

Mapping Donors:

Key areas for tackling illegal
wildlife trade (Asia and Africa)



Rosaleen Duffy, Jasper
Humphreys

June 2014

This report has been produced for Evidence on Demand with the assistance of the UK Department for International Development (DFID) contracted through the Climate, Environment, Infrastructure and Livelihoods Professional Evidence and Applied Knowledge Services (CEIL PEAKS) programme, jointly managed by HTSPE Limited and IMC Worldwide Limited.

The views expressed in the report are entirely those of the author and do not necessarily represent DFID's own views or policies, or those of Evidence on Demand. Comments and discussion on items related to content and opinion should be addressed to the author, via enquiries@evidenceondemand.org

Your feedback helps us ensure the quality and usefulness of all knowledge products. Please email enquiries@evidenceondemand.org and let us know whether or not you have found this material useful; in what ways it has helped build your knowledge base and informed your work; or how it could be improved.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.12774/eod_hd.june2014.duffy_et_al

First published (month and year)
© CROWN COPYRIGHT



Contents

Report Summary	ii
SECTION 1	1
Methodology.....	1
SECTION 2	3
Main Issues in Funding	3
SECTION 3	5
Major Donors and Implementing Agencies.....	5
SECTION 4	6
Gaps and Areas of Weakness.....	6
SECTION 5	9
At a Glance	9
SECTION 6	14
Selected References.....	14
Appendix 1 Donors and implementing agencies	21

List of Appendices

Appendix 1 Donors and implementing agencies.....	21
--	----

List of Tables

Table 1 At a Glance: Active donors and organisations in illegal wildlife trade projects.....	10
--	----



Report Summary

The wildlife trade is rapidly becoming a major international priority for governments, NGOs and private philanthropists (for example see White House, 2014). This is evidenced in the recent increase in funding made available for wildlife trade related projects. Recent examples include: USAID has committed US\$40 million, Howard G. Buffett Foundation has committed US\$25 million to South Africa for rhino protection,¹ The Clinton Global Initiative has pledged to raise US\$80 million (US\$10 million from US Government already) and the UK Government has identified it as a major policy, with the announcement of a £10 million fund for tackling the trade. The authors mapped the donors and projects following a review of secondary and grey literature as well as relevant websites. However, such a search can only ever be considered as indicative rather than comprehensive: the range of organisations involved in conservation initiatives is complex and extensive. Further it is difficult to disaggregate projects that deal with specific species conservation (e.g. elephant or rhino) more generally, from those that specifically tackle the illegal wildlife trade – there is some inevitable overlap. The precise figures involved are also difficult to determine because of double counting, or confidentiality regarding donations. Finally, there are a number of on-going projects which cannot be listed; they are necessarily confidential because they are aimed at uncovering various aspects of an illegal trade. From our initial assessment it appears there are four main areas:

1. Two types of funding for demand reduction initiatives: projects and campaigns
2. Funding related to rural development/CBNRM approaches is not well recognised as an effective policy response
3. Funding related to intelligence gathering, surveillance, capacity building in crime scene management is increasing as a priority
4. Funding related to counter-insurgency/security is an increasing priority

Following on from this summary of current initiatives the authors were able to identify areas of weakness or gaps.

1. Need for greater understanding of the implications for community relations of a 'crime/enforcement' approach
2. Need for greater levels of intelligence sharing across states and within states
3. Rangers often coping with poor equipment and working conditions
4. The main approach to understanding the illegal wildlife trade is as a criminal activity rather than an issue of wider forms of (under)development
5. Little or no support for communities on how to resist intimidation
6. Need for capacity building in investigation skills/crime scene management
7. Need for governance related initiatives that address corruption, especially in state agencies.
8. Little understanding of the precise dynamics of demand markets/consumer motivation
9. Lack of attention to pre-emptive efforts in demand reduction and anti-poaching
10. Patterns of funding differ substantially between and within states
11. Little attention paid to transit states/networks

¹ <http://www.thehowardgbuffettfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/HGBF-SANParks-Kruger-Press-Release-FOR-RELEASE-14-March-2014.pdf> (accessed 23.06.14).



SECTION 1

Methodology

Evidence on Demand requested, on behalf of DFID, that Professor Rosaleen Duffy (SOAS) and Jasper Humphreys (KCL) use their combined knowledge and expertise to prepare a rapid review (5 days) of evidence to map the main donor and implementing partners in elephant and rhino conservation across African source and transit states and Asian transit and market states. The purpose of this review was to provide information to assist in designing a challenge fund to support the conservation of primarily rhino and elephant, amongst other species, through a reduction in poaching.


The core questions to be addressed were:

1. Which donors are active on elephant and rhino poaching in the main source, transit and market states in (Africa: source & transit) (Asia: transit and market)?
2. Which implementing partners are donors working with in source, market and transit countries?
3. What interventions are donors/ implementing partners undertaking in source, market and transit countries?
4. How long have the interventions been implemented for?
5. What / where are the funding gaps?

