



Department
for Environment
Food & Rural Affairs



UK International
Development

Partnership | Progress | Prosperity

Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund IWT127 Year 2 Annual Report

• IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

Scheme (Main or Extra)	Main
Project reference	IWT127
Project title	Conservation Litigation & Wildlife (CLAW)
Country/ies	U.K., Indonesia, India, Cameroon
Lead Organisation	Lancaster University
Project partner(s)	Law and Wildlife, Wildlife Trust of India, Indonesian Center for Environmental Law, Environmental Law Institute, Wildlife Conservation Society, Last Great Apes Organisation
IWTCF grant value	£525,014.65
Start/end dates of project	1 st July 2023 - 30 th June 2026
Reporting period	Apr 2024-Mar 2025, Annual Report 2
Project Leader name	Jacob Phelps
Website/blog/social media	www.Conservation-Litigation.org
Report author(s) and date	Jacob Phelps, Naila Bhat, Difa Shafirah, Debobroto Sircar, Rika Fajrini, Lynne Hempton. 30 April 2025

1. Project summary

IWT causes serious, cascading—but often overlooked—harms that affect biodiversity, human wellbeing and ecosystems across scales:

- Threatening the survival of endangered species focal to CLAW cases, including Indian elephants (EN), chimpanzees (EN), and Sumatran orangutans (CR);
- Injuring individual animals, which often end up in publicly-funded rehabilitation centres (e.g., orangutans);
- Exacerbating rural poverty for households reliant on wildlife through ecotourism, in our core countries, include Indian elephant, and Cameroonian chimpanzee;
- Compromising human wellbeing in the core countries, harming non-monetary “intangible” values for wildlife such as cultural, religious, and existence values (e.g., elephants in India, orangutan in Indonesia). Critical to humans, there are now calls for policy and enforcement to better recognise them;
- Degrading ecosystem goods and services upon which humans rely (e.g., carbon, pollination), often disproportionately affecting women and marginalised groups reliant on wild resources; and
- Pressuring under-resourced government conservation budgets and stealing taxes from legal revenues.

This problem is that the diversity and magnitude of these harms are overlooked by traditional criminal enforcement, which is focused on punishing violators with fines and imprisonment. Such traditional sanctions are often low relative to the benefits of IWT, fail to hold violators accountable for the harm they cause, and leave harm unresolved. This means nature and communities are rarely remedied—exacerbating poverty, injustice and environmental degradation. Moreover, traditional IWT enforcement projects globally have often focused on small-scale and local-level violators, risking an over-criminalisation of IWT.

There is a need for additional, strategic legal approaches that better align our conservation, poverty reduction and social equity goals. This requires a shift from only focusing on punishment and deterrence, to also consider how the law can hold violators accountable in ways that provide remedies, serve justice and deliver meaningful social signals that helps shift

public understanding of IWT. In particular, IWT violators should be responsible for healing the harm they cause: footing the bill for conservation, compensating poor communities whose livelihoods were impacted, and delivering meaningful remedies for harm to wellbeing. Our project does this through strategic liability litigation in IWT cases, as complementary and additional to traditional criminal enforcement. Relevant laws exist in many countries, but have rarely been used to address IWT. CLAW presents an opportunity to build on our growing courtroom experience to demonstrate how these laws can provide more meaningful responses to IWT, at a scale that can attract meaningful global attention. We have NGO and government requests from >8 countries, to support both new court cases and help revise national legislation. The short animation, “Pongo the Stolen Orangutan: How Law can Heal” provides a synthetic description of the gap we address: www.conservation-litigation.org.

2. Project stakeholders/ partners

The CLAW project emerged from a previous IWTCF-funded project, WILDS, which then evolved into a larger international network called Conservation-Litigation.org. This Network is co-led by Dr Jacob Phelps at Lancaster University (although noting that he is currently working with the Wildlife Conservation Society and is based in Indonesia, from where he continues to lead the project via his continued appointment at Lancaster). Much of the international project legal expertise has been led by Maribel Rodriguez, co-lead of the Conservation-Litigation.org network, and Director of Law and Wildlife (LaW). Technical support is also provided by partner, Environmental Law Institute (ELI). Collaborations via this network identified the opportunity to expand the legal approach pioneered under the previous WILDS project, which is what led to the CLAW project and expanded geographic scope. CLAW now includes country partnerships for domestic legal expertise and developing lawsuits and government engagement, led by local partners in 3 countries: Indonesian Center for Environmental Law (ICEL), Wildlife Trust of India (WTI), and Cameroon’s Last Great Apes Organisation (LAGA).

These partnerships, including both long-standing and new partners, have actively strengthened over the project period as a result of very regular communication (online meetings, active WhatsApp groups, see AR1, in-person meetings ([Annex 4.7](#), [Annex 4.19, 2](#)), and collaborating to bring best practices forward in developing conservation litigation ([Annex 4.10](#)). The international partners have worked together in good faith, and are even going on to develop further joint projects and proposals together.

Key lessons

- In-person meeting midway through the project is helpful to building community and keeping momentum.
- Have a person in charge of regularly re-visiting the log-frame to help track progress.
- Scaling-up initiatives to include outside stakeholders is very worthwhile, but time-consuming.
- It can be strategic to lever an existing project to develop follow-up proposals.
- Projects with many partners require additional management.

Key strengths

- We have built a strong sense of community and cohort that is proving very useful.
- We are drawing in additional partners to some of our key activities (e.g., Kerala workshop [Annex 4.7](#); [Annex 4.19, 2](#)), which is providing good value. This includes partners taking legal action as well as intellectual collaborators who are leaders in their fields (e.g. BELS scholar network, see: [Annex 4.3](#))

Summary of relationships:

- **Law and Wildlife (LaW):** This long-term relationship with LU continued to include weekly calls and technical discussions. They are very actively involved in project monitoring, reporting, and design.

- **Indonesian Center for Environmental Law (ICEL):** This is a new partner for Lancaster, and is working well. We are in regular communication, and they are active in developing Indonesia-specific strategy in cooperation with LU and LaW.
- **Wildlife Trust of India (WTI):** This is a new partner for Lancaster, and they are making active contributions. Despite some delays with delivery, there is clear communication.
- **Last Great Apes Organisation (LAGA):** Almost all the contributions from this partner to the project are in-kind, and this has been reflected in their continued engagement, albeit less than in Y1 due to availability.
- **Environmental Law Institute (ELI):** They serve principally as technical experts as needed, and have been readily available via emails and calls. They have also made additional in-kind contributions of expert time beyond what was committed.
- **Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS):** Their involvement is principally in hosting the Project Leader, as an administrative host, which is working well.
- The project has actively involved other relevant stakeholders, dramatically expanding the size of the network. This includes follow-up engagement with local lawyers who, as part of the CLAW project were involved in conducting legal analyses, and who are now exploring case development (e.g., Philippines, Uganda, [Annex 4.14](#); [Annex 4.19](#))

3. Project progress

Planned activities/outputs/outcomes are in black font, and [Year 2 progress in blue font](#).

3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities

Output 1: Active global Community of Practise that promotes and supports CL across jurisdictions as a tool to tackle IWT

Activity 1.1: LaW to establish online CoP platform (LinkedIn “closed” group) for practitioners as a hub for CL community, growing the CoP with targeted invitations via the partners and engagement activities.

[This was developed and reported on in Year 1 \(evidence in AR1\). In Year 2, the group has continued to stay active via the WApp group and has grown with the addition of practitioners from Uganda, Philippines and Nepal.](#)

Activity 1.2: LaW and LU to maintain active CoP member engagement via posts of news, questions, consultations, organising discussion threads

[CoP engagement continued in Year 2 through our WhatsApp group, an in-person workshop \(\[Annex 4.7\]\(#\)\), and co-authoring technical resources such as Lessons Learned document \(\[Annex 4.10\]\(#\)\) and a new guide to developing damage claims \(\[Annex 4.21\]\(#\)\). LU and LaW also engaged regularly, bilaterally with the partners on development of their cases \(\[Annex 4.19\]\(#\)\).](#)

Activity 1.3: LaW and LU to establish a broad/inclusive network of people interested in CL/keeping in touch, via new mailing list (active participants may later join the CoP)

[Beyond the CoP, we maintain a membership mailing list that grew from 133 in Year 1 to 833 in Year 2 \(\[Annex 4.1\]\(#\)\). This list receives periodic updates via our newsletter \(\[Annex 4.2\]\(#\)\) as well as announcements and recordings of our webinars. \(\[Annex 4.16\]\(#\)\)](#)

[Beyond the MoV, we grew the new academic community, the Biodiversity and Environmental Liability Scholars \(BELS\) Network, from 12 members in Y1 to 45 members in Y2 \(2024-25\) and it meets quarterly to discuss topics related to the project. \(\[Annex 4.3\]\(#\)\)](#)

Activity 1.4 LU and LaW to develop a general multi-purpose “slide deck” resource, which partners can then use with legal practitioners across future workshops

[We have a core slide developed that we customise as needed \(\[Annex 4.20\]\(#\)\).](#)

Activity 1.6 ICEL and WTI to announce “law clinic” opportunities for law students, and recruit >6 students to support case development (e.g., legal research, preparing documents)

[ICEL recruited one final year law student from Universitas Padjajaran from September 2024 to March 2025 to help them with case development and research \(\[Annex 4.4\]\(#\)\). This activity will be a focus in Y3.](#)

Activity 1.7: ICEL, LAGA, WTI, LU, LaW present strategic conservation litigation to undergraduate law modules in >3 countries via the partners

This activity will be a focus in Y3.

Beyond the MOV, the following opportunities related to legal education were advanced:

- The Biodiversity and Environmental Liability Scholar (BELS) network grew to 45 members in Y2 and meets quarterly ([Annex 4.3](#)).
- Marsya Mutmainah Handayani (ICEL) participated in the “Wildlife Tracking and Money Laundering Workshop” held by the US Overseas Prosecutorial Development, Assistance and Training in Manado, Indonesia. The presentation “Conservation Litigation: Criminal and Civil Law Strategy for Wildlife Restoration” focused on mainstreaming the CL legal approach in Indonesia and Philippines. ([Annex 4.5, 2](#))
- Rika Fajrini (LaW) represented CLAW twice for Regional Judicial Dialogues organised by the Raoul Wallenberg Institute, where she talked about biodiversity and its harm as seen by laws in the Southeast Asian countries, remedies possible, remedies that have been awarded by the courts, and innovative remedies seen around the world. ([Annex 4.5, 3 and 4](#))
- Maribel Rodriguez (LaW) represented CLAW to discuss fundraising for innovative legal pathways at the Green Fundraisers Forum. ([Annex 4.5, 1](#))

Activity 1.8: LU and LaW to host meetings with Advisory Committee to discuss key topics (e.g., see Indicator 2.4, 2.5)

The Advisory Committee met on 26th March 2025 to update them on CL achievements and progress, while also seeking advice on establishing the CL nonprofit, and leveraging their contacts and expertise for future funding opportunities. ([Annex 4.6](#))

Activity 1.9: LU to host 2 in-person workshops of CLAW partners, to discuss project start, case resources and frameworks, and then case develop development and strategy

The second in-person workshop was held 3-7 February 2025 in Kerala, India with partners WTI, ICEL, LAGA, ELI, and LaW, and additional lawyers from India, Philippines and Uganda, an academic from University of Helsinki, and a judge from India. During the workshop, countries updated the group on their cases, CL leadership updated the group of progress in the year, and the group discussed CL model legislation and damage claims. Importantly, the workshop was successful in bringing back together lawyers and experts from across the world to form a network to discuss liability litigation, and a cohort for this “green wave” of cases ([Annex 4.7](#)).

