others who have subsequently joined that had been unable to get to London) to continue to share information and learn from each other. It is a very vibrant group with 25 members and almost daily postings!</p>

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Output 1: Evidence base on effectiveness of community based approaches to tackling IWT built and widely shared within Africa and internationally

Progress towards this output is firmly on track.

As discussed under 3.1 and evidenced here <https://www.peoplenotpoaching.org/explore> , we have documented over 70 case studies from over 40 countries in our online portal since the start of the project (9 months) compared to a baseline of 29 in the CCC database (Indicator 1.1). A full list of case studies is provided in Annex 4. We have also uploaded numerous resources including journal articles, policy documents and videos. We have advertised the portal and the resources that it provides widely and will continue to do so over the course of the

project. We have not started to synthesise the evidence and draw out the lessons learned but will do this from October onwards – one year after the portal was launched. We may need to adjust indicator 1.2 (No of policy makers and practitioners accessing and using evidence in 2018, 2019, 2020) as web analytics may not enable us to distinguish different types of users.



Map showing numbers and distribution of IWT case studies

Output 2: Community voices routinely included in national, regional and international policy dialogues on IWT

Progress towards this output is on track, although it is too early to report much progress since we have not yet engaged in any national or regional policy dialogues (the output indicators 2.1, 2.2) need to be adjusted to reflect this). However the London Conference 2018 provided an excellent opportunity for community voices to be included in a major international policy event – the first IWT conference in which communities have participated at plenary level (indicator 2.3). The outcome statement of the London Conference emphasises the central role of communities: “We recognise the essential engagement role and rights of local communities and indigenous people to ensure a sustainable solution to addressing the illegal wildlife trade. We also recognise the importance of local communities acknowledging the value of protected species and habitats, and the benefit this value can bring.”

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/declaration-london-conference-on-the-illegal-wildlife-trade-2018/london-conference-on-the-illegal-wildlife-trade-october-2018-declaration>

Output 3: Communities, their representatives and other stakeholders enhance capacity, knowledge and own experience, and contribute to that of their peers, through effective networking and peer-to-peer learning.

This output is on track.

The Community Voices event in London was very well received – feedback is included in the event report in Annex 4, with examples including: “*Herewith, receive my sincere appreciation for organizing a truly rich experience for community representatives and for your tireless efforts of advocacy to have community voices heard at such high-level platforms. If we have reached just one, it was plenty.*”

The WhatsApp group is also proving an excellent way for the community representatives to continue to communicate and share experience – we will explore a mechanism to capture the level of engagement in WhatsApp in a revised Output indicator.

We have also directly supported community representatives to document and contribute case studies to the online portal thus further extending their ability to communicate internationally.

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

The anticipated outcome of this project is that “Anti-IWT strategies at local, national and international levels, reflect best practice in community engagement as a result of improved access to evidence and improved profile and voice of local communities”.

It is too early to report much progress towards this outcome but the language on communities in the London Declaration and their level of involvement throughout the Conference is a positive indication of progress at least at the international level.

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Our output 1 assumptions remain valid, particularly 1 and 2, as our compilation of case studies and video interviews as described above is demonstrating :

1. Communities trust CSOs, are willing to share experiences, have them documented, analysed and put in public domain
2. Literature is available and accessible

We have not yet had much opportunity to test assumption 3 (Policymakers and practitioners are interested in evidence-based decision making) but have no reason to assume this is not valid.

Assumption 4 (Evidence is accessible and user-friendly) requires us to conduct a survey of users of the web portal which we will conduct in year 2

Output 2 assumptions 1 and 2 (Key stakeholders (community, govt, NGO etc) are willing to engage in dialogue process; and National level dialogues add value to ongoing advocacy processes and engagements by national CSOs) are as yet untested since we have not held a national dialogue process. These are planned for Year 2. Assumption 3 (Appropriate regional and international policy opportunities arise within timeframe of project) appears valid – we have already had the London Conference and are aware of numerous international and regional events in 2019 and 2020.