The purpose of the report was to provide an overview of patterns of funding and coverage, as well as to identify any important gaps.

This report is based on a rapid review of grey literature produced by national and international organisations including IUCN, CITES, WWF and TRAFFIC amongst others, web searches of major donors and NGOs, a review of relevant secondary literature and insights from key contacts in conservation sector. In particular, Professor Rosaleen Duffy is grateful for information and advice provided by Dr. Tanya Wyatt, University of Northumbria, Jo Shaw, WWF-South Africa, Raoul Du Toit, (Lowveld Rhino Trust/WWF), (Cathy Dean (Save the Rhino International) and Richard Thomas (TRAFFIC-International).

A rapid review of this kind has inevitable limitations, produced by the shortness of time; such a rapid assessment can only provide an overview of the organisations involved, what kinds of projects are funded and what their time frame is. Much more time would be required to provide more detailed information about which actors are involved, the precise dates/lifespans of particular projects and the precise amounts of funding involved. As such this rapid review will inevitably miss smaller organisations and those that do not have a major web presence. It does not capture emerging or very new initiatives, such as the recent funding call from the US State Department via the Bureau of International Narcotics and Law Enforcement (INL) for the South Africa Transnational Organized Crime Investigations – Wildlife Crime initiative, for three awards of up to US\$750,000; and the commitment to the Elephant Protection Initiative by the Governments of Ethiopia, Botswana, Gabon, Chad and Tanzania (which also was missed by our searches because it does not as yet have any specific funding attached). Equally many organisations are involved in wider conservation activities that might have an effect on reducing poaching rates or reducing demand for rhino horn and ivory, but the projects are not described in those terms. The problems with mapping donor and NGO expenditure are discussed more fully in Brockington and



Scholfield, 2010; Holmes et al, 2012; Halpern et al, 2006; Ramutsindela, Spierenburg and Wels, 2011; Armsworth et al, 2012; and Smith et al, 2012. With more time the authors would have consulted more fully with those engaged in projects on the ground in source and end-use markets. Finally, given shortness of time and priorities for DFID we concentrated on low income countries, this means that projects in India, China and South Africa are relatively under-represented in comparison with other countries/regions.

In order to avoid duplication of effort, it may be useful to consult three other reports commissioned during 2013 by Evidence on Demand, which covered some key issues that are relevant to this report: Standley, S. and Emslie, R.H. (2013) *Population and Poaching of African Rhinos across African Range States 2007-2012*, Evidence on Demand Report (no. HD078)
Duffy, R., Emslie, R.H. and M. Knight (2013) *Rhino Poaching – How Do We Respond?* Evidence on Demand Report (no.HD087).

Duffy, R. and F.A.V. St. John (2013) *Poverty, Poaching and Trafficking: What are the links?* Consultancy Report for DFID, June 2013. Evidence on Demand Report (no. HD059).



SECTION 2

Main Issues in Funding

The wildlife trade is rapidly becoming a major international priority for governments, NGOs and private philanthropists (for example see White House, 2014). This is evidenced in the recent increase in funding made available for wildlife trade related projects. Recent examples include: USAID has committed US\$40 million, Howard G. Buffett Foundation has committed US\$25 million to South Africa for rhino protection,² The Clinton Global Initiative has pledged to raise US\$80 million (US\$10 million from US Government already) and the UK Government has identified it as a major policy, with the announcement of a £10 million fund for tackling the trade. There are four key findings here. Funding can be grouped in to four main approaches, one of which is relevant in both source and end user markets (key finding 3).

Key Finding 1: Two types of funding for demand reduction initiatives: projects and campaigns

These can be broadly characterised in two ways: specific projects and public awareness campaigns. The latter are more prevalent, and exist in source and end user markets as well as in countries where major donors or supporters are located. Examples of specific demand reduction projects are: Examples of campaigns are: TRAFFIC-Asia campaigns/research to understanding demand profile in Vietnam, The Humane Society 'Don't Buy Wild', the series of adverts produced by WildAid featuring key opinion makers/celebrities such as Yao Ming and Li Bing Bing around 'If the Buying Stops, the Killing Can Too' (for further discussion of the role of celebrities in conservation see Brockington, 2009). Further, there are a number of emerging projects, especially from TRAFFIC-International that are investigating consumer behaviour and motivation, as well as learning from other 'behavioural change' projects to design more effective approaches to changing consumer behaviour; this encompasses awareness campaigns as well as implementation of existing penalties for consumers.


Key Finding 2: Funding related to rural development/CBRNM is not well recognised as an effective policy response

Projects centred on CBRNM are often not explicitly identified as projects directly related poaching or illegal wildlife trade. They rely on the idea that poaching is driven by poverty and that wider forms of economic development or provision of alternative livelihood strategies will result in pro conservation activities and an associated reduction in poaching (see Duffy and St. John, 2013; Dressler et al 2009). Good examples are the partnerships between Save the Rhino International, Dambari Wildlife Trust and the Lowveld Rhino Trust in Zimbabwe which take an explicitly 'rural development' approach to outreach and engagement with local communities as partners in conservation.