Output 2: New body of resources freely available that reduces barriers for future CL cases

Activity 2.1: Cooperation with lawyers in 7 countries, LaW will conduct legal analysis about how CL can be operationalised in each country, following the CL checklist we have developed/trialled in 4 countries.

In Y1, legal analyses were published in Cameroon and Indonesia. In Y2, legal analyses were completed for Uganda, Philippines, and Brazil, Mexico and India ([Annex 4.8](#)). This activity is now completed for all 7 countries.

Activity 2.2: ICEL, LAGA, WTI and LaW will host technical workshops in 7 countries with legal experts to refine the checklist and consider socio-legal realities of strategic litigation

These workshops focus on the legal analyses in each country (linked to A 2.1 and 2.3). In Y1, workshops were held in India, Indonesia, Cameroon, and Uganda. In Y2, workshops were held in the Philippines and Brazil ([Annex 4.9](#)). The workshop in Mexico was delayed due to illness but is scheduled for summer 2025.

Activity 2.3: Publish 7 country-specific reports and “In Brief” summaries that synthesise CL laws and procedures, for dissemination via website, social media, CoP, network and events

In Y1, we published Cameroon and Indonesia reports. In Y2, Reports and In Brief summaries were published for Uganda, The Philippines, and Brazil, as well as the Bahasa Indonesian translation on the Indonesian report ([Annex 4.8](#)). The India and Mexico reports have been delayed due to a colleagues' severe illness, but we are working with our lawyers in India and Mexico to have these reports completed in Y3.

Activity 2.4: All partners will develop a resource on "lessons learned about strategic conservation litigation", based on a virtual workshop and discussions with partners and CoP. Lessons Learned is published on our website as a "living" resource that we will continue to develop as new lessons are learned. ([Annex 4.10](#))

Activity 2.5: LaW will develop online, free database (e.g., using Google) to populate with cases contributed by WTI, ICEL, LAGA, CoP and in-country lawyers across >7 countries. This database has been published as a "living" resource, with new cases added when available ([Annex 4.13](#)).

Activity 2.6: All partners and Advisory Committee will build a case-selection framework, to guide selection of strategic CL case. This was published in Y1. (evidence in AR1)

Activity 2.7: LU will develop risk identification and mitigation framework through consultation with partners, based on review of other organisations' protocols (including via IWTCF recipients) and in discussion with Board of Advisors. The Risk Identification and Mitigation Framework was published in Y1. (see AR1)

Activity 2.8 LU, LaW and DLA to develop draft "model legislation" text, to guide The Model Forest Act Initiative (MoFAI) so that they can use it to inform policy globally. The model legislation resource was discussed at the February 2025 Kerala, India workshop and is an advanced draft is published a "living" resource and will be updated with feedback from different partners ([Annex 4.12](#)).

Activity 2.9: LU and LaW to develop regular online posts, with contributions from WTI, LAGA, ICEL, and disseminate via website, CoP, network and social media. Online presence increased in Y2 via its presence on LinkedIn, with partner contributions as well as with regular updates to its website. ([Annex 4.11](#))

Activity 2.10: LU to organise partner roles for public communications (blogs, website updates), and maintain/develop database of media contacts to coordinate maximum visibility for cases. In Y2 there were 6 blog contributions from our partners ([Annex 4.11, 3](#)). We maintain a list of international media contacts to reach out to as our cases become public (e.g., the Italy cactus case featured in BBC and The Guardian ([Annex 4.18](#))).

*Activity 2.11: LU to lead partners in co-authorship of blogs/editorials, website updates, and 2 key academic publications via collaborative GoogleDocs. The website is regularly updated with blogs, news, and CL resources ([Annex 4.11](#)). We have a manuscript "Legal action to recognise nature's diverse values" invited for submission to *One Earth*. The other publication was submitted and rejected from *Nature* in Y2, and is now being revised for *Nature Sustainability*. Drafts of both manuscripts are available on request.*

Activity 2.12: LU and LaW to disseminate new resources (above) via website, social and print media, CoP, network mailing list, and in-person and virtual workshops, IWTCF newsletter. New resources (See Activity 2.4) have been published on our website ([Annex 4.10](#)), discussed on our blog ([Annex 4.11, 2](#)) and on LinkedIn ([Annex 4.11, 1](#)) and shared via newsletters to our mailing list ([Annex 4.2](#)). These resources have been presented/discussed at the February 2025 CLAW workshop in Kerala, India. ([Annex 4.7](#))

Output 3: Active conservation litigation cases in at least 3 countries

Activity 3.1: LAGA, WTI, ICEL to identify, summarise and propose candidate cases in 3 target countries that are locally appropriate/strategic and CLAW goals. And coordinate to identify a plaintiff for each case—most likely a government agency

Cases are being developed in the 3 countries, each at different stages of development (see Annex 4.19 for case summaries and more detailed updates).

Other cases: Beyond the MoV, in Y2 the project supported an IWT case in Italy that received a positive verdict ([Annex 4.14, 1](#)). Inspired by the legal analyses published in Y2 for Uganda and Philippines, there are now other emerging cases under development. ([Annex 4.14, 3, 4, & 5](#))

Activity 3.2: LU to use case-selection framework, risk-mitigation framework and Advisory Committee consultation to evaluate each case, and recommend whether/how to proceed, and mitigation actions

We continue to use the tools, as discussed in AR1, to review new and emerging cases.


Activity 3.3: LU, ELI and LaW to support LAGA, WTI, ICEL in developing damage claims for each case, via workshops, shared GoogleDoc, and convening species-conservation experts via IUCN to help provide scientific expertise

Building on progress in Y1, draft damage claims were developed for cases with all the partners. Based on this experience, in Y2 we also started to develop a simple/general resource, entitled “Guideline: Developing claims for remedies in cases of environmental harm”, to help plaintiffs around the world to develop damage claims. This will be published in Y3 in cooperation with IUCN World Commission on Environmental Law ([Annex 4.21](#))

Activity 3.4: LAGA, WTI and ICEL to coordinate with government and legal team to prepare selected case details, evidence, and legal argumentation— for comment from other partners, LaW, ELI, LU

Indonesia: ICEL actively engaged on two cases.

India: WTI engaged government lawyers working on IWT cases to invoke underutilized provisions under the India’s Wildlife Protection Act that allow for compensation for ecological loss



Cameroon: We have not identified a case yet, but decided that this will definitely focus on chimpanzee IWT in Cameroon. We had 3+ virtual discussions and email exchanges about how to develop this approach in Cameroon/what is most strategic.

Activity 3.5: LAGA, WTI and ICEL to formally submit cases in respective courts
This will happen in Y3

Activity 3.6: LAGA, WTI and ICEL to host a press release event and publicise their case. Cooperate with LU on international media campaign.
This will happen in Y, after the cases are filed.

Output 4: Opportunities for new plaintiffs are created, promoting and facilitating future CL lawsuits in new countries.

Activity 4.1: Drawing on the 7 country legal analyses and general CL resources, LaW and in-country lawyers develop presentations for each country

Presentations have been developed and delivered for the workshops conducted in 6 of the 7 countries (Indonesia, Cameroon, India, Uganda, Philippines, and Brazil).

Activity 4.2: WTI and ICEL host in-person engagement workshop with practitioners to discuss developing future conservation litigation cases in their jurisdictions

Indonesia: ICEL and the PI have met a series of potential plaintiffs in Indonesia (evidence in AR1). In Y2, ICEL hosted an in-person workshop, “Promoting Remedies-Oriented Law Enforcement for Biodiversity Damage” ([Annex 4.15.4](#)) for public interest lawyers and environmental and legal-aid organisations to educate them about these type of legal cases, and remedies for wildlife crime cases.

India: The WTI team has conducted 3 in-person workshops in 3 different states in India: Uttar Pradesh, Assam, and Kerala ([Annex 4.15](#), [1](#), [2](#), [3](#)). These workshops were for prosecutors and judges to introduce the project legal approach.

Activity 4.3: LaW, LU and in-country lawyers invite a targeted group of practitioners in 4 additional countries to virtual workshops to present results of legal analysis and discuss litigation potential. i.e. Dissemination workshop in Mexico, Philippines, Brazil, Uganda

These engagements are with practitioners who might be end-users of the resources, and could be potential plaintiffs in future cases. In Y2, in Uganda we hosted virtual discussions with the National Environmental Management Authority and Uganda Wildlife Authority, as the key potential plaintiffs in that country. In the Philippines, we held 3+ discussions with the Environmental Legal Assistance Center to discuss case development ([Annex 4.14](#)). In May 2025 we will host a stakeholder workshop with Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO) Philippines to present the report results. Further engagements with practitioners in Brazil and Mexico will follow in Y3, and may be targeted or more open workshops depending on what is deemed most strategic.

Activity 4.4: Partners and in-country lawyers identify the most appropriate prospective future plaintiffs, and help organise virtual meetings with LU/LaW

We held a series of meetings with prospective plaintiffs ([Annex 4.14](#)). We have currently identified at least 10 prospective plaintiffs in 9 countries (Liberia, Somalia, Uganda, India,

Nepal, The Philippines, South Africa, Georgia, and Colombia) who are very interested in the CL approach with the possibility of taking action. Several of these plaintiffs are seeking to bring a case to court soon, and are working with us on fundraising to take action. ([Annex 4.14](#))

Activity 4.5: ELI and LU to lever international and partners' networks co-host open virtual events for law practitioners globally

In Y2 we hosted two global virtual webinars: “Rights of Nature: Taking Action When Nature is Harmed” and “Climate Litigation is Also About Biodiversity”. Each webinar was attended with over 70 people joining, and over 200 people signed up to receive a recording of these webinars ([Annex 4.16](#))

Beyond MoV, in Y2 a virtual workshop was held “Why a Legal Case about Chilean Cacti Matters to Conservation Globally”, in cooperation with WWF, WCS and TRAFFIC. The webinar had over 110 attendees.

3.2 Progress towards project Outputs

Output 1: Active global Community of Practise that promotes and supports CL across jurisdictions as a tool to tackle IWT.