Output 3 assumptions (Key stakeholders (community, govt, NGO etc) are willing to engage in south-south learning; Learning mechanisms that are age, language and gender appropriate can be developed; Experience from different contexts is relevant to others) have already proven to be valid just on the basis of experience of the pre London Conference Community Voices event.

At the outcome level we have no reason to believe our assumptions Civil society legal and political enabling environment in African countries is stable or improving; IWT continues to be a threat requiring development of new strategies/plans/projects) are not still relevant and valid.

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

The anticipated impact of this project is that “An increase in effective community engagement initiatives tackling IWT resulting in reduction in pressure on African rhino and elephant populations and increased local benefits from wildlife stewardship.” We are only 9 months into the project and so it is too early to assess our contribution to this impact but we will collect community, policy maker and practitioner perceptions on this in year 3 as part of our planned M and E.)

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

This project is contributing directly to the Kasane statement commitment to development information sharing mechanisms on community engagement.

In the long term we expect it will also contribute to supporting community livelihoods but providing a strong evidence base on different strategies to engage communities in tackling IWT including through reducing human wildlife conflict and increasing local benefits from conservation.

6. Impact on species in focus

It is too early to assess impact on target species and our research design does not allow for species-specific impacts to be assessed. However, our previous work has highlighted that many anti-IWT projects are not successful in stopping poaching because they alienate local communities rather than successfully working with them as active and committed partners. This project will increase the effectiveness of policies, strategies and projects that are aimed at reducing poaching of African elephants, rhinos, pangolins and other species by improving the way in which they engage with communities rather than alienating them. In the long term we expect this project to lead to better design of more effective IWT interventions resulting in better protection of elephants, rhinos and other iconic species by communities – ie slowing and ultimately stopping poaching before wildlife is killed rather than catching poachers after the event.

7. Project support to poverty alleviation

We expect our project to make an indirect contribution to poverty reduction by increasing the voice of these previously marginalised communities in IWT policy forums so that community perspectives are taken into account in the planning and design of anti-IWT initiatives. It will also expand the knowledge base on IWT and poor people and generate guidance on best practice in supporting community based efforts to tackle IWT so that such efforts can be scaled up, with benefits to both wildlife and poor people. It is too early to assess progress against these objectives, but our M and E is intended to collect perspectives from communities, policy makers and practitioners as to whether or not they think progress has been made in this regard. We can already detect, however, an obvious sense of pride and stature that community representatives have from being able to participate in learning exchanges with others, and, at the London Conference, to be recognised by their government representatives as co-delegates with relevant experiences and voices.

In the longer term the improvements in evidence, capacity and voice will lead to increased opportunities for communities to participate in, and benefit from, the anti-IWT initiatives implemented by governments, donors and NGOs. It will also lead to the avoidance of negative impacts on poor people from IWT projects – such as loss of access to resources, human rights abuses – and actively engage and support them in enforcement, conservation and sustainable use, including through equitable benefit sharing from the use and conservation of wildlife.

8. Consideration of gender equality issues

Our project intends to specifically explore how/whether community roles are gendered in efforts to tackle IWT. We have included gender issues in our case study template (annex 4) but not yet analysed the information collected.

We have held one learning event to date and have actually found it very hard to ensure equal participation of men and women. Of the 42 community representatives attending the Community Voices event prior to the London Conference only 6 were women. Some additional women were due to attend but unable to get visas, but even with full attendance women would only have numbered around 25% of the total (participants list is attached in Annex A). As we continue with the programme we will explore what the barriers are to female participation in our events (or if the London event was a one-off) and seek to redress the imbalance.

9. Monitoring and evaluation

At the global level our main M&E approach is to measure our progress against our logframe indicators. We will also be tracking changes in the priorities afforded to community engagement in international policy statements against a baseline that we established prior to the start of the project through other research (see annex of community voices report in annex 4 for a list of international commitments on communities).

At the national level, we are measuring changes in perceptions of communities, policymakers and practitioners on the community engagement and changes in the degree to which policies/strategies and projects focus on community engagement. The teams in Zambia and Tanzania have carried out baseline surveys of communities, policy makers and practitioners (survey instrument included in Annex 4) but not yet analysed the data. .