Key Finding 3: Funding related to intelligence gathering, surveillance, capacity building in crime scene management is increasing as a priority

There are a range of new initiatives that address poaching and the illegal wildlife trade from the approach of criminology. This relies on the definition of poachers and traders as active criminals, operating outside the national legal frameworks. There are a growing number of initiatives that rely in the development and use of new technologies, including drones,

² <http://www.thehowardgbuffettfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/HGBF-SANParks-Kruger-Press-Release-FOR-RELEASE-14-March-2014.pdf> (accessed 23.06.14).



cellphones, surveillance equipment, sniffer dogs and GPS (eg see Koh and Wich, 2012; Marris, 2013; Schiffman, 2014). Good examples are SMART (funded by IUCN SOS and GEF amongst others), The RhODIS database (a DNA Indexing system for rhinos), and Interpol-led Projects Wisdom, Baba, Costa, Mogatle, Ahmed, Worthy and Wendi which focused on securing arrests and convictions of poachers and traders across Africa and Asia.

A number of organisations have also tried to develop a greater level of intelligence gathering and sharing between relevant agencies (e.g. TRAFFIC-International). Elephant Action League (in partnership with a range of other organisations) recently launched WildLeaks (<https://wildleaks.org/>) operating on the same basis as WikiLeaks but offering a specific service to those wishing to expose wildlife crime. As with other forms of anonymised reporting, while it can be very useful, concerns have been raised about possible abuse. Intelligence sharing across organisations has been hampered somewhat by the sensitivity of the topic (the activities are illegal) and the need to ensure confidentiality about specific operations. Further, there are well documented concerns about corruption within state institutions in poaching (see Reeve and Ellis, 1995; Leakey, 2001) which have also hampered information collection and sharing. Equally, concerns have been raised that funding for hi tech solutions is expensive, and is perhaps not a priority in a context where core staff are poorly equipped, poorly paid and lack motivation.

Key Finding 4: Funding related to counter-insurgency/security is an increasing priority

There has been a growing concern about the relationships between poaching, wildlife trafficking and regional or global security. As a result there are projects that specifically aim to tackle militia groups involved in poaching. A good example is funding from the Clinton Global Initiative funding (US\$80 million) to combat trafficking in areas of instability, expert witness testimonial by Iain Douglas Hamilton (Save The Elephants) to US Congressional hearings and on the ground investigations by Elephant Action League (US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, 2012). If such links do exist, they are, by their nature, clandestine, and therefore very difficult to verify independently. Despite this, it is clear that major donors are taking this issue seriously and funding has been made available to areas of geo-strategic interest (see Lawson and Vines, 2014).



SECTION 3

Major Donors and Implementing Agencies

It is impossible to provide an exhaustive list of all the organisations involved in combating the illegal wildlife trade. Here we concentrate on some ‘major players’ but try to capture smaller initiatives that are working with a wide range of partners. Therefore, any projects, donors or partners listed here/mapped in this report can only be regarded as *indicative* rather than definitive.

A key point to note is that it is difficult to separate out donor and implementer. This is especially a challenge in the NGO sector, as larger NGOs such as WWF, FZS and TRAFFIC act as donors and implementers (for further discussion see Holmes et al, 2012; Armsworth et al, 2012). A second caveat is that it is very challenging to ascertain precise levels of funding for on-going projects. There are two reasons for this: first the organisations involved do not provide the information on their websites, and second where figures are provided errors can be introduced by the blurred lines between the network of donors and implementers. For example Save Our Species is a donor as well as implementer and their projects may also be listed as WWF projects or IUCN projects.

Further, the focus on donors and implementing partners can mean that important demand reduction initiatives in Asia are missed – organisations that run public awareness campaigns are not adequately captured by this framing. Good examples are public awareness and media activity by organisations such as WildAid, Environmental Investigation Agency, TRAFFIC and United for Wildlife. However, they are important in the overall picture.

The role of individual donations by private individuals and private companies is important and they are an indicator of how the issue of the wildlife trade is fast gaining global attention. Recent large donations have been provided by a range of individuals – Howard G. Buffet Foundation (Kruger Park), Google (ZSL/Kenya), Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation (Save the Elephants/Elephant Crisis Fund), Dutch and Swedish postcode lotteries (to Peace Parks Foundation).

Finally, it is important to note that solely searching for projects around illegal wildlife trade produced a narrow range of initiatives – it is difficult to separate out projects that work broadly on e.g. elephant conservation from those specifically directed at illegal wildlife trade and poaching. Broader conservation programmes do tackle these issues within a wider remit. It is impossible to list all conservation initiatives here (for a very good summary of some of them see Holmes et al, 2012).

We have listed a range of donors and implementing agencies in Appendix I – this list should be treated with caution as it is indicative rather than definitive. We have also mapped them according to type of organisation in Figure 1.



