



Department  
for Environment  
Food & Rural Affairs



UK International  
Development

Partnership | Progress | Prosperity

## Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Challenge Fund Main & Extra: Annual Report

To be completed with reference to the "Project Reporting Information Note":  
(<https://iwt.challengefund.org.uk/resources/information-notes/>)

It is expected that this report will be a **maximum of 20 pages** in length, excluding annexes)

**Submission Deadline: 30<sup>th</sup> April 2025**

**Submit to: [BCF-Reports@niras.com](mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com)** including your project ref in the subject line

### IWT Challenge Fund Project Information

Scheme (Main or Extra)	Main
Project reference	IWT 139
Project title	Towards Zero Poaching in the Greater Virunga Landscape
Country/ies	Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and Uganda
Lead Organisation	WWF UK
Project partner(s)	WWF Uganda Country Office, WWF DRC, Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration GVTC), International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)
IWTCF grant value	£599,907
Start/end dates of project	01/08/24 – 31/03/27
Reporting period (e.g. April 2024-Mar 2025) and number (e.g. Annual Report 1, 2, 3)	August 2024 – March 2025 Annual Report 1
Project Leader name	Catriona McLean (interim)
Project website/blog/social media	N/A
Report author(s) and date	Catriona McLean (WWF-UK), Paul Hatanga (WWF UCO) Dervla Dowd (WWF-UK) 30th April 2025

### 1. Project summary

The Greater Virunga Landscape (GVL) (see map in Annex 1) is one of Africa's richest biodiverse ecosystems containing more threatened vertebrate species than anywhere else across the continent. It encompasses a network of protected areas across the DRC, Rwanda and Uganda, and is home to globally important populations of elephants and mountain gorillas. Despite its significance, the GVL faces numerous threats. The region has one of the highest human population densities in Africa, with as many as 1000 people/km<sup>2</sup> in some sections of the Landscape, and up to 80% in some areas living below the poverty line. Moreover, poaching and IWT remain key concerns for conservation. For example, elephant poaching in East Africa

remains above average, while domestic market consumption is also affecting trends. Uganda and DRC have some of the highest records of ivory and pangolin seizures in Africa (authorities recently seized 102kg of elephant ivory and 15kg of pangolin scales in Uganda) and are classified as source, consolidation and transit countries for IWT across Central and East Africa, with ivory trafficking and poaching often recorded across the DRC and Uganda border. Porous borders and insecurity facilitate IWT regionally, highlighting that wildlife crime needs a joint response involving non-conservation agencies who may not prioritise tackling IWT.

As such, transboundary coordination/collaboration among Protected Area Authorities (PAAs), law enforcement, customs/immigration agencies, and communities is needed. The Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration (GVTC) (an interstate institution for GVL) has developed a Zero Poaching (ZP) Strategy, with support from WWF and other partners, to address these challenges. However inadequate resources and poor coordination have limited its implementation.

Regionally, a lack of harmonised information gathering and sharing mechanisms hinder cross-border information sharing on wildlife offenders. To feed into this, standardised data is needed from PAAs using tools such as SMART (Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool) to facilitate data gathering on wildlife and threats. Analysis of this data helps managers identify and map threats, decide on appropriate actions, prioritise limited resources, and track changes in activity over time. However there is also currently limited capacity in the PAAs to do so.

Furthermore, as joint action is needed from law enforcement (prosecutors, customs etc) as well as wildlife-focused agencies, the lack of a mechanism to bring these stakeholders together hinders effective joint planning and awareness raising on IWT. While the online TWIX tool facilitates exchange of information and cooperation between law enforcement agencies on wildlife seizures, awareness and capacity also needs to be raised to use this effectively.

Moreover, limited engagement with local communities, whose understanding of IWT and poaching is unmatched, also limits capacity to address IWT efficiently. Support is urgently required for cross-border implementation of the ZP Strategy to both detect and respond to IWT, while mitigating negative impacts on frontline communities from both the current trade and future reduction in trade.

Overall, in response to ongoing persistent issues in tackling illegal wildlife trade (IWT), capacity, capability and coordination of multiple governmental bodies responsible for wildlife across the Greater Virunga Landscape (GVL) will be improved to detect, prevent and reduce both national and cross-border IWT. Through advancement and promotion of standardised monitoring systems and tools; and regional cross-learning and coordination, this project will ultimately contribute towards ensuring stable populations of wildlife, and improved well-being of local communities across this landscape.

## **2. Project stakeholders/ partners**

The project is being implemented through a large collaboration of partners: Four WWF offices (UK as project lead, Uganda as regional project lead, DRC as DRC representation and Kenya for technical support), as well as the key tristate partner (Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration – GVTC) and other technical partners, namely International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) and Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS). The project partnership was developed through the wider work on the recently developed Transboundary Strategic Plan (TSP) for GVL. This is a 10-year plan for GVTC and partners and includes a workstream on IWT that the project partners were keen to work on together, building on the previous work on the existing Zero-Poaching Strategy. Given the geographic range, technical expertise and official mandates of each of the partners, it was agreed to work on this IWT main project together. GVTC are also contracting TRAFFIC as a consultant to support on the database and TWIX aspects of the project in year 2 .

So far in year 1, we have developed our agreed ways of working. This has taken some time to develop, but the core team, with representatives from each partner, meet on a bi-weekly basis to review project progress, troubleshoot and jointly plan. A specific group has also been set up to focus on the MEL of the project (which meets quarterly), ensuring that baseline data is collected, adequate surveys are prepared and that the logframe, risks and assumptions are up to date.

The inception meeting in October 2024 provided the opportunity for all partners to meet face to face in Rwanda and to clarify the roles and responsibilities of each partner. During the inception and launch of the project, the project hosted FCDO's East Africa Climate and Environment Advisor, Gwilym Jones, who gave a keynote address. This collaboration has helped to continue strengthening the relationship with British Embassies in the region. As soon as the inception and launch event were completed, downstream grant agreements were developed by WWF UCO. With some back and forth, this means we expect to see more project implementation in year 2, now that the grant agreements and payments are in place.

Finally, Government stakeholders including representatives from Protected Area Authorities and Law Enforcement Agencies were involved in inception and other initial activities including the inception meeting held in Rubavu Rwanda in October 2024, the project launch and baseline assessment activities.

### **3. Project progress**

#### **3.1 Progress in carrying out project Activities**

0.0 Inception workshop/meeting: This has been completed. An in-person meeting was held in Rubavu, Rwanda between the 22<sup>nd</sup> and 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2024. The first two days focused on technical matters while the final day was for the official launch of the project. During the workshop, attended by all project partners and relevant staff, various sessions were held to cover ways of working, project delivery plans, MEL planning, donor compliance, communications, Safeguarding, etc. Technical sessions on the Zero-Poaching Framework and data availability on poaching in the region were also held. The agenda can be found in Annex 2, the workshop report in Annex 3 and the list of participants in Annex 4.