We worked with a Masters student from Imperial College to conduct an analysis of the community engagement content of a wide range of IWT strategies and plans in African countries. The Zambia and Tanzania components of this study have contributed to the baseline surveys which have been conducted (but not yet analysed) by the country teams.

10. Lessons learnt

At the global level we have found that organising the Community Voices event and negotiating the involvement of community representatives in the London Conference took a lot longer and was more costly in terms of human resource requirements than expected. We were lucky, however, that the event was very timely and appealing and that a) a lot of people were interested to attend and b) a number of additional donors were keen to support the event and have their names associated with it. In reality we could have organised a much larger (more participants) and longer (2-3 days) event to do justice to the wealth of community experience that was available. Such events are hugely valued by participants and yet often very difficult to raise funds for unless incorporated into wider projects such as this. But even in this case they consume large amounts of resources and the outcomes are hard to integrate into a logframe focussed on measurable changes in species populations and poverty levels!

As noted in the gender section, however, it has proven much more difficult than expected to identify female community representatives. The vast majority of expressions of interest to participate came from men and we have learnt that we will actively need to seek out female participants for future events.

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

Not applicable

12. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

Although our project is focussing on Africa, at the London Conference it was announced that there would be a regional IWT conference in Latin America in 2019. We are thus working with SULi members in the Latin American region and with Clara Lucia Sierra Diaz from Colombia – who participated in the Community Voices event – to organise a similar learning exchange in Latin America and to ensure community voices feed into the Latin American Conference.

13. Sustainability and legacy

It is somewhat early to comment on the sustainability and legacy of the project but we have been pleased by the level of interest in the online portal and as we continue into the project will explore sources of long term support for this.

14. IWT Challenge Fund Identity

We have publicised the IWT Challenge Fund as the sponsor of this project in all communications and in all outputs to date.

15. Project expenditure

Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (April 2018-March 2019)

	2018/19	2018/19	Var	Var	Comments
Project spend since last annual report	Grant (£)	Total Darwin Costs £	(£)	%	
Staff costs (see below)					
Dilys Roe - Project Leader IIED					
Francesca Booker – Researcher IIED					
Fiona Roberts – Project management					
Hannah Fairley/Jack Lloyd - Logistics					
IIED communications team					
Rodgers Lubilo ZCBNRMF Chair and Zambia oversight					
Project Officer ZCBNRMF					
Project Assistant ZCBNRMF					
Project Accountant ZCBNRMF					
Sophia Constantine Masuka TNRF lead					
Executive Director TNRF oversight					
CBNRM assistant TNRF					
Film and editing crew TNRF					
M&E officer TNRF					
Consultancy costs					
Overhead Costs					
Travel and subsistence					
Operating Costs					
Capital items (see below)					
Others (see below)					
IIED Publication production costs					
IIED Bank charges on project transfers					
ZCBNRMF office costs					
TOTAL					

We recognise that we have some significant spend to main budget lines this year. These materialised late in the project year and we did not have an opportunity to submit a formal change request to LTS before reporting. For transparency we are planning to submit a budget change request that explains these variations in more detail. This will also propose some changes to budget lines in forthcoming years.

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

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

The Community Voices event held prior to the London Conference was an outstanding success. It attracted lots of interest not just from community representatives but also by support NGOs and other donors who were keen to support the event and have their names associated with it. Community presence at the London Conference itself would not have happened without this event beforehand. Feedback from communities has emphasised how valuable they found it.

Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against Logical Framework for Financial Year 2018-2019