SECTION 4

Gaps and Areas of Weakness

Key Finding 1: Need for greater understanding of the implications for community relations of a ‘crime/enforcement’ approach

In the projects related to surveillance, enforcement and crime scene management there is little discussion of the potential problems, including possible alienation of local communities, the implications of surveillance for civil liberties, whether such activities can be used to gather other kinds of information on a wider range of individuals (Dowie, 2009; Duffy, 2010; Peluso, 1993). The anti-poaching initiative, Operation Tokomeza in Tanzania, was suspended following serious allegations of human rights abuses. Such problems have been identified in other settings e.g. Liwonde National Park (Malawi) in the 1990s (Neumann, 2004).

Key Finding 2: Need for greater levels of intelligence sharing across states and within states

Many of the organisations involved (donors and implementing agencies) express a desire for greater levels of intelligence sharing across states because of the transnational nature of the illegal wildlife trade. However this far this has been difficult to implement in practice because of issues around confidentiality (amongst other things) (also see Duffy, Emslie and Knight, 2013). There is a need for trust building and networking between relevant agencies, across and within states.

Key Finding 3: Rangers coping with poor equipment and working conditions

A need for better equipment and working conditions for Rangers operating in the field, especially in areas with low levels of funding, poor capacity and in countries experiencing a sudden increase in poaching (also see Duffy, Emslie and Knight, 2013). WWF-South Africa has identified the importance of patrol leadership as a key factor in effectiveness and motivation (pers comm, Jo Shaw WWF-South Africa). Indeed evidence from conflict situations indicates that technological solutions are only effective when there are well trained, equipped and motivated personnel on the ground (Rogers, 2013).

Key Finding 4: The main approach to understanding the illegal wildlife trade is as a criminal activity rather than an issue of wider forms of (under)development

Very few projects related to poaching and the illegal wildlife trade explicitly address it as issue centred on rural development and the need to provide livelihood alternatives (the importance of understanding the role of poverty in driving poaching is highlighted by Roe, 2014; Duffy and St. John, 2013; Roe et al, 2014; Dowie, 2009). An important factor highlighted by wildlife NGOs is the reduction in available space/habitat for wildlife as a result of changing land use patterns; this is not simply a matter of population expansion, but is also related to the expansion of ‘land grabs’ (especially in Sub-Saharan Africa) or ‘green grabs’ (such as the introduction of new biofuel plantations in Asia) and the extension of privately held land for conservation and tourism initiatives which significantly change patterns of rural development and land use in a number of countries (see Pearce, 2012; Borras and Franco, 2013).



Key Finding 5: Little or no support for communities on how to resist intimidation

The searches did not reveal any projects that supported/trained communities in how to resist intimidation and pressure from criminal gangs to engage in poaching and trafficking. This does not mean that no such projects exist, simply that they are not showcased in reports and on websites. Training and capacity building may be required to support communities under pressure to engage in poaching by more organised networks, as well as by fellow community members. The effectiveness of such an approach would also be linked in to provision of alternative livelihoods for communities.

Key Finding 6: Need for capacity building in investigation skills/crime scene management

There is a clear need for a greater degree of capacity building in investigation teams and judicial systems in key source and end user markets. Inadequate resources and skills needed to investigate, arrest and convict was a common theme in the reports/sources consulted. A good example is Mozambique where penalties for poaching are typically very low (Rademeyer, 2013; Duffy, Emslie and Knight, 2013).

Key Finding 7: Need for governance related initiatives that address corruption, especially in state agencies.

A common theme in the sources consulted was the need for programmes that addressed anti-corruption and transparency within state agencies, especially those directly connected with wildlife management. Such governance initiatives would also build trust between organisations.

Key Finding 8: Little understanding of the precise dynamics of demand markets/consumer motivation

Very little work has been undertaken to understand the dynamics and drivers of consumer demand in end user markets. A limited amount of work has been undertaken by TRAFFIC-Asia, it identified the need to engage with consumers 'in their own terms' or in ways that are culturally/socially intelligible to users of wildlife products. Campaigns need to go beyond 'awareness raising' and tackle related issues such as implementation of existing laws/penalty systems for consuming or selling illegal wildlife products.


Key Finding 9: Lack of attention to pre-emptive efforts in demand reduction and anti-poaching

Currently, the main focus is on places with an upsurge in demand and poaching, with little attention paid to possible emerging markets or future sites of poaching. Much of the funding, support and attention has been focused on states that have experienced an upsurge in poaching. However, populations that are not currently under pressure could become targets; pre-emptive work may be important (e.g. rhino populations in Etosha and Kunene in Namibia).

Much of the attention around demand reduction has focused on countries with a high demand; however, the emergence of Vietnam as a major market for rhino horn was largely unexpected. Further new markets may emerge in states with little or no history of use of ivory, rhino horn (or derivatives of other key species), such as Myanmar, Laos, Cambodia (see Milliken and Shaw, 2012; Cao and Wyatt, 2012).

