



Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund Final Report

IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

Project reference	IWT061
Project title	Wildlife in Indonesia: Loss, Damage, & Sanctions (WILDS)
Country(ies)	Indonesia
Lead organisation	Lancaster Environment Centre
Partner institution(s)	Auriga Nusantara, Environmental Law Institute, Legal Atlas
IWT grant value	£297,237
Start/end dates of project	01/10/2018 – 31/05/2021
Project Leader's name	Jacob Phelps
Project website/blog/social media	www.conservation-litigation.org
Report author(s) and date	Jacob Phelps

NOTE: Sensitive information has been highlighted in yellow. This is for consideration by the Reviewer, LTS and Defra, but not for further circulation. Thank you for your consideration.

1. Project summary

Problem: Many conservation efforts focus on traditional criminal enforcement to protect biodiversity from the IWT, punishing violators with fines and imprisonment. While these are important actions, they do little to remedy the huge harms IWT causes the environment and society. For example, IWT impacts not only individual plants, fungi and animals, but also has cascading effects on the survival of entire species, on ecosystem services, on livelihoods that are reliant on wildlife (e.g., reduced fish stocks, ecotourism), and on NGO and government budgets (e.g., taxes, monitoring costs). IWT also impacts human wellbeing and the intangible values we place on wildlife (e.g., cultural, scientific, intrinsic, existence values) or historical impacts of species loss), and introduces new costs of increased public investment into additional conservation measures (e.g., reintroductions, restoration, monitoring). It also yields lost tax revenues (e.g., from legal timber and fisheries trade); cascading ecological impacts (e.g., removing keystone species).

The magnitude and nature of these impacts—on the public and on private citizens—is rarely reflected in the criminal sanctions that perpetrators receive. Indeed, criminal law is designed to punish and deter—not to remedy. Failure to provide remedies via the legal system, especially in egregious cases of IWT, means that harm is externalised onto others. It also fails to communicate the scale of IWT harm to the public, and fails to send clear deterrence signals to offenders. As the biodiversity crisis accelerates, there is a growing need not only to protect threatened species, but to also help them when they are harmed. Environmental liability legislation already exists in many countries (usually part of civil law), and can be used to demand that those who cause harm the environment be held responsible for providing remedies to fix that harm—akin to the “polluter pays” principle. However, this legislation is not widely used in many countries, especially across the Global South, and are rarely used to address harm caused by IWT.

Project response: Our project is framed around the concept of conservation litigation—pioneering the use of existing liability legislation to conservation contexts. Our team of conservationists, lawyers, and economists is exploring how conservation litigation suits can be developed in response to high-level commercial IWT (e.g., by corporations, organised criminal groups). It challenges the impunity of IWT perpetrators by:

- Developing a novel approach for structured, comparative legal review of IWT laws across countries, focused on evaluating traditional criminal sanctions. This provides an approach for understanding the diversity of legal responses to IWT, and strengthening future legal frameworks responding to IWT.
- Developing a widely-applicable framework for developing conservation litigation in IWT contexts.
- Testing conservation litigation for IWT through a “test case”. This case study serves as both a learning opportunity, as well as an opportunity for strategic litigation of domestic and international significance.
- Engaging stakeholders globally, including judges, NGOs and government agencies, to help them understand the wide impacts of IWT and potential for conservation litigation.

As such, the project explores new, interdisciplinary questions legal responses to IWT to help ensure future responses better deter future harm, fairly reflect large-scale IWT harms, and help to remedy existing harm. This will have impacts for the specific species targeted by this proposal, as well as for other species globally that might benefit from both strengthened sanctions regimes and protection via environmental lawsuits.

Country context: The project uses case study countries—notably Indonesia—to draw conclusions and approaches that have global implications. The comparative legal review (desk-based) draws on law from 8 countries. However, the on-the-ground work focuses on Indonesia, a priority IWT source and consumer country, where there is active work on criminal enforcement and a legal framework conducive for testing conservation litigation. Indonesia is the country we highlight as an example in some of our key publications and guideline.

Please considering viewing this 5-minute animation, which encapsulates the key message of our project approach: <https://vimeo.com/510514912/9cccd4ea1>. Our website, www.conservation-litigation.org, also succinctly describes the project and will provide helpful context for evaluating the project.

2. Project Partnerships

The funded partners were: Lancaster Environment Centre (LEC), Auriga, Legal Atlas (LA) and the Environmental Law Institute (ELI). The Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) also became a major partner as the project developed (via a consultancy and pro-bono). Overall, the partners worked well together, in good faith and with regular communication. Relationships within the core staff team (LEC-Auriga) strengthened significantly following in-person meeting in the UK in 2019 and 2020. This core team had very regular meetings online, notably of the core Lancaster-Auriga team, but also into 2020 with the lawyers and plaintiff (Annex 4.24).

Key lessons:

- The geographic spread of the partners: It would have been strategic to begin the project with an in-person group meeting. The April 2019 meeting was held at that time due to schedules and because we wanted to jointly evaluate initial project results. However, an earlier date would have helped strengthen relationships and communication.
- The greater-than-expected complexity of working across disciplines and countries: Working between conservation and law in different countries has led to several cases of confusion and miscommunication. This has highlighted the importance of clarifying technical jargon, particularly across sectors and jurisdictions, which are doing as the project progresses.
- Budgeting time and ensuring partners understand scale of commitment. The project required more time input than we had planned or budgeted, or than some partners had fully anticipated. However, all of the partners, notably Lancaster and Auriga, made accommodations, often at a personal level, to contribute the additional time. This is reflected in the quality and number of outputs and engagements.
- Engage partners’ senior administration early in the process: During project development and running, LEC engaged with project staff at LA and Auriga but less with senior management who

did not always understand key elements of the project or its administration. It is important to ensure that partner leadership, and not just project staff, are fully onboard.

Key strengths:

- The active involvement of early-career female researchers: Early-career members, including 3 researchers at Auriga and 2 PhD students in the UK and Brazil have been actively involved in shaping the project and leading publications (e.g., Annex 4.3, 4.1, 4.10).
- Participation of outside experts: We have received significant interest and support from outside lawyers, artists and scholars, who are lending pro-bono expertise to the project (Annex 4.20).
- Diversity: Our team reflects diversity on a number of axes, including nationality, religion, gender, disciplines (law, ecology, economics, art), career stage, and between academics and practitioners.

Summary of relationships:

LEC-Auriga: The primary partnership is between LEC and Auriga. It was slow to start, and strengthened significantly after January 2019, when we finally recruited a Research Assistant/Project Manager (U.Latifah). She was central to operationalising the project, including on communications and ensuring project pace. The use of WhatsApp was helpful and allowed us to keep in regular (weekly, if not daily) contact. In addition, we had larger team meetings at critical junctures via Skype (e.g., project initiative, selection of case studies, methodology, government engagement) to ensure a shared vision and agreed plans (Annex 4.24). The relationship strengthened through face-to-face workshops in 2019 and 2020, but were limited by non-travel due to COVID. Importantly, Auriga has been central in facilitating networks in Indonesia (Annex 4.23), with government (Annex 4.19), the lawyers and prospective plaintiffs. We have had occasional miscommunications and some delays, including because Auriga staff was overloaded with other projects, which often resulted in “chasing” by LEC and the Research Assistant. We have also faced challenges with financial management standards, although these have been addressed in collaboration with Lancaster’s finance team. However, the relationship has been open, communication has always remained productive, and all deliverables were well met—notably the guideline (Annex 4.4), engaging stakeholders in Indonesia (Annex 4.23) and launching the test case (Annex 4.1). Collaboration continues around the test case (Annex 4.1). Although further formal collaboration between the organisations is unlikely, at a personal level the core staff members have managed successful relationship and several are likely to continue.

LEC-Legal Atlas: This relationship has developed since the proposal was developed, as their project lead, M.Rodriguez, left to start a PhD at LEC and following COVID-19 became a consultant. The relationship was challenging at times, given the complexity and scale of the LA research, and differences in terminology and approaches between practitioners and academics including regarding approach, scope and methods. However, we achieved our key output from this partnership (Annex 4.7, 4.8), which LA has gone on to successfully use to inform policy in a number of other countries (Annex 4.11).

LEC-ELI: This is a long-standing collaboration (>7yrs), and ELI has specialised technical expertise in economics and law that are important to this project—and were core to informing the strategies reflected in the project approach (guideline, Annex 4.4 and publication, Annex 4.2). They provided an internal background paper on liability for environmental harm and biodiversity (Annex 4.2), participated in our key UK workshop (Annex 4.5), and have been key to networking with international law groups (Annex 4.9), including to organise the global WCEL webinar (Annex 4.8). This relationship is continuing as we explore opportunities to support conservation litigation in various jurisdictions (Annex 4.23) and to bring it into mainstream policy discussions.

WILDS Project-LIPI: Although not originally a project partner, LIPI was introduced as a requirement of the Indonesian Government. This ended up being a very productive and important partnership. We were tremendously fortunate that the researcher in charge, T.P.Nugraha was relevant in terms of content, orangutan expert who helped with guideline and publication case study and secondary data sources. Moreover, he was actively involved in helping access experts from across his institution, which lends significant weight to our outputs (Annex 4.14). He also helped to navigate the multiple permissions we

needed to undertake the project and to engage meaningfully with the Ministry of Environment and Forests (Annex 4.19), support without which our project would have severely struggled. Although we issued a small consultancy to LIPI, most of this work was in-kind. This relationship is likely to continue at a personal level.

WILDS Project-Indonesia Ministry of Environment and Forests: The Ministry was not core partner but was an important stakeholder, especially because the government instructed us to include them (notably their regional BKSDA Conservation Agency offices) as an in-country collaborator. We made tremendous efforts to do this, including to invite seconded scientists to participate in project design and fieldwork (Annex 4.19). A number of discussions, meetings and letters were advanced, to national offices as well as regional agencies in West Kalimantan and North Sumatra that ran until the final weeks of the project (Annex 4.32). Ultimately, our partnership was very limited due to time availability, COVID-19, hesitancy to collaborate with international researchers and bureaucracy.. However, we did host several important workshops with them (Annex 4.14) as well as public events that they attended (Annex 4.17) that were useful to collecting insights and sharing our ideas with them.