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Progress and Achievements April 2018 - March 2019	Actions required/planned for next period
<p>Impact: An increase in effective community engagement initiatives tackling IWT resulting in reduction in pressure on African rhino and elephant populations and increased local benefits from wildlife stewardship</p>		<p>Too early to assess contribution to impact at this stage but we have no reason to doubt the project will contribute over the next few years</p>	
<p>Outcome Anti-IWT strategies at local, national and international levels, reflect best practice in community engagement as a result of improved access to evidence and improved profile and voice of local communities</p>	<p>0.1 By the end of the project, local community representatives in at least 2 African countries report improved engagement in national IWT policy processes compared to 2018</p> <p>0.2 By end of the project, at least 2 African countries develop new or revised effective anti-IWT strategies, plans or projects that reflect community experience and voice</p> <p>0.3 By end of the project at least 1 international or regional IWT policy process reflects improved recognition of community experience and voice compared to pre-2018</p>	<p>0.1 Baseline survey of community perceptions of level of engagement undertaken in Zambia and Tanzania</p> <p>0.2 Baseline surveys of IWT strategies and projects and degree to which they emphasise community engagement undertaken in Zambia and Tanzania</p> <p>0.3 Baseline analysis of international IWT policy statements prepared in advance of project and developments at London Conference 2018 integrated</p>	<p>0.1 Analysis of baseline data</p> <p>0.2 Analysis of baseline data and ongoing monitoring of any new major policies or projects</p> <p>0.3 Ongoing assessment of any new international or regional policy processes</p>
<p>Output 1: Evidence base on effectiveness of community based approaches to tackling IWT built and widely shared within Africa and internationally</p>	<p>1.1 No of examples of community engagement to tackle IWT collected, documented and added to online database in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline of 28 in CCC database)</p> <p>1.2. No of policy makers and practitioners accessing and using evidence in 2018, 2019, 2020.</p>	<p>1.1 28 CCC case studies re-written to conform to new template and a further 49 collected and added</p> <p>1.2 Since October 2019 we have had 2, 036 visits to the web portal. Mostly these have been new visitors (85.7% new visitors, to 14.3 % return visitors). The visitors have mainly been from the US (35.21%), UK (11.86%), and India (4.48%) with the rest being a mixture of visits from Germany, South Africa, Canada, the Netherlands, China and Kenya. Currently, we cannot assess whether users are policy makers or practitioners but we are assessing a</p>	

		mechanism (and the value of this mechanism) to understand whether a visitor is a policy maker, researcher, practitioner etc.
1.1 Develop web design spec for online portal – structure, functionalities etc		Completed
1.2 Construct and test web portal and import existing evidence		Completed
1.3 Design evidence collection template to guide information collected in community consultations and desk review		Completed
1.4 Inventory major IWT programmes, funders, implementers and put out call for evidence for community driven approaches via ICCA Consortium and PCLG		Ongoing
1.5 Conduct desk review to collect documented case studies		Initial review completed but ongoing monitoring of journals and press articles
1.6 Call for experiences via SULi, PCLG, ICCA Consortium		Ongoing
1.7 In-country community consultations and evidence collection (including videos)		Initial consultations completed
1.8 Write up of case studies (based on community consultations and call out and desk review) against template		77 completed but collection and write up ongoing
1.9 Analyses of lessons learned from case studies		First analysis planned for October 2019
Output 2. Community voices routinely included in national, regional and international policy dialogues on IWT	<p>2.1 No of national IWT dialogues held involving local community representatives in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project)</p> <p>2.2 No of regional IWT dialogues held involving local community representatives in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project)</p> <p>2.3 No of international IWT dialogues held involving local</p>	<p>2.1 Not yet started – indicator needs adjusting as no dialogues were planned for 2018</p> <p>2.2 Not yet started – indicator needs adjusting as no dialogues were planned for 2018</p> <p>2.3 One international dialogue conducted in 2018 against baseline of zero (previous community events have been held prior to Kasane Conference and Hanoi conference under the Beyond Enforcement Initiative but London Conference 2018 was first opportunity to have dialogue outcomes directly feeding into the Conference.</p> <p>2.4 42 community representatives (36 male, 6 female) from 15 countries included in 1 international dialogue against zero baseline</p>