0.1 Baseline data consolidation on - METT for at least 5 PAs; levels of capacity, collaboration and coordination of GVTC, RDB, UWA, ICCN; and on IWT incidences in the GVL: Baseline data consolidation has been completed, except for Virunga National Park (NP) data in DRC. Assessments were conducted for seven protected areas in Rwanda and Uganda using the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT). Baselines for levels of capacity, collaboration and coordination were also collected using the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework (WCPF) tool, these were also collected for the seven protected areas managed by RDB and UWA.

Both assessments were facilitated with key stakeholders in Rwenzori Mountains National Park, Queen Elizabeth Protected Area, Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Semuliki National Park, Volcanoes National Park and Kibale National Park. Unfortunately, due to the conflict in Eastern DRC, it was not possible to carry out these assessments for Virunga National Park or Sarambwe Wildlife Reserve under ICCN. METT assessments are still being validated with partners but summarised assessment results can be seen in Annex 5.

For assessment of GVTC, it was decided that the WCPF tool was not wholly appropriate given the nature of their role, and a bespoke capacity assessment tool was developed for them, drawing on the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework, ICCWC Indicator Framework for Combating Wildlife and Forest Crime, and the ICCWC Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks (WENs) (Annex 6)

Data on poaching and IWT incidents and seizures has been collected from Rwenzori Mountains National Park, Queen Elizabeth Protected Area, Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Mgahinga

Gorilla National Park, Semuliki National Park and Volcanoes National Park. This has not been included in annexes due to the sensitivity of data.

0.2 Conduct endline assessments on - METT for at least 5 PAs; levels of capacity, collaboration and coordination of GVTC, RDB, UWA, ICCN; and IWT incidences: Not started – planned for Year 3.

**OUTPUT 1: By end year 3, an integrated and robust monitoring and learning system is in place for monitoring IWT activities within the Greater Virunga Landscape**

1.1 Develop MEAL plan and dashboard to support streamlined/integration of IWT data collection and reporting at regional level through GVTC Centre of Excellence: A consultancy (not funded under this project), contracted by GVTC, developed a report on the “Needs Assessment on Data and Information Collection, Storage and Sharing in the GVL”. The recommendations from this report were used to develop the ToRs (Annex 7) for the development of the data sharing framework and MEAL plan and dashboard which will then take place in year 2 . Procurement has been initiated to recruit a consultant to conduct this work.

1.2 Dashboard validation workshop and launch of dashboard: Planned for Year 2

1.3 Conduct training for protected area authorities and other key stakeholders to use the integrated MEAL dashboard in each GVL partner state: Planned for Year 2

1.4 Develop, produce and distribute GVL Annual Conservation Status Report (ACSR) each year: Activities relating to development of the ACSR is largely cofinanced by GVTC and other projects. Significant work has been undertaken to convene the relevant stakeholder to feed into the ACSR, particularly in bringing together the Protected Area Authorities from the GVL at a meeting in December to share data and information and inform the content of the report (Annex 11). A writeshop will be held in May 2025 to develop the report itself.

**OUTPUT 2: By end of year 2, 4 responsible government bodies within the GVL have respective workforces that are appropriately equipped and trained with standardised equipment, tools and practices**

2.1 Rollout of training on SMART: This will be conducted in year 2.

2.2 Produce best practice guidelines on key trainings and subject matter: Planned for Year 2

2.3 Procure and distribute essential tools and equipment to enhance workforce performance in the GVL (smartphones, tents, rain jackets): This has been completed. Smart phones and their case covers, powerbanks, handheld GPS units, camping tents, sleeping bags and waterproof bags have been procured and are ready for distribution. A distribution criteria was discussed with PAs based on a needs assessment (Annex 8b) (see Annex 8 for the contract for procurement of equipment).

**OUTPUT 3: By end of year 3, a Regional Task Force to improve transboundary coordination on IWT is established and functioning effectively in line with the International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks**

3.1 Conduct meetings with relevant organisations in each partner state to identify individuals/officers to formally constitute a regional IWT task force: This activity is planned for Year 2. However initial discussions have been conducted between GVTC, WCS and project partners to inform the road map for the task force development and constitution, including an initial list of potential members .

3.2 Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and action planning of the regional task force: Planned for Year 2

3.3 Develop and support the roll-out of regional information sharing protocols and databases to enhance decision making and collaboration: Planned for Year 2

3.4 Rollout of Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (TWIX) to Task Force members, supported by TRAFFIC: This is on-going. The MoU with TRAFFIC (Annex 9) was developed and they commenced work planning for activity implementation in Year 2.

3.5 Conduct meetings to promote and popularise relevant CITES, CBD and CMS decisions at regional level so they are incorporated into planning: Planned for Year 2

3.6 Support Task Force members to conduct self assessments against Zero Poaching Framework: Planned for Year 2

### **3.2 Progress towards project Outputs**

#### **OUTPUT 1: By end year 3, an integrated and robust monitoring and learning system is in place for monitoring IWT activities within the Greater Virunga Landscape**

It is too early in the project for there to be results under this output, though there have been some activities to support its development. The baseline condition has been set, in that currently there is no integrated robust monitoring and learning system in place for monitoring IWT activities at landscape level in the GVL. Work has already begun to identify the 25 key stakeholders (Indicator 1.1) which will be engaged to use the Regional IWT Dashboard once developed. The ToRs for the development of the dashboard have been developed and procurement initiated (Indicator 1.2), informed by the 'Needs Assessment on Data and Information Collection, Storage and Sharing in the GVL' (an adjacent piece of work contracted by GVTC concluded in December 2024), which will also inform the data sharing framework (Indicator 1.3).

#### **OUTPUT 2: By end of year 2, 4 responsible government bodies within the GVL have respective workforces that are appropriately equipped and trained with standardised equipment, tools and practices**

It is too early in the project for there to be results under this output, though there have been some activities to support its development, namely the procurement of equipment for the Protected Area Authorities and GVTC (Indicator 2.6) to ensure workforces are appropriately equipped to support effective implementation of duties.

#### **OUTPUT 3: By end of year 3, a Regional Task Force to improve transboundary coordination on IWT is established and functioning effectively in line with the International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks**

It is too early in the project for there to be results under this output, though there have been some activities to support its development, namely the contracting of TRAFFIC to support capacity development in year 2 of the project on use of the online Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (TWIX) tools and data to monitor IWT incidents in GVL (Indicator 3.6). The downstream agreement with WCS as the lead on task force establishment was also concluded in year 1. Activities will kick off early in year 2.