Key Finding 10: Patterns of funding differ substantially between and within states

There is a danger in attempting to identify countries and regions as having high or low levels of external funding support for initiatives around the international wildlife trade. Some countries do undoubtedly gain larger donations and greater support than others, but this can



miss important differences within countries. For example, South Africa has received a lot of attention and some very large donations (e.g. US\$25 million to the Kruger National Park to set up an Intensive Protection Zone for rhinos, 2014-2017 by the Howard G. Buffett Foundation); or R26.8 million from the Dutch and Swedish Postcode Lotteries via Peace Parks Foundation, working with Ezemvelo KZN to conserve rhinos in protected areas. However, other vulnerable elephant and rhino populations in South Africa have received little or no attention. The Department of Environmental Affairs as recently commissioned a review of rhino-related fundraising activities, amounts of money raised and where/how it is spent in order to prevent duplication of effort (the data set is still confidential but will be made public in the future). There are other good examples of large donations that gain international attention, including US\$500,000 to Zoological Society of London for digital technologies for anti-poaching in Kenya (for a discussion of philanthropy in conservation see Ramutsindela, Spierenburg and Wels, 2011; and Holmes, 2012). Equally particular countries have gained lots of attention and support because of major policy announcements, President Ali Bongo of Gabon is regularly invited to address international meetings because he committed to enforcing Gabon's national parks.

However, such large donations tend to be focused on specific sub-state geographical areas, and are not made available for other vulnerable populations within the same country. Therefore, it is important to consider funding as part of a context of 'appropriate scale'.

Other states have received less attention or funding, but are regularly cited as major problems in poaching and the illegal wildlife trade e.g. Vietnam (Cao and Wyatt, 2012), Mozambique (Duffy, Emslie and Knight, 2013). Furthermore, there are states with very small populations of elephants and rhinos that are not major areas of current priority for global funding, but where smaller investments might have a positive effect, Namibia, Angola and Malawi for example. Finally, Central Asia is not well covered in terms of wildlife trade projects, but it is an important transit region in the illegal wildlife trade. In regional terms, one broad pattern that was discernible in our searches, was that Asia tends to get less attention/support for demand reduction campaigns, losing out in favour of enforcement projects in source countries. Enforcement projects can typically offer a series of objectives that are achievable within a defined timetable and with a specific budget; demand reduction activities tend to be much longer term, budgets are hard to estimate and the outcomes may not be for ten or more years (as in the case of reduction of demand for ivory in Japan and rhino horn in Taiwan).

Key Finding 11: Little attention paid to transit states/networks

Overall the pattern of interest and funding is focused on either producers (poaching etc.) or consumers in end use markets. These two ends of the chain encompass large amounts of people. However, linking these two ends are a much smaller number of individual, networks and states that are often overlooked. A focus on such central 'nodal' points as weaknesses in the chain has the potential to be very effective.

SECTION 5

At a Glance

Africa: Rhino and Elephant

Information on specific projects is listed in Appendix 1.

Major Donors (NGOs also appear on list of implementers as they often have a dual role)

This list is indicative rather than exhaustive/comprehensive.

Private Foundations	International Organisations	States	NGOs	Other
Howard G. Buffett Foundation (US\$ 250 million+ in total, recent announcement of US\$ for Kruger Park)	EU	US Fish and Wildlife Service	WWF Netherlands	Swedish Postcode Lottery
Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation (US\$ 1 million)	RAPAC (EU)	USAID (recent announcement of US\$ 40 million)	Wildlife Conservation Society	
Adessium Foundation (Euro 1.05 million)	UNEP Global Environment Fund	UK government (recent announcement of £10 million)	Conservation International	Zoological Society of London
Clinton Global Initiative (commitment to raise US\$80 million, US\$ 10 million raised from US government thus far)	IUCN Save Our Species (SOS)	Spanish Government	Elephant Crisis Fund	Paignton Zoo
Paul G. Allen Family Foundation	World Bank	US Government (US\$ 10 million to be administered via Embassies in South Africa and Tanzania)	Flora and Fauna International	Chester Zoo
Blijdorp Tahndiza Foundation	Global Environmental Facility (World Bank/UNEP)	Ondo, Osun and Ogun State Governments (Nigeria)	Save The African Elephant (Germany)	Darwin Initiative
Rufford Foundation	Interpol	International Conservation Fund of Canada (ICFC)	African Wildlife Foundation	Saint Louis Zoo
Disney Corporation				International Institute for Environment



Private Foundations	International Organisations	States	NGOs	Other
				and Development (IIED)
Abraham Foundation			Save The Elephants	
Maurice Laing Foundation			Born Free Foundation	
Google Global Impact Awards			TUSK Trust	
Ms Anne Hojjer			Pro-Natura (Nigeria)	
Fondation Segre			WWF-Zambia	
Wildlife Conservation Service			International Ranger Foundation	
Anna McWane Foundation			Thin Green Line	
Big Life Foundation			Peace Parks Foundation	
Paul Tudor Jones/Malilangwe Trust			David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation	
Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund			StopRhinoPoaching.com	
Hunter Hall Investment			Save African Rhino (Australia)	
			Save the Rhino International	

Table 1 At a Glance: Active donors and organisations in illegal wildlife trade projects

This at a glance table of donors and implementers inevitably misses important regional initiatives such as the IUCN Elephant Action Plan and Elephant Fund (because they are subsumed under the category 'IUCN' and they are on elephant conservation more generally, rather than focusing on wildlife crime per se).