3. Project Achievements

3.1 Outputs

Output 1 was to create a new resource for comparing IWT legislation and sanctions across jurisdictions. Although there are many calls for stronger enforcement, there was no resource available to help enable standardised, structured approach to analysing and comparing legislation for wildlife offenses. This output was well-reached, through collaborative work between LA and LEC, resulting in an Open Access publication in *Conservation Biology* (Annex 4.7) and resources on the <https://www.legal-atlas.com> (Annex 4.8). Moreover, this resource was selected by the Society for Conservation Biology to be featured their Emerging Issues in Conservation Seminar Series (Annex 4.16). Importantly, the resource is already be used by LA and its partners to inform IWT legislation in 15 countries (Annex 4.3). We did less public dissemination of the resource than originally proposed (Indicator 1.4) but we believe this is more than compensated for by the actual policy work this had led to and the more targeted presentations to relevant experts (Annex 4.15); indeed the final resource was more technical than would of interest to the general public.

Output 2 was to provide legal and technical clarity and resources are available to facilitate development of IWT civil liability damage claims. This presented a far greater challenge than we expected; these types of lawsuits—although legally possible in many countries—are have almost never been pursued in court and so there is limited experience and no accessible, practical resources for guiding their development, especially in cases involving biodiversity/IWT/wildlife. Moreover, each country has its own legal particularities that mean that creating a resource that is meaningful to multiple jurisdictions was a tremendous effort. We did, however, successfully and meaningful achieved this output, by first engaging dozens of relevant experts from law, economics, ecology and conservation. This included numerous consultations and focus groups with Indonesian NGOs, academics, government officials and lawyers (Annex 4.23), including several targeted workshops and inputs from Indonesia’s leading legal minds (Annex 4.5). This ultimately included >150 engagements. We further engaged the international community, with a workshop in Alston Cumbria (Annex 4.15) and with pro-bono contributions of input from a wide range of international experts (4.30). We drew on all this to produce a first-of-its-kind resource: “Pioneering civil lawsuits for harm to threatened species: A guide go claims with examples from Indonesia” is a core output of the project, which aims to help practitioners understand how to develop this type of litigation around the world. It is an initial resource for anyone interested in pursuing this type of litigation and identifying the steps, approaches and questions they need to ask (Annex 4.4). The resources is supported by a set of training PowerPoint slides (Annex 4.5) and an additional Policy Brief (Annex 4.6). Those are underpinned by a journal publication in *Conservation Letters* that provides academic rigour justifying our approach (Annex 4.2). We also developed a website to succinctly explain the project concept and aggregate resources (www.conservation-litigation.org).

Output 3 was to help ensure that Indonesian prosecutors, experts and judges are able to operationalise civil liability cases for IWT, with the guidance to allow them to account for environmental and socio-economic dimensions. As these lawsuits are so new to most practitioners (in Indonesia and elsewhere) the baseline of understanding was very limited, with no relevant resources and only 1 previous training

ever undertaken on the subject. As such, we made significant gains towards this output by creating the necessary resources to enable training and starting the process of engaging practitioners. To this end, we developed and disseminated the Policy Brief (Annex 4.6) and training slides (Annex 4.5) to the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Conservation Agency (BKSDA) offices in West Kalimantan, Jakarta and Medan, and Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI). The resources were also widely shared via WhatsApp across the conservation and government community (although this cannot be evidenced). We also held a final workshop with the Indonesian Institute of Science and with the Ministry of Environment and Forests (inviting their regional offices) to discuss the project outputs, make contributions, and discuss their use (Annex 4.5). These meetings were heavily limited by COVID-19, and we had to resort to online engagements that were far less appropriate and engaging for our audience. We further, and specifically targeted judges for engagement with this resource, given their very central adjudication role in shaping these cases (Annex 4.28). We had focused engagement with 32 Indonesian judges, via an online mock-trial simulation involving an IWT case, and follow-up interviews (Annex 4.11)—this provided a combined opportunity to share the project concept with key decision-makers, while also better understanding judges' views about our approach, which resulted in a journal manuscript (Annex 4.10). That process was very time-consuming, given the difficulties of accessing judges. We had proposed to keep an impact log of these engagements, but that proved inappropriate due to confidentiality concerns of the sensitivity of engaging with judges. Gender equity was addressed in that we sought to include women judges (6/32), but low numbers of women reflect the gender dynamics of the judiciary. Importantly, project resources were also circulated by the Supreme Court's Environmental Working Group (Annex 4.29), which heavily shapes how courts address environmental issues, and are now also part of the supplementary reading list for judges involved in the Supreme Court Environmental Certification Programme (Annex 4.12). The resources were also presented to 3 NGOs who have been involved in education for Indonesian judges and prosecutors (Annex 4.29), although they are not currently actively doing these trainings although they seems likely to happen in future. This reflects that the relevant government actors are aware of the approach and interested in operationalising it.

Output 4 was for the Indonesian and international legal and environmental communities to demonstrate awareness of the project approach. As the approach is so new in most contexts, most relevant stakeholders (even environmental lawyers in most countries) have no, or very little familiarity with these types of lawsuits in wildlife cases. To this end, the project was a feature article in Mongabay International, reposted in several locations, and articles about the approach and “test case” lawsuit were included in 15 Indonesian language media pieces (Annex 4.24). Overall, we had much less international media engagement than we expected, despite considerable networking efforts and press releases, which we think is because the narrative is too complex and the “test case” is not yet resolved. As a result, we produced nine blogs about the project for a diverse range of online, high-profile platforms targeting parts of the conservation community (Annex 4.25). We further developed a 5-minute animated video featuring the project concept which is being disseminated in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.4). Perhaps more significantly, we had a number of direct engagements with key organisations and members of the conservation and law community, allowing a more targeted, strategic approach for sharing our project approach with the most relevant stakeholders. This included involvement of Indonesian NGOs in our early planning and scoping (Annex 4.1; 4.23), as well as targeted courtesy calls with at least 28 Indonesian and at least 30 international NGOs. Notably, we held meetings and with groups such as Wildlife Justice Commission, UNODC Wildlife Crimes Research Unit, Center for International Environmental Law and TRAFFIC, and in several cases, we were further invited to provide formal presentations to broader project teams. This reflected a high level of interest in the project among leading organisations involved in IWT and environmental law. We further published 2 journal articles in the leading conservation journals (Annex 4.2) and have drafts of 3 further manuscripts forthcoming (Annex 4.10, 4.11, 4.13). We presented at 9 international conferences (Annex 4.15), and participated in 6 ‘special’ by-invitation events, reflecting the scale of outside interest in our work (Annex 4.16). We also co-hosted an international webinar about the topic with the World Commission on Environmental Law. Importantly, there is wide evidence that the approach is being discussed more widely: we contributed text for new draft legislation in Liberia (Annex 4.22); have been invited to contribute “boxes” in forthcoming global reports by UNODC and IPBES (Annex 4.21), and Legal Atlas is using the legal taxonomy work with 9 new NGO/IGO partners in 15 other countries (Annex 4.20). Most significantly, there is evidence that new civil lawsuits are emerging, inspired and informed by our project—including lawsuits being explored by NGOs in Cameroon, Italy and Indonesia, and 3 lawsuits under consideration by Indonesian government agencies. This is significantly exceeded our expectations.

Output 5 was to submit a “test case” in court, demonstrating the project approach in action. As part of this, we needed to first answer a number of questions about how to actually operationalise this, which involved a number of internal analyses (Annex 4.12) and conclusions that are reflected in the published guideline (Annex 4.4). We then had to identify a real-world case, defendant and plaintiff (Annex 4.1). This was a far more demanding process than expected, including because the vast majority of IWT cases are against low-level actors against whom it would be inappropriate to bring civil charges. We also faced challenges with plaintiffs, both NGO and government, being reluctant/scared to pursue legal action. We addressed this through sheer persistence and networking, and ultimately identified a viable case.

3.2 Outcome

Our target outcome was for the “Indonesian legal system demonstrates ability to better account for the harm that IWT causes society, pioneering approaches that will improve the global community’s understanding of IWT harm and ways to strengthen sanctions to deter future IWT and compensate for IWT harm.” This is reflected in the pioneering “test case” successfully submitted to court (Annex 4.1), itself an important case that articulates the many types of harm caused by IWT. The case also sets domestic and global precedent for how these types of lawsuits can be developed into the future. Achievement of this outcome is also reflected in the engagement and uptake of our guideline resource (that explains how to develop these types of lawsuits) by groups including Indonesia’s Ministry of Environment and Forests’ Environmental Expert Forum (Annex 4.29). It is also evidenced by the 4 NGOs now interested in bringing forward a series of lawsuits of their own using our proposed approach (Annex 4.24).

Notably, our proposed approach to lawsuits has demonstrated interest from NGOs and IGO from groups outside Indonesia, which reflect outcomes broader than those originally targeted. They are evidenced by expressions of interest to launch I lawsuits in countries other than Indonesia (Annex 4.14), the incorporation of conservation litigation into draft Liberian legislation (Annex 4.13) and in upcoming policy documents from UNODC, IPBES and End Pandemics (Annex 4.12), meaningful engagement from high-profile international NGOs (Annex 4.9) and participation by invitation events (Annex 4.7).

3.3 Monitoring of assumptions

We monitored assumptions throughout. The key assumption that changed and challenged throughout the 3 years had to do with Indonesian government permissions and receptiveness to the ideas we presented in this project. This variously included providing new requirements for partnerships and extensive paperwork that, even once met, still did not grant full permissions (Annex 4.20). This was a major obstacle that we addressed through diligent completion of government requests and careful documentation and sheer persistence and investment of time. Notably, when we realised that a government plaintiff for a “test case” lawsuit was going to be too burdensome, we shifted our focus to supporting NGO plaintiff (which is what we ultimately did in our test case), and to use this as an example. Ultimately, based on those efforts, the relevant government agencies are expressing interest and intention to act based on this project outputs (Annex 4.24).

We also shifted more of our work to secondary data rather than primary data collection, in part because government permissions were so challenging. This was significantly exacerbated by COVID-19. However, this was ultimately a positive outcome because we invested far greater effort into the conceptual underpinnings of the project and realised that secondary data was adequate for our needs and was a lower-burden example of how to build an IWT lawsuit (versus a resource intensive field-based data collection process).