	community representatives in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project) 2.4 No and representativeness of communities included in dialogues in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project)	
2.1 Organise and host 2 X national dialogues		Not yet started
2.2 Document lessons learned from dialogues and disseminate		Not yet started
2.3 Develop calendar of international and regional IWT policy forums and prioritise for community participation		Ongoing
2.4 Community participation in at least one regional event		Not yet started, plans underway for a Latin America regional event and participation in an African Elephant Range States meeting
2.5 Community participation in at least two international events		Ongoing – one international event completed
Output 3: Communities, their representatives and other stakeholders enhance capacity, knowledge and own experience, and contribute to that of their peers, through effective networking and peer-to-peer learning.	3.1 No and type of stakeholders from each focal country and elsewhere engaging in Learning Platform activities in 2018, 2019, 2020 (against baseline of 0) 3.2 No and type of stakeholders from each focal country and elsewhere reporting enhanced capacity to design and implement initiatives to engage communities in tackling IWT in 2018, 2019, 2020 (against baseline of 0) 3.3 No and type of new networks/relationships developed in 2018, 2019, 2020 (against baseline of 0)	3.1 42 community representatives (36 male, 6 female) from 15 countries + 79 NGO, donor, academic participants engaging in first international learning exchange. 3.2 Baseline assessed in Tz and Za but changes not yet assessed – indicator needs adjusting to reflect this will happen in Year 3 3.3 One new Community Voices whatsapp group established in 2018 involving participants from London Community Voices event
3.1 Organise and host at least two webinars from Learning Platform		Not yet started – planned for 2019
3.2 Learning exchange visit (host country tbc)		Not yet started
3.3 International South-South exchange event		Community Voices event held in London in October 2018

Annex 2: Project's full current logframe as presented in the application form (unless changes have been agreed)

N.B. if your application's logframe is presented in a different format in your application, please transpose into the below template. Please feel free to contact IWT-Fund@ltsi.co.uk if you have any questions regarding this.

Project Summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important Assumptions
Impact: (Max 30 words) An increase in effective community engagement initiatives tackling IWT resulting in reduction in pressure on African rhino and elephant populations and increased local benefits from wildlife stewardship			
Outcome: Anti-IWT strategies at local, national and international levels, reflect best practice in community engagement as a result of improved access to evidence and improved profile and voice of local communities (Max 30 words)	<p>0.4 By the end of the project, local community representatives in at least 2 African countries report improved engagement in national IWT policy processes compared to 2018</p> <p>0.5 By end of the project, at least 2 African countries develop new or revised effective anti-IWT strategies, plans or projects that reflect community experience and voice</p> <p>0.6 By end of the project at least 1 international or regional IWT policy process reflects improved recognition of community experience and voice compared to pre-2018</p>	<p>0.1 Baseline and end of project surveys of community perceptions on level of involvement in, and influence over, national IWT policy processes; national dialogue meeting agendas, minutes and meeting participant lists.</p> <p>0.2 Content of strategies/plans/project compared to pre-project interventions</p> <p>0.3 Policy decisions, consultation processes, participant lists</p>	<p>Civil society legal and political enabling environment in African countries is stable or improving.</p> <p>IWT continues to be a threat requiring development of new strategies/plans/projects</p>
Outputs: 1. Evidence: Evidence base on effectiveness of community based approaches to tackling IWT built and widely shared within Africa and internationally	<p>1.1 No of examples of community engagement to tackle IWT collected, documented and added to online database in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline of 28 in CCC database)</p> <p>1.2. No of policy makers and practitioners accessing and using evidence in 2018, 2019, 2020.</p>	<p>1.1 Online database content, case study reports from country partners</p> <p>1.3 Download stats, dissemination reports, citations in policy statements or project plans</p>	<p>Communities trust CSOs, are willing to share experiences, have them documented, analysed and put in public domain</p> <p>Literature is available and accessible</p> <p>Policymakers and practitioners are interested in evidence-based decision making</p> <p>Evidence is accessible and user-friendly</p>
2. Dialogue and voice: Community voices routinely included in national, regional and international policy dialogues on IWT	2.1 No of national IWT dialogues held involving local community representatives in 2018, 2019 and 2020	2.1 – 2.3 Dialogue/workshop agendas, reports, minutes; content (or revisions to	Key stakeholders (community, govt, NGO etc) are willing to engage in dialogue process