### **3.3 Progress towards the project Outcome**

**OUTCOME: By end of year 3, government bodies responsible for tackling Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) in Greater Virunga Landscape have enhanced capacity, capability and coordination, leading to a reduction in IWT**

We have made considerable progress in collecting the baseline data for the five Outcome Indicators. Baseline capacity assessments were conducted to assess institutional capacity, levels of coordination and collaboration covering seven protected areas managed by the Rwanda Development Board (RDB) and the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) for the first time ever, following the toolkit in the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework (Indicator 0.1). METT assessments were conducted in Rwenzori Mountains National Park, Queen Elizabeth Protected Area, Bwindi Impenetrable National Park, Mgahinga Gorilla National Park, Semuliki National Park, Volcanoes National Park and Kibale National Park (indicator 0.2). It has not been possible to collect data for indicators 0.1 or 0.2 yet for the Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN) due to the current conflict in the Virunga National Park/Goma area. Lastly, baseline tools and methods for data collation and collection from the six protected areas on poaching and IWT incidents (indicators 0.3, 0.4 and 0.5) have been developed and agreed. The MEL working group of the project are confident that the proposed indicators and tools are adequate to measure the intended project outcome.

The project has also made some progress on institutional coordination and cooperation (indicator 0.1) demonstrated through active participation of key state and non-state institutions in project activities and initial efforts to share data and information. For example, during the inception workshop and the annual conservation status review meeting (supported by a parallel project), there was clear demonstration of the willingness to share data and information, which is a building block to effective collaboration and coordination as highlighted under the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework.

However, with recent escalations of conflict in Eastern DRC, the likelihood of effective coordination and collaboration with DRC remained compromised during Year 1, a risk we also identified during project design. Mitigation measures have included temporary suspension of baseline assessment activities for ICCN while also ensuring that virtual engagement of our project partners continues through GVTC, IGCP and WWF-DRC teams. Given the recent tense relations between Rwanda and DRC, the project team will conduct any regional meetings/workshops in Uganda to ensure that all countries can relatively be able to participate. While this may not guarantee 100% presence of all partner states, it will help to mitigate any absenteeism due to political differences between the two states.

### **3.4 Monitoring of assumptions**

#### **OUTCOME LEVEL ASSUMPTIONS:**

Assumption 1: Geo-political situation remains stable for project duration and beyond

Comments: WWF & partners are keeping track of the situation in DRC and are working with GVTC to ascertain how cross-border work and capacity building can take place in the current context. Project partners will continue to promote collaboration at a technical level, rather than engaging at a political level at this point.

Assumption 2: There are no external shocks (e.g. economic, climate-related) which lead to a significant increase in IWT activities

Comments: Evidence is emerging that the conflict in eastern DRC might be causing impacts on IWT in the region due to economic shocks and limited law enforcement in Protected Areas and across borders, though it is difficult at the moment to properly evaluate this.

Assumption 3: The Governments of all 3 countries remain committed to the GVL Zero Poaching Strategy

Comments: Conflict in DRC has broken down the collaboration between DRC and Rwanda. However, GVTC is still in place and represents a trilateral platform, and demonstrates the three states' commitment to collaboration for the GVL in the recently approved Landscape Strategy and existing 2015 treaty. GVTC remains committed and will continue to work with national counterparts on the issues/actions in the project.

#### **OUTPUT 1 ASSUMPTIONS:**

Assumption 4: The geopolitical situation remains constant so that the three governments in the landscape remain committed to sharing information and to working together.

Comments: See comments above

Assumption 5: Trained staff available are incentivised to use the improved data.

Comments: Assumption to be tested in year 2

#### **OUTPUT 2 ASSUMPTIONS:**

Assumption 6: Responsible bodies have the capacity and capability to take part in training and to use assets provided by the project

Comments: Assumption holds on the basis of engagement of responsible bodies to date.

Assumption 7: Use of standardised equipment, tools and practices facilitate better coordination across the Greater Virunga Landscape

Comments: Assumption will be tested in year 2.

Assumption 8: PAAs across the Landscape agree on which RBM method to use (SMART vs ER) (NEW ADDED 22/10/24)

Comments: Discussions are ongoing around the prioritisation of SMART or EarthRanger by PAAs. Use of a platform is being explored which should enable collection and display of data from both systems, which would mean that either or both could be used and this would enhance the data made available.

#### **OUTPUT 3 ASSUMPTIONS:**

Assumption 9: Responsible bodies continue to see the value in taking part in a coordinating taskforce, are incentivised to do so and have the capacity to do so

Comments: Assumption holds, as evidenced by ongoing engagement with GVTC and the GVL Strategy by the responsible bodies

Assumption 10: Government authorities identify and nominate appropriate delegates to the Regional Task Force in line with the guidance set out in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Comments: Assumption will be tested in year 2.

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

As defined in the proposal, the expected impact of the project is **‘By 2035, the Greater Virunga Landscape (GVL) has stable iconic wildlife populations and improved well-being for communities living alongside wildlife’**

Given the short project duration this far (8 months) it is too early to report evidence of contribution to these impacts. Results in relation to the baselines set in year 1 of the project related to IWT and human development and wellbeing will be assessed at the project’s conclusion (though progress will be tracked at the end of year 2).

**Impacts on illegal wildlife trade:** Multi-agency coordination is critical to deliver reduced IWT, however this is only effective if reliable and meaningful data are collected and analysed consistently; and authorities come together systematically to undertake agreed actions. This project will enable the use of meaningful data to inform decisions around tackling IWT across the GVL, supporting improved cross-border collaboration and capacity to tackle IWT which will reduce incidences of IWT.

**Impacts on poverty reduction:** Generating more accurate data will allow authorities to identify hotspots of poaching, therefore the project will allow for more effective targeting of sustainable livelihoods activities (not provided through this project but nonetheless a pillar of the Zero Poaching Strategy), mitigating against the potential negative impacts of reduced poaching on local community livelihoods.

Additionally, as IWT is known to finance and contribute to conflict actors and criminal groups and insecurity, restricting the flows of such income in the GVL will support improved security in the area with benefits for local communities.

Over time, reduced IWT in the GVL will lead to the impact of stable populations of iconic species and improved well-being for local communities, with particular scope for increased tourism and economic development if the iconic species are protected.

Year 1 has laid the foundations for progress towards the impact by first reinforcing engagement with and between the key stakeholders needed to deliver cross-border collaboration and coordination to tackle IWT. The facilitation of self-assessments covering capacity, coordination and collaboration, as well as METT assessments, have enabled stakeholders to identify where they currently stand, and to identify future actions to improve against the current status. This will inform collaborative actions across the GVL to enhance actions to address IWT.

Work has also commenced to outline the needs for the IWT data sharing platform which will be developed through a consultancy in year 2 (informed by a needs assessment carried out alongside this project). This will provide necessary data to support collaborative action. While equipment provided to ranger workforces will improve their working conditions and support them to carry out their duties more effectively to tackle IWT.

## **4. Thematic focus**

The project aligns with two of the IWT Challenge Fund’s themes. These are: (2) Ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents; and (3) Strengthening law enforcement.

The project will support the delivery of the Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration Treaty, a priority for all three governments, to develop strategies for transboundary management of biodiversity; promote coordination of transboundary conservation; and harmonise the generation and sharing of knowledge, experience and best practices for evidence-based decision-making to tackle IWT and wildlife crime.