The “test case” is currently with the judiciary and, as anticipated in the assumptions, is facing challenges of slow processing. We are addressing this through persistence, a legal team that is working beyond the timeframe of this project completion. We have also identified a potential funder who may support further legal appeals if this becomes necessary.

Many of our assumptions relied on receptive audiences across agencies and NGOs in Indonesia and globally. We faced challenges with this, as our proposals are very different from the usually enforcement

response to IWT. For this reason, we decided to invest heavily into targeted, 1-on-1 courtesy call presentations to targeted groups working in this space, to ensure we could explain the nuances of our approach and its potential relevance to others' work (versus generic communications).

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

The key contributions we made towards our target impact of a “reduction in the commercial illegal wildlife trade in Indonesia, to improve judicial accountability and protect natural capital stocks that support biodiversity, rural livelihoods and wellbeing” were by:

- Developed and disseminated a novel approach of using civil lawsuits to apply to IWT. This is evidenced by our publication in *Conservation Letters* (Annex 4.2) and practitioner-facing guidelines (Annex 4.4). These articulate how to develop these lawsuits in response to IWT cases in ways that meaningfully address impacts on biodiversity and humans—including the impacts of IWT on livelihoods and human wellbeing that are often overlooked and/or not formally recognised within traditional enforcement processes. These resources are now openly available to help government agencies, citizens and NGOs to take forward legal actions of their own—to both challenge IWT, and seek remedies for the harms caused by IWT.
- Developed a precedent-setting “test case” that applies this civil law strategy to IWT (Annex 4.1). This provides a tangible example of how these cases can be developed and litigated, informing and inspiring action in Indonesia, and internationally (Annex 4.24).
- Disseminated the approach, resources and “test case” globally, including through media (Annex 4.25, 4.26), high-profile events (e.g., Annex 4.4, 4.16), social media (Annex 4.14, 4.27) and targeted stakeholder engagement to discuss project relevance to others' work (Annex 4.19). This is important to sharing the approach globally so that others can take action to uphold their rights, protect biodiversity and secure remedies when livelihoods and wellbeing are injured.
- Developed a novel framework that facilitates comparative legal analysis of IWT legislation across countries, which is a starting point for future legal reforms and harmonization across jurisdictions, and is currently being used in 15 other countries (Annex 4.21).

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

The project primarily contributed to 1) strengthening law enforcement, and 2) ensuring effective legal frameworks—points that were echoed by the UK Government's commitment at the London Conference to “strengthen enforcement, ensure effective legal frameworks”, as well reflected in the Kasane statement's focus on “ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents”. These contributions are specifically evidenced by:

- The project centres on conceptualising and operationalising civil lawsuits in response to IWT—a recourse that is legally possible in many countries, but has not been widely operationalised in most or used to address IWT. We published a journal article (Annex 4.2), Guideline (Annex 4.4), Policy Brief (Annex 4.6), training resources (Annex 4.5), website (4.3) and animated video (4.14) that seek to explain and facilitate these novel legal response to IWT. This reflects Indonesia's statement at the London Conference that it is receptive to looking at “innovative ways of combatting IWT”. We filed a “test case” that serves as a proof of concept for how these proposed legal actions can be practically operationalised on-the-ground (Annex 4.1), and there is evidence that this is inspiring others to take legal actions using this strategy (Annex 4.24).
- The work with Legal Atlas on “Building a global typology of wildlife offenses”, published in *Conservation Biology* (Annex 4.7) provides a unique tool for analysing, interpreting and comparing criminal law and sanctions on IWT across countries. This provides a baseline for future legal analyses of IWT legislation, and for discussing “best practices” in IWT legislation and sanctions. This contribution provides tools to help with processes to “review and amend national legislation as necessary” (Kasane statement), and there is evidence that it is already service this purpose in several African countries (Annex 4.21).

- We further conducted widespread, targeted engagement the key stakeholders—government agencies in Indoensia and civil society groups globally—who are in positions to operationalise these legal actions (e.g., Annex 4.19, 4.17, 4.18). This included courtesy calls as well as developing resources for practitioners, including judges (Annex 4.28) and groups training judges (Annex 4.29)) to help ensure the public bodies are able to operationalise their responsibilities. This support enforcement efforts, specifically the Kasane statement aim to “ensure that relevant prosecutors, judges, Financial Intelligence Units, and authorities engaged in law enforcement, have the... knowledge to investigate and prosecute financial crimes associated with wildlife crime”.
- We conducted an additional, structured review of recent IWT legal suits in Indonesia (Annex 4.11), which is providing deeper insight into how criminal law in Indonesia is actually dealing with IWT. This is important in the face of increased enforcement, but little public analysis of what cases are being prosecuted. As such, it provides a basis for arguing that existing legal approaches for IWT (in Indonesia and globally) are insufficient for dealing with large-scale IWT, and that liability suits are an important additional resource to explore. It also supports opportunities to review Indonesia’s commitment made at the London Conference, where it stakes that it “takes enforcement of IWT seriously along with other forms of environment and forest crimes”.

5. Impact on species in focus

The project does not have species-level impacts to report on, nor do we have indicators at this scale, as the project is focused on much broader systemic reforms. This includes changes to the way in which legal frameworks and legal practitioners use the law in response to IWT. Where the proposed approach is successfully used, these lawsuits can provide benefits to species at several levels: (1) It can benefit individual flora/fauna/fungi affected by a specific IWT case by providing rehabilitation and long-term care; (2) it can benefit the species by securing remedies such as specific conservation actions in the wild to help reverse the negative impacts caused by an IWT case, and (3) it can provide remedies for harms caused to human wellbeing. As such, the approach reconfigures legal responses to IWT, from one focusing on punishment of those who conduct IWT, to one that actively focuses on providing remedies for the harm caused by specific IWT cases—with clear benefits for species.

Nevertheless, this project does have specific-species benefits associated with the pioneering “test case” lawsuit that – if successful will provide tangible benefits to one key species involved in that lawsuit.

6. Project support to poverty alleviation

In terms of poverty alleviation, the primary intended beneficiaries are forest-dependent communities in Indonesia who are affected by IWT in a number of ways--including because IWT may disrupt ecosystems on which they rely; limit the wildlife they harvest (an estimated 4 million people in Indonesia), or other aspect of their livelihoods (e.g., tourism); impinge on specific cultural and religious ties to affected wildlife; or because they are affected by poaching in their communities (e.g., security) and/or restrictions placed on them because of concerns over IWT. The project also benefits the civil society, local and national government agencies often representing the interests of these communities in formal institutions. The project has long-term and indirect impacts for poverty-reduction and wellbeing within these communities, and there were 3 key types of impacts identified in the application.

Evidence of contributions towards the 3 key types of poverty-reduction impacts

Impacts listed in proposal	Evidence of contributions towards those impacts
Better quantify the scale of IWT harm on society, including on the poorest communities who often suffer the burdens of IWT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline and related publication (Annex 4.4, 4.2) include a framework for classifying types of legally-recognised harm and matching these to remedies that can be pursued via lawsuits. This is illustrated through an example of the Bornean Orangutan, including illustrating how harm to that species causes cascading impacts

	including on human wellbeing and intangible values for nature.
Pioneer legal mechanisms that help compensate victims of IWT, whether through direct payments or actions that remedy harm (e.g., reintroduction, apologies)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guideline that addresses key legal questions determining whether/how these types of claims can be made in Indonesia and globally (Annex 4.4) • “Test case” submitted that seeks to hold offenders of IWT legally liable for the harm they caused to human wellbeing, which is a link that has not been previously acknowledged by courts (Annex 4.1).
Improve judicial responses to IWT to ensure legal responses fairly assess the impacts of IWT.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engagement and interviews with 32 Indonesian judges that include specific evaluations of whether they are willing to accept lawsuits that make claims for remedies for harm caused by IWT, including harm associated with poverty and wellbeing (Annex 4.10, 4.28). • Development of resources for training judges about civil environmental law, and incorporation of these into their networks and trainings (Annex 4.29).

In addition, the project is making contributions to stakeholders within:

- Indonesian society at large: Many of the types of harm that we recognise in the guideline and test case are experienced by the public at large (e.g., reduction in species survival, decrease in tax revenue, reputational harm, decrease in scientific value). As such, associated remedies have broad collective benefits.
- Conservation NGOs: The guideline highlights the important role of civil society groups as prospective plaintiffs, and provides guidance on how to operationalise claims.
- Broader global environmental law and conservation communities.: The resources we developed for civil lawsuits, in combination with the test case, are serving as a global example for action—including several proposals for future lawsuits, at least 2 of which involve specific elements of harm to livelihoods, as well as other dimensions of human wellbeing (Annex 4.24).

7. Consideration of gender equality issues

The project sought internal gender balance in terms of portion (equality), but also in decision-making and opportunity (equity). The project team was well gender balanced and included opportunities for career development of junior female colleagues. This is reflected, for example, in the WILDS UK Workshop (Annex 4.15, 58% women). While the main project partners (LEC, Auriga) were led by men (J.Phelps, G.Nagara), women have been working in prominent roles, responsible for leading specific parts of the work and actively making decisions about the project scope, approach and management. This includes the Research Assistant/Coordinator (U.Latifah), Legal Atlas lead (M.Pasucal), and ELI lead (C.Jones) and lead researcher (R.Fajrini). It included specific support for early-career women, with opportunities for networking, international travel for R.Fajrini and U.Latifah to the UK, and support with first journal publications 4 early-career female researchers (M.Rodriguez, I.Dabrowski, R.Fajrini, U.Latifah) (Annex 4.13, 4.10, 4.11). This has particular implications for building capacity and opportunities within the heavily male-dominated field of law.

Gender equality was more difficult to achieve with working with Indonesian partners outside of our own institutions. For example, our fieldwork scoping and government engagement were heavily male-dominated (Annex 4.1), as were our engagement with judges (Annex 4.28), which we cannot entirely control within the project as these reflect existing patterns in Indonesian society. Similarly, within the “test case” development has been heavily male led as a result of the lawyers and plaintiff we were able to recruit (Annex 4.1), although several women playing prominent roles in informing our damage claim, including Gender disaggregated data for engagement with NGOs and government offices (e.g., at courtesy calls, in focus groups, during webinars) was recorded where viable (Annex 4.32) but we do not

considered particularly insightful/meaningful, as participation was directed by whoever was sent to official represent those institutions, rather than any active choices made by our project.