Indicator 1.1: By Q3-Y1, Community of Practice (CoP) established, growing to >60 new registered practitioners of people actively involved in cases/case development across >7 countries, including lawyers, plaintiffs, conservation scientific expert witnesses. (*baseline = 22 people actively involved in last project; no online community exists for conservation litigation, though one exists for climate*)

The Community of Practice was established in Y1 (see AR1) and grew from 37 to 56 people. It remained active in Y2 via online calls and email correspondence, WhatsApp group and the in-person meeting in Kerala, India and collaboration on joint development of resources. We kept in touch with our broader community/network via our newsletter ([Annex 4.1](#), [Annex 4.3](#)). Beyond the MoV, in Y1 we established the Biodiversity and Environmental Liability Scholars (BELS) Network, which met quarterly through Y2 ([Annex 4.3](#)).

Indicator 1.2: By Q3-Y3, establish new Conservation Litigation Network, engaging >200 student/junior and >50 practising lawyers with CL concepts across >7 countries, including through student “law clinic” volunteers helping with cases; presentations within undergraduate law modules in >3 countries, 2 virtual global workshops targeting legal practitioners, scientists and potential plaintiffs

(*baseline = no hackathon or law clinics exists for CL; one workshop for law students held in Indonesia 2021; no workshops yet offered for lawyers; 6 volunteer lawyers identified*)

In Y2, we directly engaged 1 student through an ICEL student internship ([Annex 4.4](#)), and student engagement will be a Y3 priority. In Y2, we have engaged at least 130 practising lawyers with the CL concepts, including through in-person workshops with lawyers led by the partners ([Annex 4.15](#); [Annex 4.5, 2](#)), one-on-one engagements with prospective plaintiffs in >10 countries ([Annex 4.14](#)), and our in-person workshops in the UK and Kerala (See AR1 and [Annex 4.7](#))

Indicator 1.3: By Q3-Y1, high-profile external Board of Advisors for the project established to guide on case selection, overall strategy, maximising case visibility and risk mitigation. (*baseline = possible members identified*)

Established in Y1, we met in Y2 ([Annex 4.6](#)) and drew on them as resources when needed.

Output 2: New body of resources freely available that reduces barriers for future CL cases

Indicator 2.1: By Q3–Y2, legal report and “In Brief” summaries resource published for 7 countries (Indonesia, India, Cameroon, Mexico, Brazil, Philippines, Uganda).

Indicator 2.2: By Q1-Y2, Synthesis “lessons learned” publication by and for practitioners, highlighting best practices (case development, safety, legal procedure).

(*baseline = Drafts started for Thailand, Indonesia Cameroon, Liberia, report written for Georgia in 2022. No analyses done for the other countries in the proposal*)

In Y2, additional country reports were published for Uganda, Philippines and Brazil, and reports for Mexico and India are in draft and will be published in Y3.

Indicator 2.3: By Q1-Y2, database of relevant cases and a comparative analysis available to serve as precedents/examples for future lawsuits. *(baseline = draft, internal database under development)*.

A public case database is now available with over 20 cases where remedies have been awarded ([Annex 4.13](#)).

Indicator 2.4: By Q3-Y1, develop both 1) risk identification and mitigation framework developed, and 2) case-selection framework, in collaboration with partners, Advisory Committee and others working on IWT enforcement, to guide strategic and safe development of CL cases. *(baseline = no such public resource exists, although other conservation organisations likely have internal processes that we will request and consider)*

In Y1, we published the Risk Identification and Mitigation Framework, and Case Selection frameworks (evidence in AR1). In Y2, we published the “Lessons Learned” ([Annex 4.10](#)).

Indicator 2.5: By Q4-Y2 Model legislation prepared, based on comparative analysis of country laws and expert inputs, that countries can use as a model to help update their wildlife legislation to better incorporate liability, and engagement with receptive government agencies in >3 countries *(baseline = no such model text exists for this type of law though we developed draft for Liberia in 2012, and we have been asked for this from Zimbabwe and Zambia)*

This was published online, and a “live” version is receiving partner comment ([Annex 4.12](#))

Indicator 2.6: By Q4-Y3, increased CL profile via >3 international news stories; >6 news stories in domestic media across 3 core countries; active social media presence, >9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members, >36 updates to Conservation-litigation.org, and >2 academic publications *(baseline = 1 article in Mongabay; 10 stories in Indonesian media; small number of social media posts as individuals/not systematic; 5 blogs produced during last project; 2 journal articles, website developed with 13 posts and 8 resources)*

In Year 2, we published 16 blog posts ([Annex 4.11.2](#)) and maintained a constant social media presence through LinkedIn ([Annex 4.11.1](#)). We had coverage in 3 pieces of international media ([Annex 4.18](#)) and 11 pieces of domestic media about seeking remedies for biodiversity harm. ([Annex 4.18](#))

Output 3: Active conservation litigation cases in at least 3 countries

Indicator 3.1: By Q4-Y1 Target high-profile cases, defendants and plaintiffs identified in 3 countries

Indicator 3.2: By Q3-Y2, minimum of 3 cases submitted in courts, at least one in each India, Indonesia and Cameroon

(baseline=1 such case filed in Indonesia in 2021, 1 similar case in France 2019, 1 case in Cameroon 2018)

Cases are currently under development in Indonesia, Cameroon, India, with additional cases under active development in Uganda, Nepal and the Philippines, and further potential plaintiffs in 7 other countries ([Annex 4.14](#)).

Output 4: Opportunities for new plaintiffs are created, promoting and facilitating future CL lawsuits in new countries.

Indicator 4.1: By Q2-Y3, partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries (India, Indonesia), and LaW and LU host virtual workshops in the 4 additional countries (Philippines, Brazil, Mexico, Uganda). These will introduce CL and recruit future plaintiffs *(baseline = 3 CL workshops held in Indonesia, but 0 in India or Cameroon)*

In Y2, ICEL in Indonesia had several meetings with plaintiffs to develop the [REDACTED]
[REDACTED] ICEL has conducted one workshop for lawyers on remedies-oriented law enforcement ([Annex 4.15.4](#)). In Y2, WTI in India conducted 3 regional workshops in 3 states to educate and encourage public prosecutors, as they are the main potential plaintiffs there. ([Annex 4.15, 1, 2, 3](#))

Indicator 4.2: By Q4-Y3, LaW, LU partners organise >20, targeted one-on-one discussion calls with prospective plaintiffs (government, community, NGO) (*baseline = >20 potential plaintiffs engaged in last project*)

In Y2 we held an additional 16 1-on-1 discussions with new prospective plaintiffs globally ([Annex 4.14](#)). From these, we are currently in discussion with 10 prospective plaintiffs in 9 countries (Liberia, Somalia, Uganda, India, Nepal, The Philippines, South Africa, Georgia, and Colombia) who are very interested in the CL approach to the point of likely taking legal action. Several of these plaintiffs are already seeking to bring a case to court soon as well as working with CL for fundraising for this activity. ([Annex 4.14](#))

Indicator 4.3: By Q4-Y2, LU, ELI and LaW co-host 2 global, virtual workshops for practitioners to introduce the approach, inspire action and build community (e.g., for judges, prosecutors, officials, NGOs). (*baseline = 1 global workshop hosted in 2021*).

In Y2, two global webinars were held virtually, “Rights of Nature: Taking Action When Nature is Harmed” and “Climate Litigation is Also About Biodiversity”. Beyond the MoV, a virtual workshop was held “Why a Legal Case about Chilean Cacti Matters to Conservation Globally” ([Annex 4.16](#)).

3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome

Outcome: Conservation litigation is a globally-recognised tool for tackling IWT in ways that are deterrent, remedy-focused and have potential to deliver meaningful justice and social signals. The project is on track to delivering this outcome, and the indicators remain appropriate.

Indicator 0.1: By Q3-Y3, at least 3 new lawsuits are filed in three core countries (Cameroon, Indonesia, India) (*baseline=1 lawsuit in Indonesia 2021, 1 lawsuit in France in 2019, 1 lawsuit in Cameroon 2018*)

Despite the various delays, these cases are advancing and we expect to file cases in 3 countries in Y3. ([Annex 4.19](#))

Indicator 0.2: By Q3-Y3, 3 new organisations external to the project plan to undertake future CL action (*baseline=2 NGO in Indonesia, 1 NGO in Italy and 2 Indonesian government agencies have expressed interest*).

In Y2, an NGO in Italy took legal action using this approach, supported by CL and was successful in court ([Annex 4.14, 1](#)). In Y2, we actively supported early stages of case development for additional cases in Uganda, India, Philippines, and Nepal, and were in discussion with 7 prospective additional plaintiffs in Liberia, Somalia, South Africa, Georgia, and Colombia. ([Annex 4.14](#))

Indicator 0.3: By Q4-Y3, increased public profile for the CL approach via >3 international news stories; >6 news stories in domestic media across 3 core countries; active social media presence, and >9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members (*baseline = 1 article in Mongabay; 10 stories in Indonesian media; small number of social media posts as individuals/not systematic; 5 blogs produced during last project*)

There have been 11 domestic news stories ([Annex 4.17](#)) and 3 international news stories about the legal approach ([Annex 4.18](#)). CL has published >25 substantive blogs on the website ([Annex 4.11, 2](#)) while increasing social media engagement via LinkedIn. ([Annex 4.11, 1](#))

Indicator 0.4: By Q3-Y3 Model legislation prepared, based on comparative analysis of country laws and expert inputs, that MoFAI can use to inform policy globally (*baseline = proposed legal text drafted for Liberia’s Wildlife Agency and Conservation International*)

In Y2 we published our model legislation to guide legal revisions/drafting globally ([Annex 4.12](#)). This was also discussed at the Model Forest Act Initiative (MoFAI) meeting in Jakarta ([Annex 4.25](#)), with several follow-ups with members of the MoFAI team, into which the model legislation will feed. Additionally, we shared these technical inputs into 2 new international legal reviews: the International Criminal Court consultation on accountability for environmental crimes under the Rome Statute (evidence in AR1) and into the ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on

Human Rights (AICHR) Working Group on Environmental Rights, which is developing a regional framework on environmental rights and into which CLAW Partner ICEL is actively promoting the inclusion of the right to remedies when nature is harmed ([Annex 4.22](#)). Beyond the MoV, in Y2 the UNODC World Wildlife Crime Report specifically highlighted “liability for remedying harm” in their analysis of “What works to help reduce illegal trade” ([Annex 4.23](#)).

3.4 Monitoring of assumptions

Outcome

Assumption 1: Appropriate cases and plaintiffs can be identified, and conditions met so they can be successfully and safely litigated.

Case development continues to be very unpredictable and challenging, and delays are common because many factors are beyond our control (e.g., pace of legal system or a government ministry, or quality of evidence). However, we have cases identified and likely to be filed in Y3.

Assumption 2: There are future costs beyond the project time horizon (e.g., appeal).

We evaluate these case/country-specific risks before litigation. We continue to identify smaller, follow-up donors to support future costs. We have already done this for 2 of the 3 cases.

Assumption 3: Courts can sometimes be slow to issue their verdicts, depending on country and case.

We are maximising case impacts and visibility, regardless of outcome and timeline. We are filing multiple cases, some of which we know will be resolved sooner than others (e.g., Indonesian courts are known to be faster than Brazil's)

Assumption 4: Our lawsuits could be unsuccessful in court.