This will also support implementation of relevant legal provisions to tackle IWT within national policies. Examples include Rwanda’s Biodiversity and Wildlife Policies; Uganda’s contribution



under the Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations directed at Illegal trade in Wild Fauna and Flora; and DRC's Nature Conservation Law.

By setting up a transboundary Taskforce, with members from GVTC, Protected Area Authorities, immigration, prosecutors, local communities etc, supported by technical advisors, that will report to GVTC's regional Law Enforcement Technical Working Group, the project will contribute to both ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents and strengthening law enforcement, by establishing the Taskforce as a cross-agency mechanism to prevent and respond to wildlife crime and IWT.

The project will also contribute to strengthening law enforcement by investing in capacity building and provision of equipment and tools to counteract IWT.

While it is too early in the project for notable achievements to have been made, the project has made good progress with consolidating and strengthening relationships with the key stakeholders needed to improve cross-agency information sharing, coordination and collaboration to enhance transboundary efforts to address IWT in the coming years of the project.

## **5. Impact on species in focus**

The project is aiming for zero poaching of at least 2 iconic species (mountain gorillas and elephants) across the landscape over a 12-month period by the end of Year 3. It is too early to assess any level of impact on the species in the region and this cannot therefore be reported on yet.

## **6. Project support for multidimensional poverty reduction**

Due to the short duration of the project, impacts have not yet been achieved. From a community perspective, as described in the initial proposal, the benefits will be predominantly through two aspects. Firstly, the direct benefits of capacity building initiatives for those that work within the relevant government authorities. We are still planning to have at least 25 rangers with improved capacity to apply the SMART to gather data and monitor wildlife and threats, and a further 1,000 rangers to subsequently benefit from improved capacity in this approach following training from these trainers. Moreover, a further 25 key stakeholders in the GVL member states, from Protected Area Authorities and GVTC, will benefit from improved capacity to analyse and use the data collected through SMART to inform appropriate management and resourcing decisions, as well as the ability to use the regional dashboard created by the project to improve information sharing and collaboration across the GVL.

Secondly, local communities will benefit from improved and inclusive governance and decision making on IWT in the GVL. Community groups representing local communities and active in dealing with issues related to poaching, human-wildlife conflict and IWT, will be consulted by the Regional IWT Taskforce to ensure community perspectives inform decisions and planning, while voices of local communities will be further promoted through their participation in other relevant stakeholders GVTC platforms.

In the longer term, by generating more accurate data that will allow authorities to identify hotspots of poaching, the project will allow for more effective targeting of sustainable livelihoods activities (not provided through this project but nonetheless a pillar of the Zero Poaching Strategy), mitigating against the potential negative impacts of reduced poaching on local community livelihoods. Moreover, there are broader benefits foreseen. These will be primarily indirect, through improved governance of natural resources, which should lead to decreased levels of poaching and improved biodiversity, directly benefiting local communities who derive a livelihood from the GVL's ecosystem services - for example revenue sharing from tourism should increase as poaching decreases. Furthermore, as IWT is known to finance and contribute to conflict actors and criminal groups and insecurity, restricting the flows of such income in the GVL will support improved security in the area with benefits for local communities. This approach builds and aligns with similar transboundary initiatives under the Lusaka Taskforce Agreement and could be scaled

up through the East Africa Commission to other regional priority transboundary conservation initiatives, further improving the well-being of local communities.

## 7. Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)

GESI Scale	Description	Put X where you think your project is on the scale
<b>Not yet sensitive</b>	The GESI context may have been considered but the project isn't quite meeting the requirements of a 'sensitive' approach	
<b>Sensitive</b>	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.	X
<b>Empowering</b>	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	
<b>Transformative</b>	The project has all the characteristics of an 'empowering' approach whilst also addressing unequal power relationships and seeking institutional and societal change	

We have assessed the project as GESI sensitive. This project focuses on governance and capacity development mainly of government stakeholders, in a global context where women's representation is around only 3%-11% of PAA staff. While specific data is not known for the whole of GVL, women are underrepresented amongst project stakeholders. For example, of the 370 staff of Queen Elizabeth Protected area in Uganda in 2023, 83 were female (22%) and 287 male (78%). While in Volcanoes National Park in Rwanda, 16 were female (7.5%) and 196 male (92.5%). Changing the gender balance of that workforce is outside the scope of this project (given the budget and timeline), but the project will challenge the status quo, through influencing and advocating for better representation of women in decision-making around IWT across the landscape, for example through representation on GVTC stakeholder groups.

Participant data collection will be disaggregated by gender, enabling identification of specific issues relating to women to allow for adaptation where necessary to ensure that women's interests are heard and acted upon. Design and implementation of activities has considered the GESI context, as identified through a recent gender audit of conservation in the GVL as follows:

**Rights: Legal and Customary:** While international policies on biodiversity conservation often overlook gender issues, national policies in Uganda and Rwanda acknowledge the importance of gender equality. However, there is a gap in implementation, with many policies failing to provide specific strategies for gender mainstreaming. Customary practices and legal frameworks need to be aligned to ensure equitable treatment and participation of all genders in conservation and IWT efforts.

**Practice: Attitudes, Customs & Beliefs:** There is a need to transform societal attitudes, customs, and beliefs that perpetuate gender inequality. While there are efforts to include women in conservation activities, deep-seated cultural norms and stereotypes still hinder progress. Positive changes are observed where women are taking up roles traditionally held by men, but

more awareness and education are needed to challenge and change discriminatory practices. The project will support this by highlighting positive examples with stakeholders (particularly PAAs) where women's leadership is leading to positive conservation/IWT and social outcomes. Creating inclusive platforms and promoting women to higher positions can inspire more women to join conservation efforts and ensure their voices are heard.

**Environment: Stressors & Vulnerability:** Environmental stressors and vulnerabilities disproportionately affect women and marginalized groups. The audit identifies that women often face greater challenges due to their roles and responsibilities, such as fetching water and collecting firewood. Zero poaching and IWT efforts must consider these vulnerabilities and develop strategies to support and empower these groups, ensuring they have the resources to cope with environmental changes. While the project will not work directly on the ground, it will promote better understanding of different challenges faced by women, older people and marginalised groups by advocating for better representation of women and marginalised groups in decision-making around IWT across the landscape, for example through representation on GVTC stakeholder groups.

**Roles and Responsibilities: Division of Time, Space & Labour:** The division of labour, time, and space within communities is heavily influenced by gender roles. When it comes to staffing of Protected Area Authorities, women are often assigned lighter duties and are given special considerations during pregnancy and nursing. However, there is still a significant gender imbalance in staffing, with men occupying most of the top positions. While changing the gender balance of the workforce is outside the scope of this project, partners will continue to advocate with government authorities around the benefits to more equitable sharing of responsibilities and opportunities within the ranger workforce.

**Representation: Participation, Inclusion & Power:** Representation and participation of marginalized groups in decision-making processes are crucial for gender and social inclusion. While there are policies encouraging the recruitment of women, actual participation in leadership and decision-making remains low. Emphasis will also be placed on female participation in decision-making and capacity development activities, including training opportunities and park level Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) assessments, measuring proportionate representation for capacity-building opportunities provided in the project. The project will support their participation and will monitor performance against gender responsive measures. All meeting/training venues and timings will be arranged with participants to maximise participation.