8. Sustainability and legacy

Project profile: We have successfully built the profile of the conservation-litigation approach in Indonesia and internationally via our media engagement (Annex 4.25) and social media engagement (Annex 4.27), and notably via our targeted blogs/editorials (Annex 4.26), online events (Annex 4.17, 4.18) as well as courtesy calls to key NGOs globally (Annex 4.19). These mean that many people in the IWT and conservation space with greatest potential to act, have heard about the civil lawsuit approach, likely for the first time. Broader public awareness is likely to increase as we further disseminate our animated video (Annex 4.14). We have made resources all openly available, including our website (Annex 4.3). There is evidence that this is attracting interest, notably because other NGO and government groups are considering undertaking lawsuits of their own (Annex 4.24). It is also reflected in possibilities for future funding (Annex 4.32), the by-invitation-only events we have been asked to participate in (Annex 4.17) to some of the high-profile individuals who have engaged with us internationally and in Indonesia, including leading thinkers in the environmental law field (Annex 4.30).

Most enduring achievements: The most enduring achievement is that the concept of conservation litigation as a strategy to address IWT, which few conservationists had heard about or considered prior to this project, is now part of the conservation dialogue. We have been very thorough and targeted in our engagement with NGOs in Indonesia and globally, via both directly meetings (Annex 4.9) and broader public communication (Annex 4.16) that many more relevant stakeholders will now be at least familiar with the strategy. In addition, the test case lawsuit, particularly if it is successful in court, will be an enduring achievement because it will help to solidify and formally recognise the viability of this strategy.

Exit plan:

- We integrated our resources into existing trainings in Indonesia that serve to mainstream our approach into education for key decision-makers, notably judges. This includes via the Supreme Court Environmental Certification Programme and via Auriga's upcoming training for environmental investigators and prosecutors. We have also engaged 3 NGOs who have historically be involved IWT enforcement training for prosecutors and judges. and shared our resources and offered further support for any future trainings they. hold. We have also shared our resources with professors at 3 universities with proposals for this to be incorporated into undergraduate environmental law modules, offering to support with guest lectures in future (Annex 4.19).
- We have integrated conservation litigation strategies into several high-profile strategy-setting document that will increase visibility and help to ensure that they are considered beyond project end. including into a revision of wildlife legislation in Liberia (Annex 4.13) and into upcoming strategic global documents of the UNODC, IPBES and Beyond Pandemics (Annex 4.12).
- We have invested significant efforts into building a relationship Indonesia's Ministry of Environment and Forestry and its various divisions, so that they can explore opportunities to undertake lawsuits of their own beyond the project.
- We are seeking funding to enable future work, notably support of possible appeals for the test case, as well as for upscaling conservation litigation to other countries (Annex 4.22).
- We are offering support to groups interested in pursuing litigation of their own, and have identified several candidates (Annex 4.14)
- We have created a website where all of our resources are available in 1 location into the future (Annex 4.3).

9. Lessons learnt

- Ensure strong financial management support: We have had challenges with finance department at both Lancaster and Auriga, both of which are over-stretched and have also struggled with the complexity of the project. This has been made harder by 1) Lancaster using different internal budget headlines than Defra, and 2) by what we perceive as a challenging Defra budget template. In particular, because all project partners are grouped together on the Defra form, it can be hard to align across groups. In future, we would do more upfront work to ensure the finance departments are robust and understand processes and expectations.

- Identify fewer indicators and simplify the log-frame. We made our log frame and indicators too complex and numerous, which made reporting more onerous than it needed to be.
- Plan for holiday closures: Plan for longer than expected delays during Ramadan and Christmas/New Year season, especially in rural areas.
- Hire an experienced project administrator early in the project: Although this is often constrained by budget, it is important to ensure strong reporting, follow-up and organisation.
- Ensure partners have institutional support: Check deeply into new partners, to ensure that not only the individuals you are engaging, but the institutions backing them, fully understand the project and approach.
- Simplify log frame: Make the log frame simpler to make tracking and reporting more manageable.

9.1 Monitoring and evaluation

We made only minor changes to the log frame throughout the project, primarily clarifying some indicators adding more baselines in response to an external reviewer. The most significant changes were:

- Shift from hosting in-person workshops with government officials in West Kalimantan and North Sumatra, to greater forms of virtual engagement and more focus on 1-on-1 courtesy calls with relevant stakeholders. This allowed for more targeted engagement.
- Conducting less fieldwork than anticipated, due to government permit issues and COVID-19, and relying more heavily on secondary data to develop our damage claim. This did not affect the quality of the project as the necessary data was identified.

The M&E process was moderately helpful, but could have been strengthened by having an administrator with a role more focused on this and a more regular/structured processes for ensuring this was done in a timely manner. Although we set up a system using GoogleDocs and Slack to track progress, these were inconsistently used and staff and partners did not fill them in regularly, which increased burdens at reporting time, especially for the Project Leader and Research Assistant.

We had annual evaluations via the IWT Challenge Fund. The annual review process was a very useful check-in for all of the partners, although the evaluations themselves were generally not detailed/technical enough to meaningfully inform project plans or strategy (i.e. focused primarily on aspects of reporting rather than design).

9.2 Actions taken in response to annual report reviews

Most of the comments provided in the annual report related to clarifications and/or providing or strengthening baselines, which were addressed. In most of these cases, the baseline was that “no such action/measure/resource existed”. The key substantive issue addressed in the last annual report had to do with a suggestion to “disaggregate the single Outcome statement into two: one focused on medium-term change in Indonesia, and the other focused on medium-term change at the global level.” We failed to make this change with Defra/LTW before preparing this final report, but agree it was a good suggestion. The reviewer will note that, in our reporting of outcome in this report, we address both domestic and global dimensions of our outcome.

10. IWT Challenge Fund Identity

The Challenge Fund is well known by the international conservation NGO operating in Indonesia and the Ministry of Environment and Forests offices that deal with wildlife.

The UK Aid logo was printed on the Guideline, Policy Brief and animation produced by the project, and the IWT Challenge Fund recognised in the acknowledgements (Annex 4.4, 4.6, 4.13). The Fund was also recognised as the funder in the acknowledgement section of journal publications (Annex 4.2, 4.7), on our conservation-litigation.org website (Annex 4.3), and in our conference presentations (4.15) and public events (Annex 4.17). The Fund was further specifically mentioned in the bilateral meetings we had with NGOs globally (Annex 4.18), and in the blogs/editorials published by the team (Annex 4.25). In

all cases, it was recognised as a stand-alone project, although in the website we acknowledge that the project is ongoing beyond the project direction.

11. Finance and administration

11.1 Project expenditure

NOTE: We are yet to receive all invoices for partner costs from Auriga, so please treat these as a draft.

Financial Year 2020/21

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)				
TOTAL				

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
LU – Jacob Phelps – Project Manager	
ELI - Carol Adaire Jones	
ELI – John Pendergrass	
Auriga - Grahat Nagara	
Auriga - Roni Saputra	
Auriga - Rika Fajrini	
Auriga - Umi Latifa	
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
LU - Woodgrain Media Animation LU - Bank Fees (for partner invoices) LU - Auditing fee (Prospective) Auriga - Conference Registration Auriga – Translation Costs Auriga - Graphic Design	
TOTAL	

Financial Year 2021/22

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)				
TOTAL				

Staff employed (Name and position)	Cost (£)
TOTAL	

Other items – description	Other items – cost (£)
Auriga – Voiceover costs Auriga – Transcription Costs	
TOTAL	

11.2 Additional funds or in-kind contributions secured

Maribel Rodriguez started a PhD at Lancaster University, which reflected additional source of in-kind funding for the project, but unfortunately had to end her candidature during COVID-19.

Very substantial, in-kind contributions we obtained throughout the project, notably in the investment of time of experts internationally who supported the project with skills (Annex 4.20). This includes significant in-kind input from T.P. Nugraha at LIPI, project staff at Auriga, and J.Phelps, also invested significantly greater time into the project than was budgeted. Moreover, we secured pro-bono/in-kind contributions of time and expertise from lawyers and scholars, as well as from artists involved in the animation development.

We have not yet secured additional funding, but have identified some leads (Annex 4.22).

Source of funding for project lifetime	Total (£)
TOTAL	

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

11.3 Value for Money

This project sought out to further conceptualise, explore/understand, test and promote a novel legal strategy for addressing. We believe that we have overwhelmingly achieved this in a way that is generating possibilities for new legal action in Indonesia and other countries (i.e. surpassing our target outcome). This is especially well reflected in the uptake into policy documents (4.12, 4.13) and others' interest in building lawsuits of their own (Annex 4.14). Given that the strategy differs so significantly from existing practise/traditional enforcement, we believe it is very significant, and good value for money, that we have introduced an entirely new narrative and legal approach into the global IWT policy discourse. We believe it has provided "thought leadership" and, given the international reception that our work has received, including the high profile of journal publications (Annex 4.2, 4.7) and high-profile events and speakers we have engaged (e.g., Annex 4.7), believe this has been achieved at an excellent standard.

Financial resources were concentrated to our Indonesian partner, hiring domestic expertise and engaging key government agents to promote long-term uptake. Resources for UK/US salaries and overheads were comparatively limited, which helped to deliver strong value for money. This was furthered by the significant in-kind contributions we secured (Annex 4.20) itself an indication of the quality of the project.

12. **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.

Our project focused on Indonesia as a case study through which to explore the potential of a new legal strategy to address IWT – civil lawsuits to hold IWT offenders liable for the harms they cause. We hoped, but did not expect that the case study and precedent would generate such widespread and sincere international interest, or so quickly inspire others to undertake legal action of their own. We believe it is an outstanding achievement to have introduced a novel legal response to IWT that is being seriously considered by leading players in the field. Moreover, we believe the approach has profound implications for how we think about the impacts from and remedies IWT, and how we use different areas of law to uphold environmental rights and tackle IWT.