This remains a risk, but we are being increasingly strategic with our case selection to avoid negative verdicts.

Assumption 5: Procedural mistakes, which are easy to make, means that one of the cases fails.

Work with experienced partners that have familiarity with the procedures, have a developed report for each country where we are working that should minimise these types of mistakes.

Output 1

Assumption 6: People have time to commit.

We focus on a smaller, but high-quality/engaged group. There have been challenges with some stakeholders due to their schedules, but overall, they are very engaged.

Assumption 7: These are time-consuming activities (e.g., engaging global communities of practice).

We have budgeted heavily into staff time of people with relevant technical expertise, and are also recruiting voluntary support (e.g., via the BELS scholar Network). Our team is, however, over-stretched, especially given health challenges.

Output 2

Assumption 8: These are time-consuming activities (e.g., creating a new body of resources).

Most of the resources have been published and have proved time consuming. The country reports are delayed, due to illness.

Assumption 9: Assumes that lack of technical knowledge is a limitation to people taking legal action.

We continue to find that this is a real barrier, but there are also other, often political issues that keep plaintiffs from taking action. These governance issues are challenging to address.

Output 4

Assumption 10: Assumes that lack of technical knowledge is a limitation to people taking legal action.

We continue to find that this is a real barrier, but there are also other, often political issues that keep plaintiffs from taking action. These governance issues are challenging to address.

Assumption 11: We have adequate, quality expressions of interest from external parties.

In Y2, we are finding far greater interest and up-take than expected. Funding for cases is now a greater limitation.

3.5 Impact: achievement of positive impact on illegal wildlife trade and multidimensional poverty reduction

Impact listed in original application: Reduced IWT by increasing the likelihood that violators will face litigation with high sanctions, which can then be reinvested into healing harm and can send social signals about IWT impacts.

Short-term: In Y2 we worked on damage claims for the target cases in this project and these reflect contributions towards reducing illegal trade and reducing poverty because they highlight values overlooked by traditional criminal enforcement:

- Endangered species, with monies recovered from defendants reinvested into *in-situ* conservation. To date, recoveries (e.g., in India) have been very small, but set precedent so this can now be done in large future cases with significant conservation funding expected.
- Rural communities whose livelihoods and wellbeing are harmed by IWT, prioritising cases that benefit marginalised and poor communities, although we currently do not have current cases will seek financial compensation where livelihoods are directly harmed. This is because such financially-driven cases are not considered strategic at present because we need to first establish the legal precedents, and these should focus on nature/wildlife. However, we will also provide the 1st legal recognitions for IWT harm to wellbeing, including for “invaluable” values that are often overlooked but “may have the highest value”, like money reinvested into cultural and educational activities.
- Individual animals, with monies reinvested into rehabilitation/release.
- Governments, NGOs and rehabilitation centres that incur costs from IWT, will have those burdens legally recognised and compensated.
- Global citizens who, even if not connected to these cases, are concerned with accountability, and biodiversity’s intrinsic and existence values.

In Y2, we contributed to these not only via the cases, but via publicity of the approach and by starting development of the new “Guideline on Developing claims for remedies in cases of environmental harm”.

We made progress (212 stakeholders currently engaged) towards our goal of empowering >300 stakeholders across 7 countries to take these types of legal action through training ([Annex 4.15](#); [Annex 4.16](#)) and targeted outreach ([Annex 4.14](#)). We also engaged a broader community with these concepts through our newsletter ([Annex 4.1](#)).

CLAW offers the broader conservation and development communities a new legal tool, and we are developing resources for future plaintiffs that can help make these types of cases viable (see AR1, [Annex 4.10](#); [Annex 4.12](#)).

Long-term: The remedies described above are legally-possible, but rarely operationalised. As such, in Y2 the project was “planting seeds” and setting precedents for entirely new legal responses to environmental harm. As the approach matures, future cases are likely to involve diverse ecologically-, economically-, and nutritionally-important species. However, this first relies on better understanding relevant laws, developing resources and gaining courtroom experience

4. Thematic focus

The project contributed towards “Ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents”, and “strengthening law enforcement”. Key progress towards this includes the completion of baseline analyses to seek remedies in Mexico, Brazil, Uganda, Philippines, Cameroon, Indonesia, and India ([Annex 4.8](#)). Drawing on these analyses, we made progress towards operationalizing these laws, supporting case development to engage new partners to go to court ([Annex 4.14](#)). CL had a notable victory in court this year, where a court in Italy issued a positive verdict in a civil liability claim against two illegal cactus traders, with the CL approach, as highlighted in BBC, EuroNews and The Guardian ([Annex 4.18](#)). It was also notable that the CL approach was highlighted in the UNODC World Wildlife Crime Report which specifically highlighted “liability for remedying harm” in their analysis of “What Works to help reduce illegal trade” ([Annex 4.23](#)).

5. Impact on species in focus

Four priority species are mentioned in our proposal:

- Sumatran Orangutan (*Pongo abelii*)
- Nigeria-Cameroon Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes elliotii*)
- Indian Elephant (*Elephas maximus indicus*)
- Sunda Pangolins (*Manis javanica*)

To date, we have tangible, upcoming cases for:

_____ and existing small scales in India have involved India Schedule I protected species including Bengal Tiger, Common leopard, Spotted deer and Hog deer. We are also actively _____

[Annex 4.14, 4](#)). In the draft claims for these cases we focused, within the limits of the law in each country, on identifying the harm suffered by each species, and the types of remedies that would be warranted; this is a baseline key to obtaining legal recognition for these species’ rights to protection and remedies. This is also important to help bring stakeholders (NGOs, government) alongside us to think about how to develop our remedy-based approaches, whereby legal cases lead to actual on-the-ground actions to support both individual animals and species conservation. This strategy will also help longer-term efforts towards more meaningful environmental cases, including from other drivers such as mining, and this is being developed in our future cases inspired by this project ([Annex 4.14](#)).

6. Project support for multidimensional poverty reduction

The project actively advanced knowledge about existing legislation in least developed and low-income countries, and ‘translating’ these into reports that help make existing law accessible to citizens ([Annex 4.8](#)). This is a public good because it increases access to justice for the environment and for human wellbeing. Currently these laws exist, but are largely not used. Moreover, we actively promoted these approaches through a range of training and resources to make law accessible ([Annex 4.10](#); [Annex 4.11](#)), as well as direct support to bring precedent setting cases ([Annex 4.19](#), [Annex 4.14](#)).

The approach and cases focus on securing remedies for biodiversity where harm has been caused by IWT. These remedies focus, in the first instance, on biodiversity and actions such as care for injured animals and species conservation *in-situ*. Importantly, however, these cases and the approach we are promoting also consider the remedies needed to address negative impacts on human wellbeing, including material (e.g., livelihoods) and immaterial impacts (e.g., culture, education, relational values). These latter values are increasingly understood as part of multidimensional poverty/wellbeing, but are often not formally recognised in policy-making; our project is giving these overlooked values formal legal standing. We have explicitly addressed these impacts on human wellbeing in our legal analyses ([Annex 4.8](#)), in the training we are delivering (e.g. lawyer workshops in India and Indonesia ([Annex 4.15](#)), and in our public communications ([Annex 4.11, 2](#)). They are also an explicit part of the cases we are developing, with direct impacts on wellbeing in the individual cases ([Annex 4.19](#); [Annex 4.14](#)), as well as broader indirect long-term benefits because it is helping to create awareness about the value of

wildlife (and the costs of environmental crime), and is also creating pathway for the use of legal approaches that can be used to address a range of cases that harm human wellbeing. There is also clear scope for application to cases that increasingly focus on multidimensional poverty into the future, and several of the emerging cases are about issues that have very direct livelihood and wellbeing implications, such as

7. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)

GESI Scale	Description	Put X where you think your project is on the scale
Not yet sensitive	The GESI context may have been considered but the project isn't quite meeting the requirements of a 'sensitive' approach	
Sensitive	The GESI context has been considered and project activities take this into account in their design and implementation. The project addresses basic needs and vulnerabilities of women and marginalised groups and the project will not contribute to or create further inequalities.	
Empowering	The project has all the characteristics of a 'sensitive' approach whilst also increasing equal access to assets, resources and capabilities for women and marginalised groups	
Transformative	The project has all the characteristics of an 'empowering' approach whilst also addressing unequal power relationships and seeking institutional and societal change	X

As in Y1, we believe that our project in Y2 was transformative in its gender approach because we proactively created opportunities for women from diverse backgrounds, and because of our broader transformative mission to create societal change in the ways we address IWT enforcement. We have a strong, female-dominated core team, and further promoted gender equality through a proactive focus on creating access to opportunities. In Y2 this has included:

- Indonesia case development is being led by a team of all-women lawyers at ICEL (Difa Shafira) and LaW (Rika Fajrini)
- Rika Fajrini (LaW) gave several presentations in Y2 on CL and remedies ([Annex 4.5, 3 & 4](#))
- Of the Biodiversity and Environmental Liability Scholars network, 34 of the 45 members (76%) are women
- ICEL presentations were led by women (Marsya Mutmainah Handayani, Difa Shafira) in different workshops ([Annex 4.5, 2](#); [Annex 4.7](#); [Annex 4.15, 4](#); and [Annex 4.25](#))
- Development of new cases were led by with women in Liberia (Jenny Desmond) and the Philippines (Grizelda "Gerthie" Mayo-Anda), with them as at the forefront of cases ([Annex 4.14, 2 & 3](#))
- Women have featured heavily as speakers on our two Webinar panels (70%, [Annex 4.16](#))
- Rika Fajrini (LaW) leads the Biodiversity & Environmental Liability (BELS) Network ([Annex 4.3](#)).

Claims made in the cases we are developing include an explicit effort to recognise a more diverse range of environmental, non-monetary values and different types of ontologies than those that are traditionally recognised in policy. This includes placing values on care for injured animals, impacts on culture and relational values – many of which are gendered. Moreover, we are driving an important shift away from narrow punitive approaches to IWT enforcement and

towards one founded on remedies. This is featured in our Y2 work, including the new “Lessons Learned” document ([Annex 4.10](#)) and “Guideline: Developing claims for remedies in cases of environmental harm” ([Annex 4.21](#)). This is also the thematic focus of one of the academic manuscripts developed in Y2.

8. Monitoring and evaluation

Continuing from Y1, M&E functioned well in Y2, especially given that this is a complex project with many partners and legal actions that are reliant on engagement of 3rd parties such as plaintiffs and government agencies. This worked largely because we have 1 member of our team (N. Bhatia via partner, LaW) who very regularly reviewed our log-frame - outputs and indicators - against our project timeline, and updated our “live” progress document where we update the status of each indicator. Although we would like partners to engage more actively with this form, we recognise that it is most practical to have this under 1 person. She then actively engaged with the PI to review project progress, and reminded/supported/chased colleagues within the core team and among the partners, which is helping to ensure a sense of pace and accountability within the project. Where there were delays, she and the Project Lead worked with the partners to come up with realistic milestones and timelines. At the start of Y3, we will coordinate check-in meetings with each partner to review the log-frame, discuss progress and needed updates, as well as to discuss strategies for improving communication and M&E.