For more information see

https://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/species/who_we_are/ssc_specialist_groups_and_red_list_authorities_directory/mammals/african_elephant/strategies_plans/aeap/

It also misses emerging agendas and projects such as the Elephant Protection Initiative which is an agreement between states to organise initiatives to combat wildlife crime

<https://www.gov.uk/government/news/decisive-action-agreed-on-illegal-wildlife-trade>

Implementers

This list is indicative – more information on the projects each organisation is involved with is given in Appendix 1.

NGOs	Private Sector	State Agencies	Other
Wildlife Conservation Society	African Parks Network	SANParks	Freeland Foundation (main implementing agency for USAID)
Conservation International	Howard G. Buffet Foundation	Parcs Gabon	National Geographic
WWF – international and regional offices	OI Pejeta Rhino Reserve	Kenya Wildlife Services	International Conservation Caucus Foundation
International Fund for Animal Welfare	Northern Rangelands Trust	Ministere des Forets et de la Faune de la Republique du Cameroon (MINOF)	Association of Zoos and Aquariums
The Nature Conservancy	Malilangwe Trust	Societe Forestiere et Industrielle de la Doume (SFID)	Frankfurt Zoological Society
TRAFFIC (international and regional/ national offices)		Societe Pallisco	Zoological Society of London
Save The Elephants		Congolese Wildlife Authority (ICCN)	The Wild Foundation (USA)
Nature Conservation Trust		National Directorate of Water and Forests (DNEF), Mali	Nigeria Conservation Foundation
Leadership for Conservation in Africa		Rwanda Development Board	Honeyguide Foundation
Flora and Fauna International		SADC Rhino Management Group	CITES – individual authorities in each country
African Wildlife Foundation		Ezemvelo- KZN Wildlife (EKZN Wildlife) (South Africa)	Lowveld Rhino Trust (Zimbabwe)
Wildlife Action Group (Malawi)		North West Parks and Tourism Board (NWPTB) South Africa	Laikipia Wildlife Forum
WildlifeDirect		Eastern Cape Parks and Tourism Agency South Africa	CITES
African Parks Foundation			Interpol
WildAid			UNODC
			World Customs Union
Peace Parks Foundation			World Bank
StopRhinoPoaching.com			Leo Foundation
Wildlife and Environment Society of South Africa (WESSA)			
Wildlands Conservation Trust			
Dambari Trust			
Zambezi Society			

ASIA: Elephant and Rhino

This list is indicative of broad patterns, it is not exhaustive.

Major Initiatives

Initiative	Members/Partners
Campaign Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT)	Australian Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population, and Conservation Environment Canada Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Chile Ministry of Environment and Forests, India Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Law Enforcement DEFRA
Asian Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN)	Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Vietnam, Thailand
South Asia Wildlife Enforcement Network (SAWEN)	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka:
ARREST: Asia's Regional Response to Endangered Species Trafficking	Sponsored by the United States Government in partnership with ASEAN and over 50 governmental and non-governmental organizations including USAID, US Department of Justice (DoJ), ACRES (Animal Concerns Research and Education Society) in Singapore, and Conservation International (CI), International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW): <u>implemented</u> by FREELAND.
WWF Asia Rhino and Elephant Action Strategy	Nepal, India, Bhutan, Vietnam, Cambodia, Lao PR, Myanmar, Malaysia, Thailand, Indonesia

Major Donors (NGOs also appear on list of implementers as they often have a dual role)

This list is indicative rather than exhaustive/comprehensive

International Organisations	NGOs
European Union	International Rhino Foundation
	Flora and Fauna International
	Wildlife Conservation Society
	The Elephant Family
	Save The Rhino International

Implementers


NGOs	State Agencies	Other
TRAFFIC – International, regional and national offices	Bhutan Trust for Environmental Conservation (parastatal)	Wildlife Conservation Network
Flora and Fauna International	Assam Forest Department	The Bondoland Territorial Council
Wildlife Conservation Society	Sabah Wildlife Department	The Veterinary Society for Sumatran Wildlife Conservation
Wildlife Protection Society of India	Myanmar Forest Department	Lembaga Permata Rimba Damar Hitam
Conservation International	Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation	The Nature Conservation Agency (BKDSA)
Elephant Family		Sumatran Elephant Conservation Initiative
WWF- India		Biodiversity and Natural Conservation Association (BANCA)
International Rhino Foundation		Resources and Conservation Foundation (PRCF)
National Trust for Nature Conservation, Nepal		Golden Triangle Asian Elephant Foundation
Education for Nature, Vietnam		Pan Nature
WildAid		
TRAFFIC-Asia		
TRAFFIC – International		
Environmental Investigation Agency		
WildAid		