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

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of Verification	Important assumptions
<p>Impact: Reduction in the commercial illegal wildlife trade in Indonesia, to improve judicial accountability and protect natural capital stocks that support biodiversity, rural livelihoods and wellbeing.</p>			
<p>Outcome 0.1. Indonesian legal system demonstrates ability to better account for the harm that IWT causes society, pioneering approaches that will improve the global community's understanding of IWT harm and ways to strengthen sanctions to deter future IWT and compensate for IWT harm.</p>	<p>0.1 First IWT civil liability case prepared by project completion (Y3, baseline=zero)</p> <p>0.2 Guidelines on establishing damage claims for IWT cases are receive government engagement, notably within the Ministry of Environment an Forests' Environmental Expert Forum</p> <p>0.3 Three civil society groups apply new approaches to communicating IWT damages in their public communication strategies and/or internal project planning to undertake lasuits by project completion (Y2, Y3)</p>	<p>0.1 Auriga internal documentation preparing the case. 01. Case filing in court (see 5.4)</p> <p>0.2 Evidence (e.g., emails, personal communications, formal reports) from the key government agencies that guidelines are being discussed and used (e.g., from Ministry of Environment and Forests Environmental Expert Forum, possibly also Anti-Corruption Commission and Fiscal Policy Agency).</p> <p>0.3 Copies of online communication products from civil society groups in Indonesia and internationally (e.g., WCS, Friends of the Earth). 0.3 Meetings with and reports or emails from civil society groups</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial resources limit government agencies' ability to prepare environmental prosecution. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Project highlights the potential for civil society to prepare cases, and matches the project with Auriga, which already has funding to pursue such a case. • Cases are often slow to move through the judicial system. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Monitoring should be long term, beyond project duration, led by WCS, which has long-term (since 2003) engagement and monitoring of IWT cases in Indonesia. • Gaps within existing Indonesian regulations may limit civil liability (e.g., restrict the application of some types of liability, failure to collet awarded monies, failure to allocate money to conservation reinvestment). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Project specifically works to identifies these types of barriers and makes them the focus of expert workshops, guidelines and training. • The Indonesian judicial system is limited by many factors (e.g., corruption. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Even a small number of civil liability cases can make important impacts for governance and social signalling. • Indonesian legal reform is often slow and unpredictable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: WCS and Auriga have long-term (beyond project duration) engagement in monitoring and informing environmental legislation, including Law #5. • Agencies have the capacity and resources to conduct this additional work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Training and guideline resources seek to make this as accessible as possible. Currently, valuation and quantification are mentioned in several pieces of legislation, but without adequate support or guidance. • Groups have the capacity and resources to conduct this additional work

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: We have existing expressions of interest from several civil society groups. We know that WCS Indonesia is prepared to engage this type of work. • Stakeholder participate actively in related workshops and interviews <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Auriga has extensive experience engaging government agents and civil society groups in workshops. Our team includes dynamic individuals with the ability and experience to actively engage participants.
<p>Output 1. There is a new resource available for comparing IWT legislation and sanctions across jurisdictions (civil, administrative and criminal)</p>	<p>1.1 New resource with the country comparison including their sanctions (Y1, baseline = there is no existing published guideline)</p> <p>1.2 Journal publication on framework to compare IWT laws and sanctions across jurisdictions, “A global taxonomy of wildlife crimes” (Y3, baseline = there is no similar published article)</p> <p>1.3 Presentation at >3 international conferences (Y2, Y3) and/or incorporation into international conservation projects.</p> <p>1.4 Dissemination in >3 non-academic publications (e.g., newsletters, editorials, popular articles, targeted listserves) (Y3)</p>	<p>1.1 Resource openly available on Legal Atlas website</p> <p>1.2 Publication copy</p> <p>1.3 Registration, poster and/or abstract demonstrating participation 1.3 Copy of presentation or project documents</p> <p>1.4 Publication copies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legislation needed to conduct the review is available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Legal Atlas has established networks and experience needed to collect this type of data. Local expertise in legal systems will be provided.
<p>Output 2. The legal and technical clarity and resources are available to facilitate development of IWT civil liability damage claims.</p>	<p>2.1 >50 Indonesian participants engaged in the expert workshops, focus groups and interviews from across sectors, in order to collect input on the design of the proposed approach to forming damage</p>	<p>2.1 Participant lists 2.1 Gender disaggregated data on participation 2.1 Photographs from events 2.1 Internal documentation on successful engagements and</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is scope and receptiveness to innovations in the ways people think about and deal with IWT cases <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Current developments suggest a receptive audience within government, notably related to the current revision of Law #5 on Biodiversity, which includes reference to quantification of environmental harm.

	<p>claims and legal suits, and to disseminate the project idea. These will prioritise gender equity, and focus on key stakeholder groups: Indonesian legal community, officials involved in environmental enforcement, conservation NGOs focused on IWT (Y1/Y2, baseline = WILDS legal approach is novel to most target stakeholders)</p> <p>2.2 Guidelines for quantification IWT damage claims developed (early Y3, baseline = 1 government regulation articulates possible methods)</p> <p>2.3 Training resource on IWT sanctions, summarising application of the civil liability guidelines and sanctions standards, in English and Indonesian (Y3, baseline = 0)</p> <p>2.4 Website highlighting project outputs (by Y3 end, baseline = 0)</p>	<p>challenges, addressing gender equity</p> <p>2.1 Feedback, via email and/or social media posts, from >10 topic-relevant leaders in the conservation field</p> <p>2.2 Guidelines published</p> <p>2.3 Resources published in English and Indonesian</p> <p>2.4 Link to website</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Project also engages with existing administrative and criminal sanctions, so that focus is not exclusively on novel pathways linked to civil liability. ○ Mitigation: Workshop organisers are dynamic and able to elicit meaningful participation. ● There may be resistance to the valuation of some types of ecosystem goods and services, which can be complex and can be contested (e.g., contingent valuation), particularly in the context of courtroom application <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Specific barriers will be evaluated via the interviews with judges, and is why training and broad engagement with relevant bodies and the public is needed. ○ Mitigation: Project also looks at the value of quantifying harm from IWT <i>beyond</i> its courtroom applications, so it will yield benefits in terms of communication to the public and government agencies even outside the courtroom.
<p>Output 3. There is a body of Indonesian prosecutors, experts and judges able to operationalise civil liability cases for IWT, with the guidance to allow them to account for environmental and socio-economic dimensions.</p>	<p>3.1 Training materials developed (Y2)</p> <p>3.2 >30 Indonesian judges engaged via expert workshops and interviews (Y1, Y2, Y3, baseline = there has only been 1 previous training on civil liability suits for approx. 34 judges on related topics conducted in 2017, which did not address IWT)</p>	<p>3.1 Resources published in English and Indonesian</p> <p>3.2 Participant lists</p> <p>3.2 Gender disaggregated data</p> <p>3.2 'Impact log' with documentation on successful engagements and challenges, addressing gender equity</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Relies on the continued buy-in from the legal community and specific government agencies and successful engagement with partners. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Partners have existing, long-term relationships with key agencies. ○ Mitigation: We have existing communication with several government agencies and have received confirmation of their interest in these new resources. ● Relies on individuals to take-up these new resources and ideas <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Project focuses not only on institutional mandates but on individuals' specific understanding and engagement with these concepts. This deeper and longer-term engagement is important to recruiting buy-in.

	<p>3.3 Research collaborators from Indonesian Institute of Sciences are actively involved throughout project design and implementation (Y1, Y2, Y3)</p> <p>3.4 Project resources integrated into 3 existing environmental training programmes for government officials (e.g., Supreme Court Environmental Certification Programme, WCS, IUU Task Force, UNDP SUSTAIN initiative, UNODC, Corruption Eradication Commission) (Y3, baseline = this is not a topic covered in any exiting training materials/courses)</p> <p>3.6 Stakeholder engagement workshops including participants from Jakarta, Medan and Pontianak (Y3, baseline = no previous sub-national training has been offered for practitioners on this topic)</p> <p>3.7 Ministry of Environment and Forests demonstrates interest in filing at least 1 IWT civil lawsuit of their own (by Y3, baseline = no government-led civil suit ever filed for a wildlife case)</p>	<p>3.3 Evidence (e.g., conference presentation) that research collaborator demonstrates deep understanding of approaches to preparing damage claims for IWT cases.</p> <p>3.4 Emails and/or training materials from boundary partners demonstrating integration/plans to integrate into future training materials</p> <p>3.6 Participant lists, gender disaggregated 3.6 Photographs of workshops</p> <p>3.7 Documentation or report demonstrating plan to act</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: Project includes participation of researchers from Ministry of Environment and Forests ○ Mitigation: Project works with existing partnerships with government agents
<p>Output 4. Indonesian and international legal and environmental communities demonstrate awareness</p>	<p>4.1 >6 international newspaper reports/editorials that discuss environmental and socio-economic costs of IWT and</p>	<p>4.1 Media searches and article copies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The broader community continues to recognize the importance of IWT and related prosecutions.