**Resources: Access & Control of Assets and Services:** Women and marginalized groups often have limited access to essential resources, which affects their ability to participate in and benefit from conservation and IWT activities. Ensuring equitable access and control of assets and services is essential for promoting overall well-being and empowerment. In terms of protected area management, there is no specific budget for gender mainstreaming activities in conservation plans. Project partners will continue to advocate with government authorities to promote GESI in protected area management effectiveness actions.

## **8. Monitoring and evaluation**

All project partners participated in the development of the M&E framework during project design, and during the project inception meeting, the logframe, M&E plan, activity trackers and result trackers were reviewed and updated where needed. Assumptions and risks were also discussed and updated where necessary.

A MEL Working Group has been set up with representatives from all the partners. This group meets on a quarterly basis to review project progress and indicators, update results and adapt as needed and plan accordingly. Individual partners are responsible for monitoring relevant activities and outputs, while WWF Uganda coordinates the collation of data for the outcome indicators from various sources.

At outcome level a number of tools will be used to assess progress against the baselines gathered - namely the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework to measure capacity, coordination

and collaboration (indicator 0.1); the Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) to measure effectiveness of Protected Areas (indicator 0.2). While data relating to poaching (indicator 0.3), IWT incidents (indicator 0.4) and seizures of IWT products (indicator 0.5) will be collected through SMART Connect from protected area authorities and GVTC conservation status reports.

Training staff from government bodies to use and analyse data from 1. the Regional IWT dashboard, 2. from ranger-based monitoring (SMART) data and 3. from the online Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (TWIX) tools and data to monitor IWT incidents in GVL will support decisions and adaptive management around IWT interventions. Changes in knowledge and capacity of staff will be assessed using pre- and post-training assessment tools.

Information and data will be shared with partners through a number of ways including workshops and meetings (such as in the case of Annual Conservation Status Report meeting held in December 2024 which was cofinanced by project partners - Annex 11) and via designated offices and databases of responsible bodies in each partner state namely UWA, RDB and ICCN. GVTC also organizes regional technical committee meetings, another forum for data and information sharing.

## **9. Lessons learnt**

During this reporting period, lessons have been learned which provide a strong basis for adaptive management, and effective project execution.

The first is the importance of working in partnership with a regional entity such as Greater Virunga Transboundary Collaboration (GVTC) for a transboundary project such as this project. The presence of GVTC as the regional partner, has enabled the project to meaningfully engage each partner state's wildlife agency during the process of baseline data collection. This partnership has also demonstrated that a regional entity can enhance confidence among duty bearers, which can be a catalyst for open communication and information sharing.

The second lesson is associated with the complexity of partnerships to deliver a regional project that has diverse dimensions, such as this project. This project needed multidimensional capacities and experience, thus bringing together a large consortium. This also meant that there were extended periods of contract discussions and negotiations between consortium members which required adjustment of year 1 workplan. It's this complexity that requires adaptive management, early planning and solution oriented open communication between the project executor and the donor, a practice that will continue during the next year.

Thirdly, partners maintained the practice of having regular team meetings which helped to keep the project workplan on track, resolve challenges, and ensure accountability between the project lead (WWF UK) and in-country partners. For example, this made it possible to have partners discuss approaches to resolve and or mitigate some of the challenges experienced during the year such as the conflict situation in Eastern DRC.

## **10. Actions taken in response to previous reviews (if applicable)**

NOT APPLICABLE

## **11. Risk Management**

Yes, new risks have arisen in the first 8 months of the project, an updated risk register has been included in Annex 10.

## **12. Scalability and durability**

The GVL 10-year Transboundary Strategic Plan was agreed in 2024. Its development was led by GVTC with the support of project partners (WWF, WCS, IGCP) and other partners (e.g. International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), CARE, and relevant governmental agencies). As the interstate institution responsible for strategic transboundary collaborative management of GVL, both GVTC and the Strategic Plan are supported by the national institutions in charge of wildlife conservation (ICCN in DRC, RDB in Rwanda, and UWA in Uganda). The aims of this project fully align with needs identified in the strategic plan through the full engagement of these authorities. The ongoing implementation of the Strategic Plan will support further integration of the ZP framework for the landscape and sustainability of the project outputs and outcome.

While it is too early to demonstrate with evidence, securing sustainability has been built into project design as a fundamental approach:

**Output 1: By end year 3, an integrated and robust monitoring and learning system is in place for monitoring IWT activities within the Greater Virunga Landscape**

Data and information sharing protocols and tools developed will remain vital reference points post project. GVTC is responsible for ensuring continued adherence to protocols, and management/maintenance of the dashboard and database, which will be embedded in GVTC's Centre of Excellence, facilitating access to data and evidence to relevant key stakeholders. Training will ensure the organisation has capacity for long-term management.

**Output 2: By end of year 2, 4 responsible government bodies within the GVL have respective workforces that are appropriately equipped and trained with standardised equipment, tools and practices**

GVTC, PAAs and other law enforcement agencies will have developed the skills needed to ensure better practice law enforcement after the project ends. They will be supported by trained trainers, within their own organisations, who will be champions on best practice going forward.

**Output 3: By end of year 3, a Regional Task Force to improve transboundary coordination on IWT is established and functioning effectively in line with the International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks**

The project is already scaling up the Taskforce approach to the regional level, building on lessons from Uganda's and Rwanda's national taskforces. Through the projects' efforts, this will form a consolidation of the tried and tested approaches to tackle IWT in GVL.

The Transboundary Taskforce will continue to meet and deliver post-funding, as it will be formally embedded in the established and operational GVTC governance structure between the three nations. Where funding for in-person meetings is not available, online meetings will take place for continued momentum.

### **13. IWT Challenge Fund identity**

The IWT Challenge Fund logo was publicised during the Inception workshop and project launch as well as during other project meetings including the baseline meetings conducted in Fortportal, Uganda and Musanze, Rwanda.