The core team (LU, LaW) had nearly weekly calls to check on progress and discuss technical issues. This core team had bilateral meetings with the partners at least every 2 months, and all-partners meetings 1 time in-person in Year 2 (2024-2025). The quality of communication is a strength of the team.

We continued to maintain a detailed stakeholder engagement database where, for those we have direct engagements with ([Annex 4.14](#)), and retained shared notes about our meetings, opportunities and impact/follow-up opportunities. This is beyond our documented indicators because it is both more qualitative (i.e. relates to quality of engagement), and responsive (i.e. reacts to opportunities as they emerge). These types of engagement are important to document specifically for follow-up and because they best characterise our contributions to the outcome and impact-levels for which narrower quantitative measures are challenging. For example, the ways in which other NGOs or governments want to take up this idea ([Annex 4.14](#)), the interest of groups such as WWF to co-host an online event ([Annex 4.16, 3](#)) – these illustrate how we are shaping the broader field.

While focused on the immediate CLAW project, in Y2 the team also engaged in long-term strategizing, including related the Lesson Learned document ([Annex 4.10](#)), plans to incorporate Conservation-Litigation.org into a formal organisation, and the development of a new Visual Theory of Change ([Annex 4.24](#)). These iterative reflective discussions, including with our advisors, which pressed us to reflect on how our activities contribute to our long-term desired outcome/impact.

9. Lessons learnt

In Y2, we published a “Lessons Learned” document ([Annex 4.10](#)). The main lesson has to do with the slow pace and low predictability of legal actions, and how these present challenges for time-bound projects. For instance, in India, while a case was identified while we were writing the proposal for this project, the case is still moving through the courts slow enough that our partner in India has not been able to file a motion for remedies. Finding willing plaintiffs has proven to be hard. In Indonesia, there are several cases that could be taken to court for liability and remedies, but we have not been able to find a plaintiff willing to take the risk of going to court.

10. Actions taken in response to previous reviews

- While the project has reduced the scope and focus of the project to a lower number of countries, the reach of the project still appears to be ambitious. Confirmation of how this ambition will be managed within the timeframe of the project would be beneficial.
This comment is from the original application. As evidenced in AR1 and this AR2, we are managing to meet our ambition. The main challenges have less to do with our ambition and more with the unpredictability of identifying appropriate cases and of working with government plaintiffs/highly political contexts.
- Further information on the potential delivery and safeguarding risks around civil litigation would be beneficial to include.
This comment is from the original application, and we have since published our Risk Identification and Mitigation Framework.
- It would be beneficial to clarify the evidence behind how civil cases will create incentives.
This comment is from the original application. Strategic litigation in other areas of law have seen widespread copy-cat cases (e.g., climate litigation following the Urgenda case in the Netherlands). This AR2 also highlights high levels of external interest in the approach and its likely update, which we believe reflects how initial cases can create incentives/inspire others to take action.
- You should consider how the penalties given in successful cases are actually followed through and reduce harm as anticipated. This may be beyond the timeline of the project, but such monitoring would ensure the litigation results in the proper Outcomes.
We strongly agree, and both the CL team and in-country partners are involved with these cases and the approach long-term, beyond the CLAW project horizon. We are considering this in a number of ways, not only bureaucratic follow-up individual cases, but also in how we develop/present our claims (e.g., making sure we include timelines for our proposed remedies so that these can be followed-up), and in the resources we are developing (e.g., including this issue of execution of court orders in our country reports, and including strategies to help ensure execution in our new Guideline: Developing claims for remedies in cases of environmental harm ([Annex 4.21](#)))
- Reporting for Output 4 is slightly confusing:
Output 4. Opportunities for new plaintiffs are created, promoting and facilitating future CL lawsuits in new countries.
Indicator 4.1 By Q2-Y3, partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries (India, Indonesia), and LaW and LU host virtual workshops in the 4 additional countries (Philippines, Brazil, Mexico, Uganda). These will introduce CL and recruit future plaintiffs. (baseline = 3 CL workshops held in Indonesia, but 0 in India or Cameroon)
Annex 1 of AR1 reports a workshop in UK for Indonesia's Supreme Court and a government ministry and another in Kerala. But the latter is just one of four 'country conservation litigation workshops' (in Indonesia, Cameroon, India and Uganda). Indicator 4.1 mentions virtual workshops for a slightly different list of four. The narrative of AR1 does not mention the Kerala workshop.
Apologies for this error in our AR1 reporting. The Kerala workshop reported in AR1 is part of Outcome 2, Activity 2.2, and should not have been listed here. We have delivered in-person workshops for India and Indonesia ([Annex 4.15](#)) in Y2.
- Reporting for Output 4 is slightly confusing:
Output 4. Opportunities for new plaintiffs are created, promoting and facilitating future CL lawsuits in new countries.
Indicators:
 - *4.1 By Q2-Y3, partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries (India, Indonesia), and LaW and LU host virtual workshops in the 4 additional countries*

- (Philippines, Brazil, Mexico, Uganda). These will introduce CL and recruit future plaintiffs. (baseline = 3 CL workshops held in Indonesia, but 0 in India or Cameroon)
 - 4.3 By Q4-Y2, LU, ELI and LaW co-host 2 global, virtual workshops for practitioners to introduce the approach, inspire action and build community (e.g., for judges, prosecutors, officials, NGOs) (baseline = 1 global workshop hosted in 2021).

There is more confusion regarding 4.3, where the international workshop (mentioned in Annex 1 in connection with 4.1) is described in the narrative of AR1 as relating to indicator 4.3. Annex 1 states, in relation to 4.3, only that a virtual event is organised for late May 2024.

Sorry for the confusion. The international workshop with Supreme Court Judges is actually beyond the MoV for the project in our logframe, but reflects on our engagement with practitioners in Indonesia (Indicator 4.1). We have delivered in-person workshops for India and Indonesia ([Annex 4.15](#)) in Y2.

- A notable achievement (described as ‘unexpected’ – unclear why) was hosting a workshop on remedies in LU for Indonesia’s Supreme Court and a government ministry. This was unexpected because it is very notable to have the Supreme Court judges interested enough in a project/topic that they are willing to self-fund a workshop focused on it. These are typically very hard audiences to access.
- Monitoring and evaluation** - There is no discussion of the extent to which Outcome and Impact could be attributed to project activities, but this could be considered in future ARs. Please see our reply to Section 8, related to documenting qualitative results of our activities and their attribution to the outcome and impact of our project.

11. Risk Management

There were no new risks identified. The key anticipated risks, which are the challenges of identifying and developing cases, and then the rate at which these progress, were present in Y2 and we are working through them. We have also developed our new Risk Identification and Mitigation Framework (available on our website), which is tailored to our type of work and helps to guide the existing and future work. The IWTCF Risk Register is also attached – noting that case-related issues listed in the risk register are confidential.

12. Scalability and durability

The project made strong progress towards building legacy and scaling-up: Beyond the plaintiffs supported by this project, we have recruited 11 additional plaintiffs in 10 countries to participate in their own legal action using this approach, and near-term follow-up is very likely in at least Uganda, Philippines and Nepal ([Annex 4.14](#) [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), & [7](#)). This is faster growth/greater interest than anticipated. They have learned about us through a range of means, including our webinars, targeted meeting requests, social media, personal networks and the FCDO in the Philippines. We do not plan to make any changes to the sustainability approach, other than increasing our level of ambition to recruit a greater number of plaintiffs than we originally anticipated ([Annex 4.14](#)).

We also held national events that were important to help mainstream this into government processes (i.e.. Lawyer workshops in India and Indonesia ([Annex 4.15](#))). We also conducted 3 global virtual events to help generate greater long-term adoption of this approach ([Annex 4.16](#)). We note that our recent online webinar was co-hosted by WWF, WCS and TRAFFIC, which we believe reflects the scale of interest. Publicising the new cases, as they emerge, will also be important for building legacy, recruiting future plaintiffs, and ensuring long-term uptake of the approach.

We actively promoted sharing lessons and open access – this includes making all our resources, including our internal case selection, risk mitigation and lessons learned documents available online ([Annex 4.10](#)). As new plaintiffs emerged, we provided individualised support

and also connected them to other plaintiffs for support via our Community of Practice (See AR1, and [Annex 4.1](#)).

Legacy is also reflected in the UNODC report that highlighted our legal approach ([Annex 4.23](#)). It is also reflected in our development of model legislation that can help inform legal reform into the future ([Annex 4.12](#)); its potential for impact has grown because in Y2 we engaged with Model Forest Acts Initiative (MoFAI), a high level “initiative to develop a comprehensive legal blueprint that will support policymakers, legislators, and other stakeholders design modern forest legal frameworks to address 21st-century challenges such as climate change and biodiversity loss” ([Annex 4.25](#)).

13. IWT Challenge Fund identity

The IWTCF has been recognized in all of our publications to date ([Annex 4.8](#); [Annex 4.10](#)). Our social media posts via LinkedIn mention/tag BCF and #IWTCF, whenever relevant ([Annex 4.11.1](#)). It has also been mentioned in our letters of invitation to workshop participants. In these cases, it is being explicitly mentioned as a distinct, and main funding source for this work. The Fund has also been recognised in name and logo in a WTI video (see [here](#)) highlighting the February 2025 CLAW workshop ([Annex 4.7](#)), and advertisements of two global webinars ([Annex 4.16](#)).

14. Safeguarding



14. Project expenditure

Table 1: Project expenditure during the reporting period (April 2024-March 2025)

Project spend (indicative) since last Annual Report	2024/25 Grant (£)	2024/25 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	£198,352.68	£189,495.80	4%	

Please Note: Actual cost numbers are Drafts and will be confirmed with actual claim

Table 2: Project mobilised or matched funding during the reporting period (1 April 2024 – 31 March 2025)

Please note that the vast majority of support is in-kind and important, but not funding provided and it is very difficult to try to put monetary values on many of the in-kind contributions.

	Secured to date	Expected by end of project	Sources
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project (£)			In-Kind from DLA, LaW, ICEL, Lancaster, LAGA
Total additional finance mobilised for new activities occurring outside of the project, building on evidence, best practices and the project (£)			

15. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

16. OPTIONAL: Outstanding achievements or progress of your project so far (300-400 words maximum). This section may be used for publicity purposes.

I agree for the Biodiversity Challenge Funds to edit and use the following for various promotional purposes (please leave this line in to indicate your agreement to use any material you provide here).

An additional 10 plaintiffs have expressed interest and are working with us to pursue future cases.

The UNODC World Wildlife Crime Report specifically highlighted “liability for remedying harm” in their analysis of “What Works to help reduce illegal trade” ([Annex 4.23](#)).