<p>of emerging standards for IWT sanctions and the potential to use civil liability suits to account for environmental harm from IWT, including environmental and socio-economic impacts.</p>	<p>related liabilities, and mention, relate and/or link to this project (Y2, Y3)</p> <p>4.2 >20 Indonesian non-government participants involved in the expert workshops, targeting Indonesian conservation NGOs and legal experts in order to disseminate the WILDS approach to damage claims and legal suits (Y2, Y3 baseline = the WILDS legal approach is novel to most stakeholders)</p> <p>4.3 >10 Indonesian and >10 international civil society groups engaged via courtesy calls to present result and encourage uptake (Y3)</p> <p>4.4 Results presented at >3 international conferences and/or integrated into international projects (Y2, Y3)</p> <p>4.5 Two journal publications on project findings (Y3, baseline = no such publications in the context of biodiversity of IWT)</p> <p>4.6 Civil liability for IWT “under discussion” within >2 independent platforms that demonstrate outside uptake (Y3, baseline = these types of issues are not currently under discussion in international fora)</p> <p>4.7 >14 Legal and environmental groups in 7</p>	<p>4.2 Participant lists 4.2 Workshop photographs</p> <p>4.3 Meeting reports</p> <p>4.4 Conference/project documentation</p> <p>4.5 Copies of publications freely available online</p> <p>4.6 Online search results 4.6 Reports from international colleagues demonstrating external engagement</p> <p>4.7 Email documentation 4.7 Impact log documenting “relationship status” of promising engagements</p>	
---	---	---	--

	<p>countries (beyond Indonesia) are actively engaged with project outputs (Y3, baseline = this is not currently a topic of discussion in these fora).</p> <p>4.8 >1 body (civil society, government) interested in pursuing a similar suit, inspired by this project (Y3, baseline = no other organisations are currently working on this type of legal case).</p> <p>4.9 1 animated video developed for social media that highlights WILDS project and messages</p>	<p>4.8 Email documentation 4.8 Actual case or case plan</p> <p>4.9 Link to the video 4.9 Social media statistics on video dissemination</p>	
<p>Output 5. Pioneering civil liability for IWT harm “test case” is developed in a way that captures environmental and socio-economic harm.</p>	<p>5.1 ‘Step-by-step’ timeline of how environmental civil suits should be filed in Indonesia (Y3, baseline = there are no resources available that article how to develop these types of suits)</p> <p>5.2 Established grounds for legal standing (i.e. right of Auriga to be the body to bring this specific claim to court) (Y2, baseline = there is a lack of legal uncertainty and not related publications)</p> <p>5.3 Damage claim (part of petition to the court that quantifies the harm and the associated financial/non-financial claims made of the plaintiff) for “test case” that seeks to redress environmental</p>	<p>5.1 Internal report and guideline</p> <p>5.2 Legal brief articulating context and claim, nature of harm, and relevant regulations</p> <p>5.3 Lawsuit documentation articulating the case details, purported harm, and the damage claim being asked of the defendant</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a viable legal case and plaintiff that can be identified <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Mitigation: WCS works on IWT across Indonesia, often in cooperation with affected communities and agencies, and is positioned to help identify potential cases. ○ Mitigation: Auriga has considerable experience with investigative research and the legal expertise to pioneer this type of case. ○ Mitigation: Our networks include Indonesian Center for Environmental Law and Walhi (Friends of the Earth Indonesia), which have experience pursuing environmental cases in Indonesia, including civil liability suits (related to peatland fires), and can provide legal advice. • There are appropriate qualitative and quantitative measures for establishing a damage claim that are scientifically sound and legally acceptable.

	<p>and socio-economic impacts of IWT, including qualitative and/or quantitative measures and appropriate compensation (end Y2, baseline = no damage claim has ever been created for IWT case)</p> <p>5.4 Case submitted to the court (Y3, baseline = no similar case has ever been litigated)</p>	<p>5.4 Case registration number</p>	
<p>Activities</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Extract civil, criminal and administrative IWT legislation for the 8 countries 1.2 Establish the framework for evaluating and comparing IWT sanctions 2.1 Convene workshop in Lancaster with partners and key informants to conceptualise overall approach for calculating IWT damage claims and applying them in civil liability suits. 2.2 Convene series of stakeholder and expert workshops and interviews with economists, legal experts and civil society in Indonesia to establish consensus on existing IWT sanctions, and on the key technical and legal challenges to operationalising civil liability suits for IWT. 2.3 Analyse existing IWT cases in Indonesia to evaluate how damage (economic and non-economic impacts) can be conceptualized and how these compare to existing sanction regimes. 2.4 Develop guidelines for quantification of IWT harm for civil liability cases, cases to help guide legal practitioners. 2.5 Develop technical resources, i.e. slides for training material in English and Indonesian, Policy Brief, and opini juris (form of academic guidance to legal practitioners) that help to communicate the guidelines to practitioners with outside inputs. 2.6 Data collected at case study field site, identifying different types of harm experienced at the local level that need to included within an IWT damage claim. (more below, activity 5.2) 3.1 Engage partner and boundary organisations in Indonesia to integrate guidelines into existing training schemes for judges. 3.2 Collaborate with researchers from the Indonesian Institute of Life Sciences (LIPI), ensuring they are meaningfully engaged in project design and implementation. 3.3 Distribute findings and "proof-of-concept" via short articles, editorials, media engagement and targeted listservs of experts with relevant expertise 3.4 Hold project-end stakeholder engagement online workshops involving stakeholders from Jakarta and Medan and Pontianak 3.5 Outreach and/or online meeting with university lecturers to incorporate WILDS resources into undergraduate law degree programmes 3.6 Host online workshop for Andalas University (law and judicial students) on WILDS resources 1.1 Distribute findings and "proof-of-concept" via engagement with international and domestic media. 1.2 Engage Indonesian public via contribution of editorials and newspaper articles. 1.3 Engage targeted Indonesian civil society groups via courtesy calls and public events (e.g., webinar, domestic conferences). 1.4 Prepare journal publication on framework to compare IWT laws and sanctions across jurisdictions, "A global taxonomy of wildlife crimes" 1.5 Prepare journal article on economic valuation of IWT harm and its use in civil liability suits for IWT cases. 1.6 Engage environmental law community in 7 countries other than Indonesia, via direct engagement via ELI, Auriga and LA professional networks. 1.7 Engage international environmental law community via environmental law and conservation conferences 1.8 Public-facing animation highlighting key WILDS concepts in English & Indonesian 1.9 Engage >4 Indonesian government agencies via series of online meetings to present WILDS resources 			

- 5.1 In collaboration with government and civil society partners confirm an appropriate site for the test.
- 5.2 Conduct scoping of field site and establish permissions and contacts to pursue data collection
- 5.3 Data collected related to the test case, identifying different types of harm experienced at the local level that need to be included within an IWT damage claim (Same 2.6)
- 5.4 Conduct socio-economic and environmental assessments of IWT damages for the test case and illustrative cases for the guideline
- 5.6 Prepare summary of standing and damage claim, including socio-economic and environmental dimensions, for the case
- 5.7 Lodge court case

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>Reduction in the commercial illegal wildlife trade in Indonesia, to improve judicial accountability and protect natural capital stocks that support biodiversity, rural livelihoods and wellbeing.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Developed a novel approach to addressing IWT using civil law tools, which focuses on offenders' liability and providing remedies for the harm they cause, as evidenced by academic (Annex 4.2) and practitioner resources (Annex 4.4, 4.5, 4.6), and broad engagement (Annex 4.16, and tangible evidence of policy update (Annex Developed the first such lawsuit in Indonesia (Annex 4.1), which is being broadly shared as a global example (Annex 4.7, 4.8, 4.9, 4.4), and evidence that other NGOs and Indonesian government agencies are interested in pursuing their own cases (Annex 4.7) Developed novel framework to enable comparative legal analysis across countries (Annex 4.7), which is being now actively used to inform several other project and legislation in other countries (Annex 4.3)
<p>Outcome Indonesian legal system demonstrates ability to better account for the harm that IWT causes society, pioneering approaches that will improve the global community's understanding of IWT harm and ways to strengthen sanctions to deter future IWT and compensate for IWT harm.</p>	<p>0.1 First IWT civil liability case prepared by project completion (Y3, baseline=zero)</p> <p>0.2 Guidelines on establishing damage claims for IWT cases are receive government engagement, notably within the Ministry of Environment and Forests' Environmental Expert Forum</p> <p>0.3 Three civil society groups apply new approaches to communicating IWT damages in their public communication strategies and/or internal project planning to undertake lawsuits by project completion (Y2, Y3)</p>	<p>0.1 Lawsuit submitted in Indonesian court (Annex 4.1)</p> <p>0.2 Guideline published (Annex 4.4) supplemented with Policy Brief (Annex 4.6) and training slides (Annex 4.5) in English and Indonesia, and demonstrated engagement from 2 leading members of the Expert Forum, Prof. Andri Gunawanv and scientific expert witness Prof. Bambang Hero (Annex 4.11, 4.13). Beyond the proposed indicator of success.</p> <p>0.3 Four NGOs, operating in Cameroon, Italy and Indonesia, are in discussions with us about developing their own civil lawsuits (Annex 4.7)</p>
<p>Output 1. There is a new resource available for comparing IWT legislation and sanctions across jurisdictions (civil, administrative and criminal)</p>	<p>1.1 New resource with the country comparison including their sanctions (Y1, baseline = there is no existing published guideline)</p> <p>1.2 Journal publication on framework to compare IWT laws and sanctions across jurisdictions, "A global taxonomy</p>	<p>1.1 Resource available on https://www.legal-atlas.com (see Annex 4.8).</p> <p>1.2 Open Access publication in <i>Conservation Biology</i>, one of the top-ranking journals in the field (Annex 4.7).</p>

	<p>of wildlife crimes” (Y3, baseline = there is no similar published article)</p> <p>1.3 Presentation at >3 international conferences (Y2, Y3) and/or incorporation into international conservation projects.</p> <p>1.4 Dissemination in >3 non-academic publications (e.g., newsletters, editorials, popular articles, targeted listserves) (Y3)</p>	<p>1.3 Invited public presentation for the Society for Conservation Biology Emerging Issues in Conservation Seminar Series (Annex 4.16), and featured in presentations to FFI Cambodia and Conservation Criminology Group (Annex 4.15)</p> <p>1.3 Incorporated into other project conducting legal review in 15 countries, currently including Somalia, Somaliland region, Yemen, Ethiopia, Liberia, Guinea, Mongolia, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda (Annex 4.3)</p> <p>1.4 Resources shared on 6 Listserv Groups (Annex 4.17) ,and Indonesian WhatsApp groups and via LinkedIn Posts (not evidenced). We did not write articles or editorials about this, as it was too technical for general public audience.</p>
<p>Activity 1.1 Extract civil, criminal and administrative IWT legislation for the 8 countries</p>		<p>Legislation was extracted for all of these countries, analysed and developed into a framework. This is reflected in the publication “Building a global taxonomy of wildlife offenses”, which organises the 511 types of offenses extracted from the legislation into a 4-tier hierarchy (Annex 4.7).</p>
<p>Activity 1.2. Establish the framework for evaluating and comparing IWT sanctions</p>		<p>As previous.</p>
<p>Output 2. The legal and technical clarity and resources are available to facilitate development of IWT civil liability damage claims.</p>	<p>2.1 >50 Indonesian participants engaged in the expert workshops, focus groups and interviews from across sectors, in order to collect input on the design of the proposed approach to forming damage claims and legal suits, and to disseminate the project idea. These will prioritise gender equity, and focus on key stakeholder groups: Indonesian legal community, officials involved in environmental enforcement, conservation NGOs focused on IWT (Y1/Y2, baseline = WILDS legal approach is novel to most target stakeholders)</p> <p>2.2 Guidelines for quantification IWT damage claims developed (early Y3, baseline = 1 government regulation articulates possible methods)</p>	<p>2.1 More than 150 participant lists from across Indonesian government, academe and civil society (Annex 4.23), many engaged via targeted courtesy calls. Approx. 1/3 were women. Assorted photographs (Annex 4.8) and brief notes about promising engagements (Annex 4.23),</p> <p>2.1 Social media posts, from >10 topic-relevant leaders in the conservation field (Annex 4.17).</p> <p>2.2 Guidelines published in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.6).</p> <p>2.2 Development of a Policy Brief summarising the guideline, in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.6). This is beyond the proposed indicator.</p>