	<p>(against baseline determined at start of project)</p> <p>2.2 No of regional IWT dialogues held involving local community representatives in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project)</p> <p>2.3 No of international IWT dialogues held involving local community representatives in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project)</p> <p>2.4 No and representativeness of communities included in dialogues in 2018, 2019 and 2020 (against baseline determined at start of project)</p>	<p>content) of ensuring policies/plans/projects</p> <p>2.4 Participant lists analysed by gender, age, community, ethnicity</p>	<p>National level dialogues add value to ongoing advocacy processes and engagements by national CSOs</p> <p>Appropriate regional and international policy opportunities arise within timeframe of project</p>
<p>3. South South Learning: Communities, their representatives and other stakeholders enhance capacity, knowledge and own experience, and contribute to that of their peers, through effective networking and peer-to-peer learning.</p>	<p>2.1 No and type of stakeholders from each focal country and elsewhere engaging in Learning Platform activities in 2018, 2019, 2020 (against baseline of 0)</p> <p>2.2 No and type of stakeholders from each focal country and elsewhere reporting enhanced capacity to design and implement initiatives to engage communities in tackling IWT in 2018, 2019, 2020 (against baseline of 0)</p> <p>2.3 No and type of new networks/relationships developed in 2018, 2019, 2020 (against baseline of 0)</p>	<p>2.1 Web stats, participant lists from learning activities (meetings, webinars etc), networks established</p> <p>2.2 Before/after participant capacity surveys disaggregated by stakeholder type, gender, age, ethnicity</p> <p>2.3 Web-links developed between LeAP and other initiatives; feedback from participants;</p>	<p>Key stakeholders (community, govt, NGO etc) are willing to engage in south-south learning</p> <p>Learning mechanisms that are age, language and gender appropriate can be developed</p> <p>Experience from different contexts is relevant to others</p>
<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>OUTPUT 1</p> <p>1.5 Develop web design spec for online portal – structure, functionalities etc</p> <p>1.6 Construct and test web portal and import existing evidence</p> <p>1.7 Design evidence collection template to guide information collected in community consultations and desk review</p> <p>1.8 Inventory major IWT programmes, funders, implementers and put out call for evidence for community driven approaches via ICCA Consortium and PCLG</p>			

- 1.9 Conduct desk review to collect documented case studies
- 1.10 Call for experiences via SULi, PCLG, ICCA Consortium
- 1.11 In-country community consultations and evidence collection (including video recordings)
- 1.12 Write up of case studies (based on community consultations and call out and desk review) against template
- 1.13 Analyses of lessons learned from case studies

1.14 Dissemination of evidence, analyses and videos

OUTPUT 2

- 2.1 Organise and host 2 X national dialogues
- 2.2 Document lessons learned from dialogues and disseminate
- 2.3 Develop calendar of international and regional IWT policy forums and prioritise for community participation
- 2.4 Community participation in at least one regional event
- 2.5 Community participation in at least two international events

OUTPUT 3

- 1.1 Organise and host at least two webinars from Learning Platform
- 1.2 Learning exchange visit (host country tbc)
- 1.3 International South-South exchange event

Outcome M&E activities

- M1: Baseline survey of community perceptions on level of involvement in, and influence over, national IWT policy processes and projects
- M2: End of project survey of community perceptions on level of involvement in, and influence over, national IWT policy processes and projects
- M3: Review content of national strategies/plans/projects wrt community engagement at start of project
- M4: Review content of national strategies/plans/projects wrt community engagement at end of project
- M5: Review content of international/regional strategies/plans/projects wrt community engagement at start of project
- M6: Review content of international/regional strategies/plans/projects wrt community engagement at end of project
- M7: End of project surveys of policy makers and project designers/implementers on how to engage communities

Annex 3 Standard Measures

In future years it is our intention to develop a series of standard measures in order to collate some of the quantitative measures of activity, input and output of IWT projects. These will not be measures of the impact or effectiveness of IWT projects but will contribute to a longer term dataset for Defra to draw upon. The collection of standard measures data will be important as it will allow us to understand the combined impact of all the UK Government funded Challenge Fund projects. This data will therefore provide useful information for the Defra Secretariat and for Defra Ministers regarding the Challenge Fund.

The standard measures for the IWT Challenge Fund are currently under development and it is therefore not necessary, at present, to complete this Annex. Further information and guidance about the IWT standard measures will follow.

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.	x
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.	x
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	x
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	x
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	