Image, Video or Graphic Information:


File Type (Image / Video / Graphic)	File Name or File Location	Caption including description, country and credit	Social media accounts and websites to be tagged (leave blank if none)	Consent of subjects received (delete as necessary)
Image	Annex 4.7	Lawyers and conservationists from around the world gather in Kerala, India to discuss legal remedies for harm to nature	@Conservation-Litigation.org	Yes

• **Annex 1: Report of progress and achievements against logframe for Financial Year 2024-2025**

Project summary	Progress and Achievements April 2024 - March 2025	Actions required/planned for next period
Impact Reduced IWT by increasing the likelihood that violators will face litigation with high sanctions, which can then be reinvested into healing harm and can send social signals about IWT impacts.	We have strong progress with case development – beyond those originally targeted by this project – that will benefit priority species affected by illegal trade, and that include precedent-setting legal recognition for the impacts that illegal trade has on human wellbeing (Annex 4.19).	
Outcome Conservation litigation is a globally-recognised tool for tackling IWT in ways that are deterrent, remedy-focused and have potential to deliver meaningful justice and social signals		
Outcome indicator 0.1 By Q3-Y3, at least 3 new lawsuits are filed in three core countries (Cameroon, Indonesia, India) <i>(baseline=1 lawsuit in Indonesia 2021, 1 lawsuit in France in 2019, 1 lawsuit in Cameroon 2018)</i>	New cases under active development in Indonesia and India (Annex 4.19).	
Outcome indicator 0.2 By Q3-Y3, 3 new organisations external to the project plan to undertake future CL action <i>(baseline=2 NGO in Indonesia, 1 NGO in Italy and 2 Indonesian government agencies have expressed interest).</i>	11 additional plaintiffs across 10 countries have expressed specific interest in taking legal action using this approach (Annex 4.14)	Continue to work with these organisations/plaintiffs Look for funding for these plaintiffs Further recruit/engage with other prospective plaintiffs
Outcome indicator 0.3 By Q4-Y3, increased public profile for the CL approach via >3 international news stories; >6 news stories in domestic media across 3 core countries; active social media presence, and >9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members <i>(baseline = 1 article in Mongabay; 10 stories in Indonesian media; small number of social media posts as individuals/not systematic; 5 blogs produced during last project)</i>	Our updated website published 16 detailed posts in Y2 (Annex 4.11.2) and increased social media engagement via LinkedIn (Annex 4.11.1). Domestic media has been well engaged, especially in India (Annex 4.17), with international media pieces covering our legal approach (Annex 4.18)	Continue to publish on our website and through social media Leverage our partners and media contacts to cover CL news, especially as cases enter public domain
Outcome indicator 0.4 0.4 Indicator 0.4: By Q3-Y3 Model legislation prepared, based on comparative analysis of country laws and expert inputs, that MoFAI can use to inform policy globally <i>(baseline = proposed legal text drafted for Liberia's Wildlife Agency and Conservation International)</i>	In Y2, published model legislation to guide legal revisions/drafting globally (Annex 4.12). This was discussed at the Model Forest Act Initiative (MoFAI) meeting (Annex 4.25).	Continue to engage with MoFAI and seek comments on the model legislation for improvement

Output 1 Active global Community of Practise that promotes and supports CL across jurisdictions as a tool to tackle IWT.		
Output indicator 1.1 By Q3-Y1, Community of Practice (CoP) established, growing to >60 new registered practitioners of people actively involved in cases/case development across >7 countries, including lawyers, plaintiffs, conservation scientific expert witnesses (<i>baseline = 22 people actively involved in last project; no online community exists for conservation litigation, though one exists for climate</i>)	In Y1, we developed a core Community of Practice (evidence in AR1) that now includes 56 people involved in active case development. We also communicate to our wider network through our newsletter (Annex 4.2). This community has grown from 133 in Y1 to 833 in Y2 (Annex 4.1)	Maintain and continue to grow the core Community of Practice, and grow the network that we communicate with via the newsletters
Output indicator 1.2. By Q3-Y3, establish new Conservation Litigation Network, engaging >200 student/junior and >50 practising lawyers with CL concepts across >7 countries, including through student "law clinic" volunteers helping with cases; presentations within undergraduate law modules in >3 countries, 2 virtual global workshops targeting legal practitioners, scientists and potential plaintiffs (<i>baseline = no hackathon or law clinics exists for CL; one workshop for law students held in Indonesia 2021; no workshops yet offered for lawyers; 6 volunteer lawyers identified</i>)	The Biodiversity and Environmental Liability Scholars (BELS) Network we established in Y1 has met regularly in Y2 (Annex 4.3) and has grown from 12 to 45 members in Y2. The second global workshop was held in Y2, in Kerala, India (Annex 4.7) Student intern in Indonesia (Annex 4.4) In Y2, engaged at least 130 practising lawyers with CL concepts, including through in-person workshops with lawyers (Annex 4.7 ; Annex 4.15 ; and Annex 4.5.2) and one-on-one engagements with prospective plaintiffs in >10 countries (Annex 4.14).	Country partners to engage with local lawyers and universities to provide training
Output indicator 1.3. By Q3, Y1, high-profile external Advisory Committee for the project established to guide on case selection, overall strategy, maximising case visibility and risk mitigation.	We have a 9-member Advisory Committee that we update periodically and consult (Annex 4.6)	Continue to update the committee and seek advice
Output 2. New body of resources freely available that reduces barriers for future CL cases		
Output indicator 2.1. By Q3-Y2, legal report and "crib sheet" resource published for 7 countries (Indonesia, India, Cameroon, Mexico, Brazil, Philippines Uganda) (<i>baseline = Drafts started for Thailand, Indonesia Cameroon, Liberia, report written for Georgia in 2022. No analyses done for the other countries in the proposal</i>)	We have reports published for Cameroon, Indonesia, Thailand, and Liberia, including translations (AR1.). In Y2, reports were published for Uganda, The Philippines, and Brazil (Annex 4.8). Legal analyses completed for India and Mexico, with reports expected to be published in Y3.	Finalise and public reports for India and Mexico
Output indicator 2.2. By Q1-Y2, Synthesis "lessons learned" publication by and for practitioners, highlighting best practices (case development, safety, legal procedure), (<i>baseline = no such synthetic document exists in the sector</i>)	We published a lessons learned document with contributions from all the partners on our website as open access (Annex 4.10)	Completed

Output indicator 2.3. By Q1-Y2, database of relevant cases and a comparative analysis available to serve as precedents/examples for future lawsuits (<i>baseline = draft, internal database under development</i>).	The database has been published as open access on our website and will be continually updated with cases as we receive them (Annex 4.13).	Will continue to update the database with cases as we come across them and/or partners and members of the community send us relevant cases.
Output indicator 2.4. By Q3-Y1, develop both 1) risk identification and mitigation framework developed, and 2) case-selection framework, in collaboration with partners, Advisory Committee and others working on IWT enforcement, to guide strategic and safe development of CL cases (<i>baseline = no such public resource exists, although other conservation organisations likely have internal processes that we will request and consider</i>)	We published our Risk Identification and Mitigation Framework, and Case Selection frameworks on our website as open access In Y1 and reported it in AR1.	Completed
Output indicator 2.5. By Q4-Y2 Model legislation prepared, based on comparative analysis of country laws and expert inputs, that MoFAI can use to inform policy globally (<i>baseline = no such model text exists for this type of law though we developed draft for Liberia in 2012, and we have been asked for this from Zimbabwe and Zambia</i>)	We published the draft resources for public comments in Y2 (Annex 4.12)	Work with MoFAI to use this model legislation to inform policy globally
Output indicator 2.6. By Q4-Y3, increased CL profile via >3 international news stories; >6 news stories in domestic media across 3 core countries; active social media presence, >9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members, >36 updates to Conservation-litigation.org, and >2 academic publications (<i>baseline = 1 article in Mongabay; 10 stories in Indonesian media; small number of social media posts as individuals/not systematic; 5 blogs produced during last project; 2 journal articles, website developed with 13 posts and 8 resources</i>)	We have 16 blog posts (Annex 4.11, 2) and 39 social media posts (Annex 4.11, 1). Domestic media has been well engaged, especially in India (Annex 4.17), with international media covering the Italian Cactus case (Annex 4.18)	Continue to engage with media on our cases and broader work
Output 3. Active conservation litigation cases in at least 3 countries		
Output indicator 3.1. By Q4-Y1 Target high-profile cases, defendants and plaintiffs identified in 3 countries (<i>baseline=1 such case filed in Indonesia in 2021, 1 similar case in France 2019, 1 case in Cameroon 2018</i>)	We have new cases under active development in Indonesia, India, and Cameroon (Annex 4.19).	Continue technical support with case development and engagement with the plaintiffs in each country to ensure cases are filed.
Output indicator 3.2. By Q3-Y2, minimum of 3 cases submitted in courts, at least one in each India, Indonesia and Cameroon	Cases are on-track to be filed in Y3. Beyond the MoV we had a new case success in Italy (Annex 4.18) and have cases on the horizon in a number of other countries (Annex 4.14)	This will be our key focus in Y3, as partners advance their cases. Indonesia: This is focused on nudging the government agency to

(baseline = as above)		make their submission  Cameroon: This is focused on identifying the most appropriate case, as the government is already ready. India: This is focused on preparing the claim and submitting it when it is the right time in the legal proceedings. The government agency is receptive, and WTI is deeply embedded.
Output 4. Opportunities for new plaintiffs are created, promoting and facilitating future CL lawsuits in new countries		
Output indicator 4.1. By Q2-Y3, partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries (India, Indonesia), and LaW and LU host virtual workshops in the 4 additional countries (Philippines, Brazil, Mexico, Uganda). These will introduce CL and recruit future plaintiffs <i>(baseline = 3 CL workshops held in Indonesia, but 0 in India or Cameroon)</i>	ICEL held one workshop in Indonesia for lawyers, Promoting Remedies-Oriented Law Enforcement for Biodiversity Damage (Annex 4.15.4) WTI held 3 workshops in India for prosecutors that focussed on compensatory measures in wildlife crime (Annex 4.15, 1, 2, 3) In Uganda, held meetings with National Environmental Management Agency and Uganda Wildlife Authority (Annex 4.14.4, 5) In Philippines, held meetings with Environmental Legal Assistance Center (Annex 4.14.3), and have planned stakeholder workshop with FCDO Philippines for May 2025	Hold planned workshop in Philippines in May 2025 Organise virtual workshops or plaintiff discussions in Brazil and Mexico.
Output indicator 4.2. By Q4-Y3, LaW, LU partners organise >20, targeted one-on-one discussion calls with prospective plaintiffs (government, community, NGO) <i>(baseline = >20 potential plaintiffs engaged in last project)</i>	We have held 1-on-1 discussions with at least 16 new prospective plaintiffs in Y2 (Annex 4.14). ICEL is engaging with future plaintiff for case development (Annex 4.19.2) In Y2, we have identified 10 additional organisations across 9 countries interested in CL work and pursuing cases (Annex 4.14)	WTI and ICEL will continue to engage practitioners, as needs/opportunities come up. Continue to engage with plaintiffs interested in pursuing CL
Output indicator 4.3. By Q4-Y2, LU, ELI and LaW co-host 2 global, virtual workshops for practitioners to introduce the approach, inspire action and build community (e.g., for judges, prosecutors, officials, NGOs) <i>(baseline=1 global workshop hosted in 2021).</i>	We conducted 3 global webinars with high attendance (70-110 people): “Rights of Nature: Taking Action When Nature is Harmed”, “Climate Litigation is Also About Biodiversity”, and “Why a Legal Case about Chilean Cacti Matters to Conservation Globally” (Annex 4.16)	Completed

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

Minor change as requested by the reviewer of our Change Request from December 2024 is noted in Measurable Indicator **IO.4**. The changed indicator has been underlined.