	<p>2.3 Training resource on IWT sanctions, summarising application of the civil liability guidelines and sanctions standards, in English and Indonesian (Y3, baseline = 0)</p> <p>2.4 Website highlighting project outputs (by Y3 end, baseline = 0)</p>	<p>2.3 PowerPoint slide deck and training resource developed in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.5)</p> <p>2.3 Development of a Policy Brief summarising the guideline, in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.6).</p> <p>2.4 www.conservation-litigation.org (Annex 4.3).</p>
Activity 2.1. Convene workshop in Lancaster with partners and key informants to conceptualise overall approach for calculating IWT damage claims and applying them in civil liability suits.		<p>2.1 One large-international workshop was held in Lancaster/Alston, with conservationists and academics, including from Indonesia (Auriga, Indonesian Centre for Environmental Law), USA (Environmental Law Institute, Stanford University), Brazil (University of Santa Catarina) and several UK universities (Annex 4.14)</p> <p>2.1 Two workshops were held in Lancaster with colleagues visiting from Indonesia held, in 2018 and 2020 (Annex 4.14)</p>
Activity 2.2. Convene series of stakeholder and expert workshops and interviews with economists, legal experts and civil society in Indonesia to establish consensus on existing IWT sanctions, and on the key technical and legal challenges to operationalising civil liability suits for IWT.		Series of workshops organised with colleagues including from the Indonesian Institute of Sciences, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Public Interest Law Group (LBH), Auriga, Wildlife Conservation Society, Bogor Agricultural University and many other organisation, in Indonesia and UK (Annex 4.5)
Activity 2.3. Analyse existing IWT cases in Indonesia to evaluate how damage (economic and non-economic impacts) can be conceptualized and how these compare to existing sanction regimes.		<p>2.3 We reviewed a range of existing criminal cases in order to identify not only a test case (Annex 4.1) but also types of harm, which are ultimately reflected in the guideline (Annex 4.4)</p> <p>2.3 We further used this database of criminal cases to inform an analysis of contemporary enforcement trends in Indonesia (Annex 4.11)</p>
Activity 2.4. Develop guidelines for quantification of IWT harm for civil liability cases, cases to help guide legal practitioners.		2.3 Guidelines published in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.6).
Activity 2.5. Develop technical resources, i.e. slides for training material in English and Indonesian, Policy Brief, and <i>opini juris</i> (form of academic guidance to legal practitioners) that help to communicate the guidelines to practitioners with outside inputs.		<p>2.5 PowerPoint published in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.5)</p> <p>2.5 Policy Brief published in English and Indonesian (Annex 4.6)</p> <p>2.5 Three <i>amicus curiae</i> / <i>opini juris</i> briefs were prepared and are ready for use by the lawyers in the test case lawsuit, as part of the argumentation for the case (Annex 4.1)</p>
Activity 2.6. Data collected at case study field site, identifying different types of harm experienced at the local level that need to be included within an IWT damage claim. (more below, activity 5.2)		2.6 This primarily relied on secondary data and key informant interviews which were used to identify types of harm and illustrative example. This is reflected in the orangutan example presented in the publication (Annex 4.2) and guideline (Annex 4.4). It is also reflected in the damage claim of the lawsuit test case lawsuit (Annex 4.1).

<p>Output 3. There is a body of Indonesian prosecutors, experts and judges able to operationalise civil liability cases for IWT, with the guidance to allow them to account for environmental and socio-economic dimensions.</p>	<p>3.1 Training materials developed (Y2)</p> <p>3.2 >30 Indonesian judges engaged via expert workshops and interviews (Y1, Y2, Y3, baseline = there has only been 1 previous training on civil liability suits for approx. 34 judges on related topics conducted in 2017, which did not address IWT)</p> <p>3.3 Research collaborators from Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI) are actively involved throughout project design and implementation (Y1, Y2, Y3)</p> <p>3.4 Project resources integrated into 3 existing environmental training programmes for government officials (e.g., Supreme Court Environmental Certification Programme, WCS, IUU Task Force, UNDP SUSTAIN initiative, UNODC, Corruption Eradication Commission) (Y3, baseline = this is not a topic covered in any exiting training materials/courses)</p> <p>3.6 Stakeholder engagement workshops including participants from Jakarta, Medan and Pontianak (Y3, baseline = no previous sub-national training has been offered for practitioners on this topic)</p> <p>3.7 Ministry of Environment and Forests demonstrates interest in filing at least 1 IWT civil lawsuit of their own (by Y3, baseline = no government-led civil suit ever filed for a wildlife case)</p>	<p>3.1 Policy Brief (Annex 4.6) and PowerPoint training slide deck (Annex 4.5) published in English and Indonesian</p> <p>3.2 32 Indonesian judges, including 6 women, engaged via a mock-trial simulation involving an IWT case, and follow-up interviews/discussions (Annex 4.11), which further resulted in a novel publication about judges views on civil lawsuits for IWT (Annex 4.10). We have not maintained an impact log as further direct engagement with them is very unlikely and not ethical, outside of organising training or presentation in court.</p> <p>3.3 Dr Taufiq Purna Nugraha was actively involved in the project as LIPI project lead, including in international conference with the World Commission on Environmental Law (Annex 4.15), contributing to the guideline and publication especially related to orangutan examples (Annex 4.2.4.4), organising workshops with other LIPI colleagues (Annex 4.14). He has also led on our very regular engagement with LIPI management and the Ministry of Environment and Forests (Annex 4.3), representing the project.</p> <p>3.4 The Guideline is now part of the supplementary reading list for judges involved in the Supreme Court Environmental Certification Programme (Annex 4.12), and has been circulated by the Supreme Court’s Environmental Working Group.</p> <p>3.4 We held an online discussion with the Wildlife Conservation Society, Yayasan Planet Indonesia and International Animal Rescue (Annex 4.12). This indicator has limitations, as several of these groups are no longer /not currently doing training for judges.</p> <p>3.4 Auriga training for investigators and prosecutors (Annex 4.12).</p> <p>3.6 Targeted courtesy calls to >30 priority NGOs globally, including series of invited presentations to different organisations (Annex 4.9)</p> <p>3.6 4 workshops engaging staff from across Indonesian Institute of Sciences (Annex 4.14)</p> <p>3.6 Project-end workshop with Ministry of Environment and Forestry and its different divisions(Annex 4.14, see also Annex 4.19).</p>
---	--	--

<p>Activity 3.1 Engage partner and boundary organisations in Indonesia to integrate guidelines into existing training schemes for judges.</p>	<p>3.1 Presentation for 3 NGOs involved in training for judges and prosecutors about IWT enforcement (Annex 4.12) and series of email exchanges.</p> <p>3.1 Integration of guideline resource in Supreme Court Environmental Judge Certification reading list (Annex 4.12)</p> <p>3.1 Dissemination of resources to Supreme Court Environmental `Experts Forum (Annex 4.12)</p> <p>3.1 Module on civil law and wildlife integrated into upcoming Auriga training for prosecutors and investigators (Annex 4.12)</p>
<p>Activity 3.2 Collaborate with researchers from the Indonesian Institute of Life Sciences (LIPI), ensuring they are meaningfully engaged in project design and implementation.</p>	<p>3.2 Active engagement of Taufiq Purna Nugraha throughout the project (Annex 4.15, 4.2, 4.4, 4.3, 4.16)</p> <p>3.2 Workshops with LIPI researchers (Annex 4.14)</p>
<p>Activity 3.3 Distribute findings and "proof-of-concept" via short articles, editorials, media engagement and targeted listservs of experts with relevant expertise</p>	<p>3.3 Nine public-facing blogs by the project (Annex 4.9)</p> <p>3.3 Media Engagement in Indonesia and internationally (Annex 4.8)</p> <p>3.3 Targeted courtesy calls to NGOs globally (Annex 4.2)</p>
<p>Activity 3.4 Hold project-end stakeholder engagement online workshops involving stakeholders from Jakarta and Medan and Pontianak</p>	<p>3.4 Webinar hosted by Auriga with invitations sent to civil society groups and government agencies, recording available online (Annex 4.8)</p> <p>3.4 Final high-level workshop with Ministry of Environment and Forestry (Annex 4.14), although focused on national engagement (explained Annex 4.19)</p>
<p>Activity 3.5 Outreach and/or online meeting with university lecturers to incorporate WILDS resources into undergraduate law degree programmes</p>	<p>3.5 Several face-to-face meetings with with Andri Gunawan (University of Indonesia Law School) (Annex 4.15)</p> <p>3.5 Email discussion with Raynaldo Simbiring (Jentera Law School)</p> <p>3.5 Discussion via webinar and WhatsApp with Sukanda Husin and Frenadin Adegustara (Andalas University Law School) (Annex 4.1)</p>
<p>Activity 3.6 Host online workshop for Andalas University (law and judicial students) on WILDS resources</p>	<p>3.5 Workshop hosted on 29 March 2021 (Annex 4.1)</p>
<p>Output 4. Indonesian and international legal and environmental communities demonstrate awareness of emerging standards for IWT sanctions and the potential to use civil liability suits to account for environmental harm from IWT, including environmental and socio-economic impacts.</p>	<p>4.1 >6 international newspaper reports/editorials that discuss environmental and socio-economic costs of IWT and related liabilities, and mention, relate and/or link to this project (Y2, Y3)</p> <p>4.2 >20 Indonesian non-government participants involved in the expert workshops, targeting Indonesian</p> <p>4.1 Feature article in Mongabay international, reposted in several locations, and articles about the approach and test case lawsuits in 15 Indonesian language media (Annex 4.24)</p> <p>4.1 Nine blogs /editorials about the project (Annex 4.25)</p> <p>4.2 More than 60 people from > 28 organisations engaged in planning discussions (Annex 4.31)</p>