SECTION 6

Selected References

- Adams, W. M. (2004) *Against Extinction: The Story of Conservation* (London: Earthscan).
- Armsworth P.R., Fishburn I.S., Davies Z.G., Gilbert J., Leaver N. & Gaston K.J. (2012). The size, concentration and growth of biodiversity conservation nonprofits. *BioScience* 62: 271-281.
- Borras, S.M. and Franco, J.C. (2013). Global Land Grabbing and Political Reactions 'From Below'. *Third World Quarterly*, 34(9), 1723-174
- Bouché, P., Douglas-Hamilton, I., Wittemyer, G., Nianogo, A., Lejeune, P., Vermeulen, C. (2011) *Will Elephants Soon Disappear From West African Savannahs?* PLoS ONE 6(6):1932-6203.
- Brockington, D. (2009) *Celebrity and the Environment: Fame, Wealth and Power in Conservation* (London: Zed)
- Brockington, D., Duffy, R. and Igoe, J. (2008) *Nature Unbound: Conservation, Capitalism and the Future of Protected Areas* (London: Earthscan).
- Brockington, D. and Scholfield, K. (2010) 'Expenditure by Conservation Non-Governmental Organisations in Sub-Saharan Africa.' *Conservation Letters* 3 (2): 106-113.
- Brockington, D. and Scholfield, K. (2010) 'The work of conservation organisations in sub-Saharan Africa.' *Journal of Modern African Studies*, 48 (1): 1-33.
- Burn, R. W., F. M. Underwood, and J. Blanc. (2011) Global trends and factors associated with the illegal killing of elephants: a hierarchical bayesian analysis of carcass encounter data. *PLoS ONE* 6:e24165. doi:24110.21371/journal.pone.0024165.
- Cao, A. and Wyatt, T. (2012) 'A green criminological exploration of illegal wildlife trade in Vietnam'. *Asian Journal of Criminology*. DOI 10.1007/s11417-012-9154-y.
- CITES (2013) *Draft Decision on Rhinoceros*, CoP16 Com. II.24, from Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties Bangkok (Thailand), 3-14 March 2013.
- CITES (2002) *Elephants: Conditions for the Disposal of Ivory Stocks and Generating Resources for Conservation in African Elephant Range States* (CITES Secretariat, Geneva).
- Commission for Environmental Co-Operation (2005) *Illegal Trade in Wildlife: A North American Perspective* (CEC: Quebec, Canada)
- Daly, B.G., et al (2011) *Perspectives on dehorning & legalised trade in rhino horn as tools to combat rhino poaching* (Endangered Wildlife Trust, Johannesburg, 2011).
- Department of Environmental Affairs (2013) *Rhino Issue Management Report* (Government of South Africa).



Douglas-Hamilton, I. (2009) 'The Current Elephant Poaching Trend' *Pachyderm* No. 45 July 2008–June 2009

Dowie, M. (2009) *Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples* (Cambridge: MIT Press).

Dressler, W., Büscher, B., Schoon, M., Brockington, D. Hayes, T. Kull, C., McCarthy, J. and Streshta, K. (2010) From Hope to Crisis and Back? A Critical History of the Global CBNRM Narrative. *Environmental Conservation* 37(1):1-11.

Duffy, R. (2010) *Nature Crime: How We're Getting Conservation Wrong* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press).

Duffy, R. and F.A.V. St. John (2013) *Poverty, Poaching and Trafficking: What are the links?* Consultancy Report for DFID, June 2013. Evidence on Demand Report (no. HD059).

Du Preez, P. (2013a) *Black Rhino Conservation in Namibia* (Confidential draft report) (Windhoek: Ministry of Environment and Tourism).

Du Preez, P. (2013b) *AfRSG Namibia Country Report* (Windhoek: Ministry of Environment and Tourism).

du Toit, R. (2013) '*Response to Rhino Poaching in Zimbabwe's Lowveld Region*', Presentation at IUCN-SSC African Rhino Specialist Group Meeting, Naro Moru, Kenya, February 2013.

du Toit, R. (2011) '*Drivers of Rhino Poaching*' Presentation at IUCN-SSC African Rhino Specialist Group Meeting, Mokala, South Africa, March 2011.

du Toit R., Mungwashu L. and Emslie R.H. (2006) Ensuring the Security of Rhino populations Chapter 4 (pp57-67) in SADC Regional Programme for Rhino Conservation Guidelines for implementing SADC Rhino Conservation Strategies compiled by R du Toit with contributions from R.Emslie, M. Brooks, G.Daconto and L.Mungwashu.

Emslie, R.H. (2013a) *African Rhinoceroses – Latest trends in rhino numbers and poaching*. An update to Doc 54-2-Annexe 2 from the IUCN Species Survival Commission's (IUCN/SSC), African Rhino Specialist Group to the CITES Secretariat pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.14, (Rev. CoP15) CITES CoP16 Inf Doc 51.

Emslie, R.H. (2013b) Table 1 – Numbers of white and black rhinos in Africa as of 31 Dec 2012 by country and subspecies extracted from Section 4: Wild African Rhino Population Sizes, Numbers and Trends, including AfRSG rated populations and by management model in Confidential Full and Abridged Proceedings of the Eleventh Meeting of the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group held at Naro Moru River Lodge, Kenya from 17-22 February 2013 (Cathy Dean – compiler 2013).