Project summary	Measurable Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
Impact: Reduced IWT by increasing the likelihood that violators will face litigation with high sanctions, which can then be reinvested into healing harm and can send social signals about IWT impacts.			
Outcome: Conservation litigation is a globally-recognised tool for tackling IWT in ways that are deterrent, remedy-focused and have potential to deliver meaningful justice and social signals	<p>0.1 By Q3-Y3, at least 3 new lawsuits are filed in three core countries (Cameroon, Indonesia, India) <i>(baseline=1 lawsuit in Indonesia 2021, 1 lawsuit in France in 2019, 1 lawsuit in Cameroon 2018)</i></p> <p>0.2 By Q3-Y3, 3 new organisations external to the project plan to undertake future CL action <i>(baseline=2 NGO in Indonesia, 1 NGO in Italy and 2 Indonesian government agencies have expressed interest).</i></p> <p>0.3 By Q4-Y3, increased public profile for the CL approach via >3 international news stories; >6 news stories in domestic media across 3 core countries; active social media presence, and >9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members <i>(baseline = 1 article in Mongabay; 10 stories in Indonesian media; small number of social media posts as individuals/not systematic; 5 blogs produced during last project)</i></p>	<p>0.1 Case filing documents and case numbers</p> <p>0.2 Email documentation or meeting notes highlighting promising follow-up opportunities or plan to act from our workshops and 1-on-1 outreach activities</p> <p>0.3 URL links 0.3 List of all posts made and analytics</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate cases and plaintiffs can be identified, and conditions met so they can be successfully and safely litigated. <u>Mitigation:</u> We have focused on experienced, established partners who deeply understand the CL approach. We are seeking cases where the government is interested in being a plaintiff (certain in Cameroon, likely in Indonesia), which increases likelihood of success. Safety protocols in place. • There are future costs beyond the project time horizon (e.g., appeal). <u>Mitigation:</u> We evaluate these case/country-specific risks before litigation. We continue to identify smaller, follow-up donors to support future costs. We have already done this for 2 of the 3 cases. • Courts can sometimes be slow to issue their verdicts, depending on the country and case. <u>Mitigation:</u> We are maximising case impacts and visibility, regardless of outcome and timeline. We are filing multiple cases, some of which we know will be resolved sooner than others (e.g., Indonesian courts are known to be faster than Brazil's) • Our lawsuits could be unsuccessful in court. <u>Mitigation:</u> Develop a case-selection framework and be strategic selection with selection cases,

	<p>0.4 <u>By Q3-Y3 Model legislation prepared, based on comparative analysis of country laws and expert inputs, that MoFAI can use to inform policy globally</u> (baseline = proposed legal text drafted for Liberia's Wildlife Agency and Conservation International)</p>	<p>0.4 Draft legislation text 0.4 Email documentation and/or meeting notes of policy engagement</p>	<p>plaintiffs and jurisdictions, to maximise success. • Procedural mistakes, which are easy to make, means that one of the cases fail. <u>Mitigation:</u> Work with experienced partners that have familiarity with the procedures. Build on sharing practitioner lessons learned.</p>
<p>Output 1. Active global Community of Practise that promotes and supports CL across jurisdictions as a tool to tackle IWT.</p>	<p>1.1 By Q3-Y1, Community of Practice (CoP) established, growing to >60 new registered practitioners of people actively involved in cases/case development across >7 countries, including lawyers, plaintiffs, conservation scientific expert witnesses (baseline = 22 people actively involved in last project; no online community exists for conservation litigation, though one exists for climate)</p> <p>1.2 By Q3-Y3, establish new Conservation Litigation Network, engaging >200 student/junior and >50 practising lawyers with CL concepts across >7 countries, including through student "law clinic" volunteers helping with cases; presentations within undergraduate law modules in >3 countries, 2 virtual global workshops targeting legal practitioners, scientists and potential plaintiffs (baseline = no hackathon or law clinics exists for CL; one workshop for law students held in Indonesia 2021; no workshops yet offered for lawyers; 6 volunteer lawyers identified)</p>	<p>1.1 Membership list 1.1 Qualitative description of types of engagement 1.1 Online forum infrastructure screenshot</p> <p>1.2 Participant list for each activity (gender disaggregated) and description of volunteer activities 1.2 Event summaries 1.2 Photographs 1.2 Database of volunteers</p>	<p>• People have time to commit. <u>Mitigation:</u> We are focused on a smaller, but high-quality/engaged group interested in meaningful engagement. We will keep commitments modest but attractive/meaningful. We will create incentives for participation, such as support, public profile and opportunity to attend a UK workshop.</p> <p>• These are time-consuming activities. <u>Mitigation:</u> We have budgeted heavily into staff time of people with relevant expertise</p>

	<p>1.3 By Q3, Y1, high-profile external Advisory Committee for the project established to guide on case selection, overall strategy, maximising case visibility and risk mitigation. <i>(baseline = possible members identified)</i></p>	<p>1.3 Names of Advisors 1.3 Records of meetings</p>	
<p>Output 2. New body of resources freely available that reduces barriers for future CL cases</p>	<p>2.1 By Q3–Y2, legal report and “crib sheet” resource published for 7 countries (Indonesia, India, Cameroon, Mexico, Brazil, Philippines Uganda) <i>(baseline = Drafts started for Thailand, Indonesia Cameroon, Liberia, report written for Georgia in 2022. No analyses done for the other countries in the proposal)</i></p> <p>2.2 By Q1-Y2, Synthesis “lessons learned” publication by and for practitioners, highlighting best practices (case development, safety, legal procedure), <i>(baseline = no such synthetic document exists in the sector)</i></p> <p>2.3 By Q1-Y2, database of relevant cases and a comparative analysis available to serve as precedents/examples for future lawsuits <i>(baseline = draft, internal database under development).</i></p> <p>2.4 By Q3-Y1, develop both 1) risk identification and mitigation framework developed, and 2) case-selection framework, in collaboration with partners, Advisory Committee and others working on IWT enforcement, to guide strategic and safe development of CL cases</p>	<p>2.1 URL to open-access report and “crib sheet” for each country</p> <p>2.2 URL to open-access publication on project website</p> <p>2.3. URL to open-access database and analysis on project website</p> <p>2.4 URL links to two new frameworks</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These are time-consuming activities. <u>Mitigation:</u> We have budgeted heavily into staff time of people with relevant expertise. • Assumes that lack of technical knowledge are a limitation to people taking CL <u>Mitigation:</u> We know this is not the only barrier to taking legal action, but is certainly the first one, and one that we can help overcome. We are also providing other types of support (e.g., Community of Practise, seed funding to 5 organisations) to help overcome other barriers.

	<p><i>(baseline = no such public resource exists, although other conservation organisations likely have internal processes that we will request and consider)</i></p> <p>2.5 By Q4-Y2 Model legislation prepared, based on comparative analysis of country laws and expert inputs, that MoFAI can use to inform policy globally <i>(baseline = no such model text exists for this type of law though we developed draft for Liberia in 2012, and we have been asked for this from Zimbabwe and Zambia)</i></p> <p>2.6 By Q4-Y3, increased CL profile via >3 international news stories; >6 news stories in domestic media across 3 core countries; active social media presence, >9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members, >36 updates to Conservation-litigation.org, and >2 academic publications <i>(baseline = 1 article in Mongabay; 10 stories in Indonesian media; small number of social media posts as individuals/not systematic; 5 blogs produced during last project; 2 journal articles, website developed with 13 posts and 8 resources)</i></p>	<p>2.5 URL to “model” legislation text 2.5 Qualitative description of engagement with MoFAI and any lawyers/policy makers around use of the “model” legislation text</p> <p>2.6 List of media engagements by category 2.6 URL to copies</p>	
<p>Output 3. Active conservation litigation cases in at least 3 countries</p>	<p>3.1 (see 0.1) By Q4-Y1 Target high-profile cases, defendants and plaintiffs identified in 3 countries <i>(baseline=1 such case filed in Indonesia in 2021, 1 similar case in France 2019, 1 case in Cameroon 2018)</i></p>	<p>3.1 Summary describing cases</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See Outcome-level assumptions

	3.2 By Q3-Y2, minimum of 3 cases submitted in courts, at least one in each India, Indonesia and Cameroon <i>(baseline = as above)</i>	3.2 Case filing documents and case numbers	
Output 4. Opportunities for new plaintiffs are created, promoting and facilitating future CL lawsuits in new countries.	<p>4.1 By Q2-Y3, partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries (India, Indonesia), and LaW and LU host virtual workshops in the 4 additional countries (Philippines, Brazil, Mexico, Uganda). These will introduce CL and recruit future plaintiffs <i>(baseline = 3 CL workshops held in Indonesia, but 0 in India or Cameroon)</i></p> <p>4.2 By Q4-Y3, LaW, LU partners organise >20, targeted one-on-one discussion calls with prospective plaintiffs (government, community, NGO) <i>(baseline = >20 potential plaintiffs engaged in last project)</i></p> <p>4.3 By Q4-Y2, LU, ELI and LaW co-host 2 global, virtual workshops for practitioners to introduce the approach, inspire action and build community (e.g., for judges, prosecutors, officials, NGOs) <i>(baseline=1 global workshop hosted in 2021).</i></p>	<p>4.1. Participant and organisation list (gender disaggregated) 4.1 Meeting notes, highlighting promising follow-up opportunities</p> <p>4.2 List of organisations met 4.2 Meeting notes, highlighting promising follow-up opportunities</p> <p>4.3. Participant and organisation list (gender disaggregated) 4.3 Meeting notes, highlighting promising follow-up opportunities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assumes that lack of technical knowledge are a limitation to people taking CL <u>Mitigation</u>: We know this is not the only barrier to taking legal action, but is certainly the first one, and one that we can help overcome. We are also providing other types of support (e.g., community of practise, sub-grants) to help overcome other barriers. • We have adequate, quality expressions of interest from external parties. <u>Mitigation</u>: Our experience to date suggests this unlikely to be an issue, as we already have several expressions of interest
<p>Activities (each activity is numbered according to the output that it will contribute towards, for example 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 are contributing to Output 1)</p> <p>1.1 LaW to establish online CoP platform (LinkedIn “closed” group) for practitioners as a hub for CL community, growing the CoP with targeted invitations via the partners and engagement activities.</p> <p>1.2 LaW and LU to maintain active CoP member engagement via posts of news, questions, consultations, organising discussion threads</p> <p>1.3 LaW and LU to establish a broad/inclusive network of people interested in CL/keeping in touch, via new mailing list (active participants may later join the CoP)</p>			