	<p>conservation NGOs and legal experts in order to disseminate the WILDS approach to damage claims and legal suits (Y2, Y3 baseline = the WILDS legal approach is novel to most stakeholders)</p> <p>4.3 >10 Indonesian and >10 international civil society groups engaged via courtesy calls to present result and encourage uptake (Y3)</p> <p>4.4 Results presented at >3 international conferences and/or integrated into international projects (Y2, Y3)</p> <p>4.5 Two journal publications on project findings (Y3, baseline = no such publications in the context of biodiversity of IWT)</p> <p>4.6 Civil liability for IWT “under discussion” within >2 independent platforms that demonstrate outside uptake (Y3, baseline = these types of issues are not currently under discussion in international fora)</p> <p>4.7 >14 Legal and environmental groups in 7 countries (beyond Indonesia) are actively engaged with project outputs (Y3, baseline = this is not currently a topic of discussion in these fora).</p> <p>4.8 >1 body (civil society, government) interested in pursuing a similar suit, inspired by this project (Y3, baseline = no other organisations are currently working on this type of legal case).</p>	<p>4.2 >5 workshops held, in person and online, with Indonesian NGOs and experts (Annex 4.14)</p> <p>4.3 At least 28 Indonesian civil society organisations (Annex 4.23) and >30 international organisations engaged via courtesy calls, including one-on-one meeting and group presentations (Annex 4.18)</p> <p>4.4 Participation in 9 international conferences with formal presentations (Annex 4.15) 4.4. Participation in 6 ‘special’ by-invitation events to present the project (Annex 4.16)</p> <p>4.5 Two open access journal publications, in <i>Conservation Biology</i> (Annex 4.7) and <i>Conservation Letters</i> (Annex 4.2) 4.5 Advanced drafts of 3 manuscripts for submission to journals (Annex 4.10, 4.11, 4.13), beyond log frame</p> <p>4.6 WILDs contribution of text for draft legislation in Liberia (Annex 4.22) 4.6 Invitation to contribute “boxes” featuring conservation litigation in forthcoming global reports by UNODC and IPBES and in End Pandemics ‘Roadmap’ (Annex 4.21) 4.6 Invitations to present to present by Freeland Film Festival and London Natural History Museum (Annex 4.4)</p> <p>4.7 Legal taxonomy framework being applied by Legal Atlas and at least 9 new NGO/IGO partners in 15 other countries (Annex 4.20) 4.7 1-on-1 engagement with >30 international conservation NGOs to introduce idea, collect feedback and discuss collaborations (Annex 4.18)</p> <p>4.8 Four NGOs, operating in Cameroon, Italy and Indonesia, are in discussions with us about developing their own civil lawsuits (Annex 4.7)</p> <p>4.9 5-minute animation developed describing conservation litigation concept, in English and Indonesia (Annex 4.13)</p>
--	--	--

	4.9 1 animated video developed for social media that highlights WILDS project and messages	
Activity 4.1 Distribute findings and "proof-of-concept" via engagement with international and domestic media.		4.1 Feature article in Mongabay international, reposted in several locations, and 'leads' with several other international media (Annex 4.24) 4.1 Eight blogs about the WILDs Project (Annex 4.25)
Activity 4.2 Engage Indonesian public via contribution of editorials and newspaper articles.		4.2 articles about the approach and test case lawsuits in 15 Indonesian language media (Annex 4.24)
Activity 4.3 Engage targeted Indonesian and international civil society groups via courtesy calls and public events (e.g., webinar, domestic conferences).		4.3 >30 1-on-1 courtesy calls held with NGOs globally (Annex 4.19) and high-profile webinars in Indonesia and globally (Annex 4.17)
Activity 4.4 Prepare journal publication on framework to compare IWT laws and sanctions across jurisdictions, "A global taxonomy of wildlife crimes"		4.4 Published open access in <i>Conservation Biology</i> (Annex 4.7)
Activity 4.5 Prepare journal article on economic valuation of IWT harm and its use in civil liability suits for IWT cases.		4.5 Published open access in <i>Conservation Letters</i> (Annex 4.2)
Activity 4.6 Engage environmental law community in 7 countries other than Indonesia, via direct engagement via ELI, Auriga and LA professional networks.		4.6 Legal taxonomy framework being applied by Legal Atlas in 15 other countries (Annex 4.20) 4.6 NGOs operating in Cameroon and Italy in discussions with us about developing their own civil lawsuits (Annex 4.7)
Activity 4.7 Engage international environmental law community via environmental law and conservation conferences		4.6 Participation in 4 law-focused conferences/conference sessions (Annex 4.16) 4.6 Global webinar hosted with the IUCN World Commission On Environmental Law (Annex 4.18)
Activity 4.8 Public-facing animation highlighting key WILDS concepts in English & Indonesian		4.8 Animation developed and disseminated in English and Indonesia (Annex 4.14)
Activity 4.9 Engage >4 Indonesian government agencies via series of online meetings to present WILDS resources		4.9 Extended engagement and visits to the Conservation Agency (BKSDA) offices of Medan and West Kalimantan Provinces including for scoping (Annex 4.1) and throughout project development (4.20, 4.32) 4.9 Formal resentations to the Directorate General of Environmental and Forestry Law Enforcement (Gakkum) and provision of 2 legal analyses they requested (Annex 4.11) and meetings with Gakkum regional offices in Medan and West Kalimantan (Annex 4.32; 4.20) 4.9 >3 Workshops with the Ministry for Environment and Forests offices (KLHK) discuss the guidelines and their involvement (Annex 4.14),

<p>Output 5. Pioneering civil liability for IWT harm “test case” is developed in a way that captures environmental and socio-economic harm.</p>	<p>5.1 ‘Step-by-step’ timeline of how environmental civil suits should be filed in Indonesia (Y3, baseline = there are no resources available that article how to develop these types of suits)</p> <p>5.2 Established grounds for legal standing (i.e. right of Auriga to be the body to bring this specific claim to court) (Y2, baseline = there is a lack of legal uncertainty and not related publications)</p> <p>5.3 Damage claim (part of petition to the court that quantifies the harm and the associated financial/non-financial claims made of the plaintiff) for “test case” that seeks to redress environmental and socio-economic impacts of IWT, including qualitative and/or quantitative measures and appropriate compensation (end Y2, baseline = no damage claim has ever been created for IWT case)</p> <p>5.4 Case submitted to the court (Y3, baseline = no similar case has ever been litigated)</p>	<p>5.1 Guideline published (Annex 4.4)</p> <p>5.2 Internal legal brief developed (Annex 4.12) and findings reflected in the published guideline (Annex 4.4)</p> <p>5.3 Case submitted including damage claim and preparation for trial (Annex 4.1)</p> <p>5.4 Case number: 9 / Pdt.G / LH / 2021 / PN Psp filed in Padang Sidempuan District Court (Annex 4.1)</p>
<p>Activity 5.1 In collaboration with government and civil society partners confirm an appropriate site for the test.</p>	<p>5.1 Extensive desk-based and field scoping work conducted to identify the text case that we finally selected (Annex 4.1)</p>	
<p>Activity 5.2 Conduct scoping of field site and establish permissions and contacts to pursue data collection</p>	<p>5.2 Extensive desk-based and field scoping work conducted to identify the text case that we finally selected (Annex 4.1)</p> <p>5.2 Extensive engagement with government agencies to secure permissions (Annex 4.20)</p>	
<p>Activity 5.3 Data collected related to the test case, identifying different types of harm experienced at the local level that need to included within an IWT damage claim (Same 2.6)</p>	<p>5.3 This primarily relied on secondary data and key informant interviews which were used to identify types of harm and illustrative example. This is reflected in the orangutan example presented in the publication (Annex 4.2) and guideline (Annex 4.4). It is also reflected in the damage claim of the lawsuit test case lawsuit (Annex 4.1).</p>	

<p>Activity 5.4 Conduct socio-economic and environmental assessments of IWT damages for the test case and illustrative cases for the guideline</p>	<p>5.4 This primarily relied on secondary data and key informant interviews which were used to identify types of harm and illustrative example. Further field work and case studies were limited by COVID-19, but we had enough already done with our key orangutan example.</p>
<p>Activity 5.6 Prepare summary of standing and damage claim, including socio-economic and environmental dimensions, for the case</p>	<p>5.6 Internal policy briefs on key technical questions were developed (Annex 4.12, and key points were incorporated into the publication (Annex 4.2) and guideline (Annex 4.4).</p>
<p>Activity 5.7 Lodge court case</p>	<p>5.7 Filed 19 April 2021 (Annex 4.1)</p>

Annex 3 IWT Contacts

Ref No	IWT061
Project Title	Wildlife in Indonesia: Loss, Damage, & Sanctions (WILDS)
Project Leader Details	
Name	Jacob Phelps
Role within IWT Project	Lead
Address	
Phone	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 1	
Name	Umi Latifah
Organisation	Independent consultant working via Auriga
Role within IWT Project	Research Assistant and Indonesia Project Manager for most of the project
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 2	
Name	Timer Manurung & Roni Saputra
Organisation	Auriga Nusantara
Role within IWT Project	Indonesia counterpart leads
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 3	
Name	Dr Taufiq Purna Nugraha
Organisation	Indonesian Institute of Sciences
Role within IWT Project	Main Indonesian Government Counterpart (and worked pro-bono and as a project consultant, although not listed as partner on the IWT proposal)
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 4	
Name	Dr Carol Jones

Organisation	Environmental Law Institute
Role within IWT Project	Research Collaborator
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	
Partner 5	
Name	Maria Pascual
Organisation	Legal Atlas
Role within IWT Project	Research Collaborator
Address	
Fax/Skype	
Email	

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.	X
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.	NA
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.	