The logo was featured on the presentations and information about the project has been shared on the WWF Uganda website, through the GVTC website, and WWF Uganda's LinkedIn feed - recognising the support received from the IWT Challenge Fund. For example:

[https://www.wwfuganda.org/our\\_news/stories/?51407/WWF-and-Partners-Launch-Greater-Virunga-Landscape-Initiative-to-Combat-Illegal-Wildlife-Trade](https://www.wwfuganda.org/our_news/stories/?51407/WWF-and-Partners-Launch-Greater-Virunga-Landscape-Initiative-to-Combat-Illegal-Wildlife-Trade)

<https://greatervirunga.org/the-uk-government-is-committed-to-tackling-the-illegal-wildlife-trade-in-the-greater-virunga-landscape-through-its-biodiversity-challenge-fund/>

<https://www.linkedin.com/feed/update/urn:li:activity:7287452331028148224>

## 14. Safeguarding

## 15. 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 (£) DRAFT*	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)				
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>£96,350.00</b>	<b>£96,350.00</b>		

*\*Please note, expenditures are currently indicative figures. We are still in the process of finalising expenditures with project partners. Variances of > 10% are now anticipated on three budget headings (Overhead Costs, Travel & Subsistence and Other costs) and explained above. To date these have not been discussed with IWT Challenge Fund. We will review budget line allocations of costs with partners in case of miscoding.*

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

	Secured to date	Expected by end of project	Sources
Matched funding leveraged by the partners to deliver the project (£)	For Year 1 (2024-2025): £ (estimated)		WWF Uganda and WWF UK
Total additional finance mobilised for new activities occurring outside of the project, building on evidence, best practices and the project (£)			

## 16. Other comments on progress not covered elsewhere

N/A - challenges already discussed elsewhere

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

N/A



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

Project summary	Progress and Achievements April 2023 - March 2024	Actions required/planned for next period
<b>Impact</b> By 2035, the Greater Virunga Landscape (GVL) has stable iconic wildlife populations and improved well-being for communities living alongside wildlife		
<b>Outcome By end of year 3, government bodies responsible for tackling Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) in Greater Virunga Landscape have enhanced capacity, capability and coordination, leading to a reduction in IWT</b>		
Outcome indicator 0.1 By end of year 3, 4 government bodies (GVTC, ICCN, RDB, UWA) responsible for tackling IWT in GVL have improved their measures for institutional capacity and strengthened coordination and cooperation by at least 15% when measured against the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework, in comparison to the baseline	Baseline data collection, using the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework (WCPF) has been completed. Baselines have been updated in the Project MEL Plan and are included in Annex 5. See Section 3.1 and Annex 5	Endline will be conducted in Year 3
Outcome indicator 0.2 By end of year 3, management effectiveness scores of at least 5 protected areas (PAs) under 3 different authorities in GVL increase by an average of 5%	Baseline METT Assessments have been conducted for all 7 target protected areas across the GVL. Baselines have been updated in the Project MEL Plan and are included in Annex 5. See Section 3.1 and Annex 5	Endline will be conducted in Year 3
Outcome indicator 0.3 By end of year 3, zero poaching of at least 2 iconic species (mountain gorillas and elephants) across the landscape over a 12-month period	Poaching data from target protected areas has been collated. See Section 3.1	Launch MEAL dashboard to facilitate IWT data collection and sharing
Outcome indicator 0.4 By end of year 3, IWT incidences are reduced by 15% across at least 5 protected areas in the GVL.	Data on IWT incidents from target protected areas has been collated. See Section 3.1	Launch MEAL dashboard to facilitate IWT data collection and sharing
Outcome indicator 0.5 By end of year 3, seizures of IWT products reduced by 15%	Data on IWT seizures from target protected areas has been collated. See Section 3.1	Launch MEAL dashboard to facilitate IWT data collection and sharing

<b>Output 1 By end year 3, an integrated and robust monitoring and learning system is in place for monitoring IWT activities within the Greater Virunga Landscape</b>		
<p>Output Indicator 1.1</p> <p>By end of year 3, 25 key stakeholders in GVL government bodies report understanding and ability to use Regional IWT dashboard</p>	Starts in year 2	Conduct training for protected area authorities and other key stakeholders to use the integrated MEAL dashboard in each GVL partner state
<p>Output Indicator 1.2</p> <p>By end of year 3, Regional IWT dashboard is operational for monitoring IWT activities and sharing across the GVL</p>	Starts in year 2	Develop and launch MEAL plan and dashboard to support streamlined/integration of IWT data collection and reporting at regional level
<p>Output Indicator 1.3</p> <p>By end of year 3, a Regional IWT data sharing framework used by at least 4 government bodies is in place in GVL</p>	<p>“Needs assessment on Data and Information Collection, Storage and Sharing in the GVL” completed (not funded by this project). Recommendations from this report have informed the ToRs for the development of the data sharing Framework which will then take place in year 2.</p> <p>See Section 3.1 and Annex 7</p>	<p>Agree data collection and sharing protocols</p> <p>Develop and support the roll-out of regional information sharing protocols and databases to enhance decision making and collaboration</p>
<p>Output Indicator 1.4</p> <p>By end of year 3, the Regional IWT data sharing framework enables integration and reporting of IWT metrics in the GVTC Annual Conservation Status Report to inform resourcing decisions.</p>	<p>Annual Conservation Status Report meeting held in December 2024 to share information among PAAs and inform development of ACSR (to be developed in May).</p> <p>See Section 3.1 and Annex 11</p>	Develop, produce and distribute GVL Annual Conservation Status Report (ACSR)
<b>Output 2. By end of year 2, 4 responsible government bodies within the GVL have respective workforces that are appropriately equipped and trained with standardised equipment, tools and practices</b>		
<p>Output Indicator 2.1</p> <p>By end of year 2, at least 4 government bodies have increased capacity to consistently use Ranger Based Monitoring (SMART) to monitor IWT incidents in GVL, with 25 targeted PAA &amp; GVTC staff reporting improved ability to interpret and use SMART reports</p>	Starts in year 2	Rollout training on use and analysis of SMART data
Output Indicator 2.2	Starts in year 2	Rollout training on use and analysis of SMART data

By end of year 2, at least 15 trainers trained reporting to have delivered further training by the end of the project		
Output Indicator 2.3 By end of year 2, 1 best practice guide produced and endorsed by all 3 governments for the sharing of and use of IWT relevant data	Starts in year 2	Produce best practice guidelines on key trainings and subject matter
Output Indicator 2.4 By end of year 2, at least 25 staff members of 4 government bodies responsible for GVL benefit from training on Ranger Based Monitoring Data Analysis	Planned for year 2	Rollout training on use and analysis of SMART data
Output Indicator 2.5 By end Year 3, at least 1,000 rangers receive training on IWT from trainers trained through the project	Starts in year 2	Support trainers to conduct site level trainings for rangers in pilot PAs to reach 1,000 rangers (Bwindi, Queen Elizabeth NP and Volcanoes)
Output Indicator 2.6 By end of year 2, estimated value of £24,846 of physical assets (smartphones, rain jackets, tents, laptop for database management) handed over to 3 countries and 1 multinational organisation	Smart phones and their case covers, powerbanks, handheld GPS units, camping tents, sleeping bags and waterproof bags have been procured and are ready for distribution.	Complete.
<b>Output 3. By end of year 3, a Regional Task Force to improve transboundary coordination on IWT is established and functioning effectively in line with the International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks</b>		
Output Indicator 3.1 By end of year 3, 100% of Regional Task Force meetings are attended by at least 4 pre-determined relevant bodies and 3 local community representatives from each country.	Starts in year 2	Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and action planning of the regional task force
Output Indicator 3.2 By end of year 3, at least four Regional Task Force meetings have been held	Starts in year 2	Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and action planning of the regional task force
Output Indicator 3.3 By end of year 2, at least 75% of designated officials attend each meeting, and 75% of attendees are the same individual that attended the previous meeting	Starts in year 2	Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and action planning of the regional task force
Output Indicator 3.4	Starts in year 2	Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and