- 1.4 LU and LaW to develop a general multi-purpose “slide deck” resource, which partners can then use with legal practitioners across future workshops
 - 1.6 ICEL and WTI to announce “law clinic” opportunities for law students, and recruit >6 students to support case development (e.g., legal research, preparing documents)
 - 1.7 ICEL, LAGA, WTI, LU, LaW present strategic conservation litigation to undergraduate law modules in >3 countries via the partners
 - 1.8 LU and LaW to host meetings with Advisory Committee to discuss key topics (e.g., see Indicator 2.4, 2.5)
 - 1.9 LU to host 2 in-person workshops of CLAW partners, to discuss project start, case resources and frameworks, and then case development and strategy
 - 1.10 See also engagement workshops discussed under Output 4 that also contribute to this output.
-
- 2.1 Cooperation with lawyers in 7 countries, LaW will conduct legal analysis about how CL can be operationalised in each country, following the CL checklist we have developed/trialled in 4 countries.
 - 2.2 ICEL, LAGA, WTI and Law will host technical workshops in 7 countries with legal experts to refine the checklist and consider socio-legal realities of strategic litigation
 - 2.3 Publish 7 country-specific reports and “crib sheets” that synthesise CL laws and procedures, for dissemination via website, social media, CoP, network and events
 - 2.4 All partners will develop resource on “lessons learned about strategic conservation litigation”, based on a virtual workshop and discussions with partners and CoP.
 - 2.5 LaW will develop online, free database (e.g., using Google) to populate with cases contributed by WTI, ICEL, LAGA, CoP and in-country lawyers across >7 countries
 - 2.6 All partners and Advisory Committee will build a case-selection framework, to guide selection of strategic CL case)
 - 2.7 LU will develop risk identification and mitigation framework through consultation with partners, based on review of other organisations’ protocols (including via IWTCF recipients) and in discussion with Advisory Committee
 - 2.8 LU, LaW and DLA to develop draft “model legislation” text, to guide *The Model Forest Act Initiative (MoFAI)* so that they can use it to inform policy globally.
 - 2.9 LU and LaW to develop regular online posts, with contributions from WTI, LAGA, ICEL, and disseminate via website, CoP, network and social media
 - 2.10 LU to organise partner roles for public communications (blogs, website updates), and maintain/develop database of media contacts to coordinate maximum visibility for cases
 - 2.11 LU to lead partners in co-authorship of blogs/editorials, website updates, and 3 key academic publications via collaborative GoogleDocs
 - 2.12 LU and Law to disseminate new resources (above) via website, social and print media, CoP, network mailing list, and in-person and virtual workshops, IWTCF newsletter
-
- 3.1 LAGA, WTI, ICEL to identify, summarise and propose candidate cases in 3 target countries that are locally appropriate/strategic and CLAW goals. And coordinate to identify a plaintiff for each case—most likely a government agency
 - 3.2 LU to use case-selection framework, risk-mitigation framework and Advisory Committee consultation to evaluate each case, and recommend whether/how to proceed, and mitigation actions
 - 3.3 LU, ELI and LaW to support LAGA, WTI, ICEL in developing damage claims for each case, via workshops, shared GoogleDoc, and convening species-conservation experts via IUCN to help provide scientific expertise

- 3.4 LAGA, WTI and ICEL to coordinate with government and legal team to prepare selected case details, evidence, and legal argumentation– for comment from other partners, LaW, ELI, LU
- 3.5 LAGA, WTI and ICEL to formally submit cases in respective courts
- 3.6 LAGA, WTI and ICEL to host a press release event and publicise their case. Cooperate with LU on international media campaign.
- 4.1 Drawing on the 7 country legal analyses and general CL resources, LaW and in-country lawyers develop presentations for each country
- 4.2 WTI and ICEL host in-person engagement workshop with practitioners to discuss developing future conservation litigation cases in their jurisdictions
- 4.3 LaW, LU and in-country lawyers invite a targeted group of practitioners in 6 additional countries to virtual workshops to present results of legal analysis and discuss litigation potential
- 4.4 Partners and in-country lawyers identify the most appropriate prospective future plaintiffs, and help organise virtual meetings with LU/LaW
- 4.5. ELI and LU to lever international and partners’ networks co-host open virtual events for law practitioners globally

• **Annex 3 Standard Indicators**

■ **Table 1 Project Standard Indicators**

Please see the Standard Indicator guidance for more information on how to report in this section, including appropriate disaggregation.

IWTCF Indicator number	Name of indicator	If this links directly to a project indicator(s), please note the indicator number here	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
IWTCF-D04	>200 student/junior engaged with CL concepts (I1.2)	I1.2	Number	Women	28			28(of 61)	200
IWTCF-D04	>200 student/junior engaged with CL concepts (I1.2)	I1.2	Number	Men	32	1		33(of 61)	
IWTCF-D05	>50 practising lawyers engaged with CL concepts across (I1.2)	I1.2	Number	Men	20	78		98(of 191)	50
IWTCF-D05	>50 practising lawyers engaged with CL concepts across (I1.2)	I1.2	Number	Women	40	53		93(of 191)	
IWTCF-D13	Legal analyses published for 7 countries (Indonesia, India, Cameroon, Mexico, Brazil, Philippines, Uganda)	I2.1	Number	Legal Analyses	2	3		5	7
IWTCF-B05	Risk identification and mitigation, and case selection frameworks developed	I2.4	Number	Frameworks	2	2		2	2
IWTCF-D11	>2 academic publications	I2.6	Number	Publications	0	0			2
IWTCF-D19	Active social media presence	I2.6	Number	Twitter (558 followers); LinkedIn (273 followers)		LinkedIn (741 followers) current			NA
IWTCF-D20	2 global workshops for practitioners, and 4 virtual workshops in the 4 additional countries (Philippines, Brazil, Mexico, Uganda)	I4.3 and I4.1	Number	Number of webinar events	0	2		2	6
IWTCF-D22	>9 editorials/blogs/articles by project members	I2.6	Number	Editorials/blogs/articles by project members	4	3		7	9
IWTCF-D22	>36 updates to Conservation-litigation.org	I2.6	Number	Updates to Conservation-litigation.org website	13	16		29	36
IWTCF-B13	Minimum of 3 cases submitted in courts	I3.2	Number	Number of cases					3

IWTCF Indicator number	Name of indicator	If this links directly to a project indicator(s), please note the indicator number here	Units	Disaggregation	Year 1 Total	Year 2 Total	Year 3 Total	Total to date	Total planned during the project
IWTCF-D01	Partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries	I4.1	Number	Women, civil society, training on CL to recruit/ support plaintiffs		34		34	
IWTCF-D01	Partners host in-person workshops for practitioners in the 2 core countries	I4.1	Number	Men, civil society, training on CL to recruit/ support plaintiffs		60		60	

■ **Table 2 Publications**

Title	Type (e.g. journals, best practice manual, blog post, online videos, podcasts, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
Legal remedies for harm to biodiversity: An analysis of Uganda's environmental liability legislation.	Report	Rodriguez, M., Atwebembeire, B., Phelps, J., 2024	Female	Spain		Link

Title	Type (e.g. journals, best practice manual, blog post, online videos, podcasts, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
Legal remedies for harm to biodiversity: An analysis of The Philippines's environmental liability legislation.	Report	Rodriguez, M., Mayo-Anda, G., Pajares, R.G.T., Fajrini, R., Phelps, J., Rodriguez, M. 2025	Female	Spain		Link
Legal remedies for harm to biodiversity: An analysis of Brazil's environmental liability legislation.	Report	Rodriguez, M., Mars, B.M., Rodrigues, R., Phelps, J., 2025	Female	Spain		Link
Inaugural meeting of the Biodiversity & Environmental Liability Scholars (BELS) Network	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
Conservation-Litigation.org publishes Risk	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link

Title	Type (e.g. journals, best practice manual, blog post, online videos, podcasts, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
Identification and Mitigation Framework for strategic environmental liability litigation.						
Press Release: Cacti will have their day in court	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
UNODC World Crime Report highlights harm & legal remedies	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
Webinar on Rights of Nature: Taking Action when Nature is Harmed	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
Strengthening the protection of Indonesia's plants and wildlife	Blog	Shafira, D., Hempton, L. 2024	Female	Indonesia		Link
Global prosecutor workshop	Blog	Shafira, D., Hempton, L. 2024	Female	Indonesia		Link

Title	Type (e.g. journals, best practice manual, blog post, online videos, podcasts, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
explores civil and criminal strategies for wildlife restoration						
Conservation-Litigation.org network supports the Model Forest Act Initiative	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
Climate litigation IS ALSO about biodiversity	Blog	Phelps, J. 2024	Male	USA/UK/Barbados		Link
Announcing our October webinar: Climate Litigation is ALSO about Biodiversity	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
World Animal Day: Interview with Jenny Desmond, founder of Liberia Chimpanzee Rescue and Protection	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link

Title	Type (e.g. journals, best practice manual, blog post, online videos, podcasts, CDs)	Detail (authors, year)	Gender of Lead Author	Nationality of Lead Author	Publishers (name, city)	Available from (e.g. weblink or publisher if not available online)
Diverse values for nature & courts	Editorial	Phelps, J. 2024	Male	USA/UK/Barbados		Link
Ugandan wildlife is under threat: New analysis shows how law can help	Blog	Hempton, L. 2024	Female	UK		Link
Global group explores case developments in securing remedial measures for nature	Blog	Sircar, D., Hempton, L., Phelps, J. 2025	Male	India		Link
Press Release: Unique Legal Victory for Nature	Blog	Hempton, L. 2025	Female	UK		Link
Multidisciplinary workshop on "Promoting Remedies-Oriented Law Enforcement for Biodiversity Damage"	Blog	Shafira, D., Hempton, L. 2024	Female	Indonesia		Link

• **Checklist for submission**

	Check
Different reporting templates have different questions, and it is important you use the correct one. Have you checked you have used the correct template (checking fund, scheme, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and deleted the blue guidance text before submission?	Yes
Is the report less than 10MB? If so, please email to BCF-Reports@niras.com putting the project number in the subject line.	No
Is your report more than 10MB? If so, please consider the best way to submit. One zipped file, or a download option is recommended. We can work with most online options and will be in touch if we have a problem accessing material. If unsure, please discuss with BCF-Reports@niras.com about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the subject line.	Yes
Have you included means of verification? You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	Yes
Have you provided an updated risk register? If you have an existing risk register you should provide an updated version alongside your report. If your project was funded prior to this being a requirement, you are encourage to develop a risk register.	Yes
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 17)?	Yes
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	Yes
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	Yes
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	