Proportion of actions from previous meeting's minutes that have been implemented		action planning of the regional task force
<p>Output Indicator 3.5</p> <p>By end of year 3, at least 3 policies and/or frameworks developed or formally contributed to by the project are being implemented by appropriate authorities regarding data and IWT coordination</p>	Starts in year 2	Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and action planning of the regional task force
<p>Output Indicator 3.6</p> <p>By end of year 3, at least 25 staff members of Law Enforcement Agencies report improved ability to use the online Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (TWIX) tools and data to monitor IWT incidents in GVL</p>	Starts in year 2	Rollout of Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (TWIX) to Task Force members, supported by TRAFFIC

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

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<b>Impact:</b> By 2035, the Greater Virunga Landscape (GVL) has stable iconic wildlife populations and improved well being for communities living alongside wildlife			
<b>Outcome:</b> By end of year 3, government bodies responsible for tackling Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) in Greater Virunga Landscape have enhanced capacity, capability and coordination, leading to a reduction in IWT	<p>0.1 By end of year 3, 4 government bodies (GVTC, ICCN, RDB, UWA) responsible for tackling IWT in GVL have improved their measures for institutional capacity and strengthened coordination and cooperation by at least 15% when measured against the Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework, in comparison to the baseline  <i>(Baseline: 2021- QENP capacity 77%, cooperation 80%; BINP capacity 97%, cooperation 80%; VINP capacity 37%, cooperation 33%; VNP capacity 43% cooperation 60%; remaining baselines to be established at start of project; Target: average increase by 5%)</i></p> <p>0.2 By end of year 3, management effectiveness scores of at least 5 protected areas (PAs) under 3 different authorities in GVL increase by an average of 5%  <i>(Current baselines per PA; 2018: Rwenzori 70%; Bwindi: 65%; Queen Elizabeth: 53%; Unknown baselines will be collected at start of project; Target: average increase by 5%)</i></p>	<p>0.1 Wildlife Crime Prevention Framework assessment. Disaggregated by PA/organisation and country.</p> <p>Annual meetings will also be held to review and report on changes in capacity, cooperation and coordination (qualitative feedback).</p> <p>0.2 METT (Management Effective Tracking Tool) Capacity Assessment Report compared to baseline. Data will be disaggregated per authority and location.</p>	<p>Geo-political situation remains stable for project duration and beyond</p> <p>There are no external shocks (e.g. economic, climate-related) which lead to a significant increase in IWT activities</p> <p>The Governments of all 3 countries remain committed to the GVL Zero Poaching Strategy</p>

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	<p>0.3 By end of year 3, zero poaching of at least 2 iconic species (mountain gorillas and elephants) across the landscape over a 12-month period (<i>Baseline Mountain Gorillas: to be determined at start of project, Target Mountain Gorillas: 0.</i> <i>Baseline Elephants: to be determined at start of project, Target Elephants: 0; known examples per protected area are 2021: Virunga NP, 11 Elephants poached, Queen Elizabeth NP, 2 elephants poached</i>) (NB. Due to the high cost of species monitoring data collection across the project area , poaching data is taken as a proxy to species population data).</p> <p>0.4. By end of year 3, IWT incidences are reduced by 15% across at least 5 protected areas in the GVL. (<i>Baseline: TBD at start of project; Target: 15% reduction</i>)</p> <p>0.5. By end of year 3, seizures of IWT products reduced by 15% (<i>Baseline: Seizures in Uganda 2018-2023 = 332; Seizures in DRC 2018 – 2023 = 155; Seizures in Rwanda 2018-2023 = 0; Seizures of products originating in these countries but seized elsewhere to</i></p>	<p>0.3 Poaching data collected through SMART Connect from protected area authorities, disaggregated by site and type; GVTC conservation status reports; Monitoring of the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) databases</p> <p>0.4 Poaching data collected through SMART Connect from protected area authorities, disaggregated by site and type and GVTC Conservation status reports and MIKE databases</p> <p>0.5. WWF/TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Information System (WITIS) database</p>	

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	<i>be confirmed at start of project; Target - 30% reduction).</i>		
<b>Output 1</b> By end of year 3, an integrated and robust monitoring and learning system is in place for monitoring IWT activities within the Greater Virunga Landscape	<p>1.1 By end of year 3, 25 key stakeholders in GVL government bodies report understanding and ability to use Regional IWT dashboard (Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 25)</p> <p>1.2 By end of year 3, Regional IWT dashboard is operational for monitoring IWT activities and sharing across the GVL (Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 1)</p> <p>1.3 By end of year 3, a Regional IWT data sharing framework used by at least 4 government bodies is in place in GVL (Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 1)</p> <p>1.4 By end of year 3, the Regional IWT data sharing framework enables integration and reporting of IWT metrics in the GVTC Annual Conservation Status Report to inform resourcing decisions. (Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 1)</p>	<p>1.1 Pre and post training surveys. Disaggregated by gender, country and organisation of participant.</p> <p>1.2 Dashboard with data updated on a regular, periodic basis.</p> <p>1.3 Established Regional IWT data sharing framework and protocols; training records</p> <p>1.4 GVTC Annual Conservation Status Report integrating IWT metrics</p>	<p>The geopolitical situation remains constant so that the three governments in the landscape remain committed to sharing information and to working together.</p> <p>Trained staff available are incentivised to use the improved data.</p>
<b>Output 2.</b> By end of year 2, 4 responsible government bodies within the GVL have respective workforces that are appropriately equipped and trained	2.1 By end of year 2, at least 4 government bodies have increased capacity to consistently use Ranger Based Monitoring (SMART) to monitor IWT incidents in GVL, with	2.1 Pre and post training surveys. Disaggregated by gender, country and PA/organisation of participant.	Responsible bodies have the capacity and capability to take part in training and to use assets provided by the project

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
with standardised equipment, tools and practices	<p>25 targeted PAA &amp; GVTC staff reporting improved ability to interpret and use SMART reports (<i>Baseline: to be collected at start of project; Target: 25 targeted stakeholders are using SMART data to inform management decisions/actions</i>)</p> <p>2.2 By end of year 2, at least 15 trainers trained reporting to have delivered further training by the end of the project (Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 15)</p> <p>2.3 By end of year 2, 1 best practice guide produced and endorsed by all 3 governments for the sharing of and use of IWT relevant data (<i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 1</i>)</p> <p>2.4 By end of year 2, at least 25 staff members of 4 government bodies responsible for GVL benefit from training on Ranger Based Monitoring Data Analysis (<i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 24</i>)</p> <p>2.5 By end Year 3, at least 1,000 rangers receive training on IWT from trainers trained through the project (<i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 1,000 rangers receive training</i>)</p>	<p>2.2 Training programmes and end of training surveys and follow on surveys disaggregated by gender; country; site</p> <p>2.3 GVTC website, documentation of government endorsement</p> <p>2.4 End of training surveys and project data, disaggregated by gender, country and relevant protected area of participant.</p> <p>2.4 End of training surveys and project data, disaggregated by gender, country and relevant protected area of participant.</p>	Use of standardised equipment, tools and practices facilitate better coordination across the Greater Virunga Landscape



Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	2.6 By end of year 2, estimated value of £24,846 of physical assets (smartphones, rain jackets, tents, laptop for database management) handed over to 3 countries and 1 multinational organisation ( <i>Baseline 2023: £0; Target: £24,846</i> )	2.5 Project accounts; handover documentation	
<b>Output 3.</b> By end of year 3, a Regional Task Force to improve transboundary coordination on IWT is established and functioning effectively in line with the <a href="#">International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks</a>	3.1 By end of year 3, 100% of Regional Task Force meetings are attended by at least 4 pre-determined relevant bodies and 3 local community representatives ( <i>Baseline 2023: 0. Targets: year 1: 50%; year 2 75% year 3 100%.</i> )  3.2 By end of year 3, at least four Regional Task Force meetings have been held ( <i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 4</i> )  3.3 By end of year 2, at least 75% of meetings are attended by i) the official designate of their organisation; <i>and</i> (ii) the same individual that attended the previous meeting; ( <i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 75%</i> )	3.1 Data to be collected from Task Force meeting minutes, interpreted as a count of the number of different organisations represented at that meeting and disaggregated by PA and country. To be defined against a list of all relevant bodies in the landscape to be drawn up by the GVTC at project inception.  3.2 Regional Taskforce minutes  3.3 By end of year 2, at least 75% of meetings are attended by i) the official designate of their organisation; <i>and</i> (ii) the same individual that attended the previous meeting;	Responsible bodies continue to see the value in taking part in a coordinating taskforce, are incentivised to do so and have the capacity to do so  Government authorities identify and nominate appropriate delegates to the Regional Task Force in line with the guidance set out in the The Memorandum of Understanding.

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
	<p>3.4 Proportion of actions from previous meeting's minutes that have been implemented (<i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target:75%</i>)</p> <p>3.5 By end of year 3, at least 3 policies and/or frameworks developed or formally contributed to by the project are being implemented by appropriate authorities regarding data and IWT coordination (<i>Baseline 2023: 0; Target: 3</i>)</p> <p>3.6 By end of year 3, at least 25 staff members of Law Enforcement Agencies report improved ability to use the online Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (<u>TWIX</u>) tools and data to monitor IWT incidents in GVL (<i>Baseline: to be established at outset of training Target: x many staff members</i>)</p>	<p>3.4 Regional Taskforce minutes</p> <p>3.5 To be interpreted as policies/frameworks generated as an action of the Regional Taskforce and being implemented by the relevant bodies (as per minutes) - e.g ZP framework, information sharing protocols, amendments to GVTC governance structures</p> <p>3.6 TWIX capacity needs assessment; pre and post training surveys. Disaggregated by gender, country and relevant protected area/organisation of participant.</p>	
<p><b>Activities</b> (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>0.0 Inception workshop/meeting</p> <p>0.1 Baseline data consolidation on - METT for at least 5 PAs; levels of capacity, collaboration and coordination of GVTC, RDB, UWA, ICCN; and on IWT incidences, with specific focus on domestic use of wildlife and timber products of concern in the GVL.</p> <p>0.2 Conduct endline assessments on - METT for at least 5 PAs; levels of capacity, collaboration and coordination of GVTC, RDB, UWA, ICCN; and IWT incidences</p> <p><b>By end year 3, an integrated and robust monitoring and learning system incorporating an interactive dashboard is in place for monitoring IWT activities within the Greater Virunga Landscape</b></p> <p>1.1 Develop MEAL plan and dashboard to support streamlined/integration of IWT data collection and reporting at regional level through GVTC Centre of Excellence</p> <p>1.2 Dashboard validation workshop and launch of dashboard</p>			

Project summary	SMART Indicators	Means of verification	Important Assumptions
<p>1.3 Conduct training for protected area authorities and other key stakeholders to use the integrated MEAL dashboard in each GVL partner state</p> <p>1.4 Develop, produce and distribute GVL Annual Conservation Status Report (ACSR) each year</p> <p><b>By end year 2, 4 responsible bodies within the GVL have respective workforces that are appropriately equipped and trained with standardised equipment, tools and practices</b></p> <p>2.1 Rollout of training on SMART:</p> <p>2.1.1 Conduct needs assessment</p> <p>2.1.2 Conduct training of trainers on ranger based monitoring analysis (SMART) - use and analysis of SMART data</p> <p>2.1.3 Support trainers to conduct site level trainings for rangers in pilot PAs to reach 1,000 rangers (Bwindi, Queen Elizabeth NP and Volcanoes)</p> <p>2.1.4 Conduct pre and post training surveys (for Training of Trainers and site level ranger training)</p> <p>2.2 Produce best practice guidelines on key trainings and subject matter</p> <p>2.3 Procure and distribute essential tools and equipment to enhance workforce performance in the GVL (smartphones, tents, rain jackets)</p> <p><b>By end Year 3, a Regional Task Force to improve transboundary coordination on IWT is established and functioning effectively in line with the <a href="#">International Consortium on Combatting Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Guidelines for Wildlife Enforcement Networks</a></b></p> <p>3.1 Conduct meetings with relevant organisations in each partner state to identify individuals/ officers to formally constitute a regional IWT task force;</p> <p>3.2 Establish IWT Task Force, support bi-annual meetings and action planning of the regional task force</p> <p>3.3 Develop and support the roll-out of regional information sharing protocols and databases to enhance decision making and collaboration, 3.4 Rollout of Trade in Wildlife Information eXchange (TWIX) to Task Force members, supported by TRAFFIC</p> <p>3.5 Conduct meetings to promote and popularise relevant CITES, CBD and CMS decisions at regional level so they are incorporated into planning</p> <p>3.6 Support Task Force members to conduct self assessments against Zero Poaching Framework</p>			

## 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 <b>correct template</b> (checking fund, type of report (i.e. Annual or Final), and year) and <b>deleted the blue guidance text</b> before submission?	x
<b>Is the report less than 10MB?</b> If so, please email to <a href="mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com">BCF-Reports@niras.com</a> putting the project number in the subject line.	x
<b>Is your report more than 10MB?</b> If so, please discuss with <a href="mailto:BCF-Reports@niras.com">BCF-Reports@niras.com</a> about the best way to deliver the report, putting the project number in the subject line.	
<b>Have you included means of verification?</b> You should not submit every project document, but the main outputs and a selection of the others would strengthen the report.	x
If you are submitting photos for publicity purposes, do these meet the outlined requirements (see section 17)?	
Have you involved your partners in preparation of the report and named the main contributors	x
Have you completed the Project Expenditure table fully?	x
Do not include claim forms or other communications with this report.	