Emslie, R. H., Milliken, T., Talukdar, B., (2012) *African and Asian Rhinoceroses – Status, Conservation and Trade*, A report from the IUCN Species Survival Commission (IUCN/SSC) African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC to the CITES Secretariat, pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15), CoP16 Doc. 54.2-rev 1.

Emslie, R.H. and Brooks P.M. (1999) African Rhino, Status Survey and Action Plan, IUCN/SSC African Rhino Specialist Group. (Gland: IUCN).



European Commission (2014) *Commission Summary – Key Outcomes of the Expert Conference on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking* (Environment DG, EC: Brussels, Belgium)

Geneva Graduate Institute of International and Development Studies (undated) *Research Report on Social Dynamics and Wildlife Trade and Lessons Learned from Review of National Wildlife Trade Policy Review Processes* (Geneva, Switzerland: IHEID)

Halpern, B.S., Pyke C.R., Fox, H.E., Haney, J.C., Schlaepfer, M.A., Zaradic, P. (2006) 'Gaps and mismatches between global conservation priorities and spending'. *Conservation Biology* 20: 56–64.

Holmes, G. (2012) Biodiversity for Billionaires: Capitalism, Conservation and the Role of Philanthropy in Saving/Sellign Nature' *Development and Change*, **43**: 185-203.

Holmes, G., Scholfield, K. and Brockington, D. (2012) 'A Comparison of Global Conservation Prioritization Models with Spatial Spending Patterns of Conservation Nongovernmental Organizations.' *Conservation Biology* 26 (4): 602-609.

Humphreys, J. (forthcoming, 2014) 'Horns of a dilemma: is rhino poaching insurgency, crime or neither?' *International Affairs*.

Hutton, J., Adams, W.M., and Murombedzi, J.C. (2005) "Back to the barriers? Changing narratives in biodiversity conservation" *Forum for Development Studies* 32: 341–370.

IFAW (2008) *Killing with Keystrokes: An Investigation of the Illegal Wildlife Trade on the World Wide Web* (Brussels: IFAW).

Interpol (2014) *Elephant Poaching and Ivory Trafficking in East Africa: Assessment for an Effective Law Enforcement Response* (Environment Sub-Directorate, Interpol: Lyon, France)


IUCN (undated) *IUCN's 2013-2016 Programme: Global Situation Analysis* (IUCN: Gland, Switzerland).

IUCN (2000) *Amman Policy Statement on the Sustainable Use of Wild Living Resources* (IUCN: Gland, Switzerland)

IUCN/TRAFFIC (2012) *Analyses of the proposals to amend the CITES Appendices at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties* (IUCN: Gland, Switzerland/ TRAFFIC: Cambridge, UK)

Knight, M.H., Balfour, D., and Emslie, R.H. compilers (2013) *Biodiversity Management Plan for the Black Rhinoceros (Diceros Bicornis) in South Africa 2011-2020 prepared by South African members of the SADC Rhino Management Group on behalf of Department of Environmental Affairs and approved by the South African Minister of Environmental Affairs and Gazetted as a species Biodiversity Management Plan under the National Environmental Management and Biodiversity Act (NEMBA)*.

Knight, M.H., Emslie, R.H. and Smart, R. compilers (in prep, 2013) *Biodiversity Management Plan for the White Rhinoceros (Diceros Bicornis) in South Africa 2013-2018 prepared by the SADC Rhino Management Group following a multi-stakeholder workshop at the request of the South African Minister of the Environment on behalf of Department of Environmental Affairs*.



Koh, L.P. and Wich S.A. (2012) Dawn of drone ecology: low-cost autonomous aerial vehicles for conservation. *Tropical Conservation Science*. 5, 121.

KWS (2012) *Conservation and Management Strategy for the Black Rhino and Management Guidelines for the White Rhino in Kenya (2012-2016)* (Nairobi: Kenya Wildlife Service).

KWS (2007) *Conservation and Management Strategy for the Black Rhino and Management Guidelines for the White Rhino in Kenya (2007-2011)* (Nairobi: Kenya Wildlife Service).

Lawson, K., and A. Vines (2014) *Global impacts of the illegal wildlife trade: the costs of crime, insecurity and institutional erosion*. Chatham House, London

Lindsay, P.A., and Taylor. A. (2011) *A study on the dehorning of African Rhinoceroses as a tool to reduce the risk of poaching* (Endangered Wildlife Trust and the South African Department of Environmental Affairs).

Leakey, R. (2001) *Wildlife Wars: My Battle to Save Kenya's Elephants* (London: Pan).

Litchfield, C. A. (2013) Rhino poaching: Apply conservation psychology. *Science* **340**:1168.

Lockwood K. (2013) Rhino Economics: A bioeconomic model to determine potential impact of different trading rhino (horn) trading regimes on free-ranging rhino populations in Confidential Full and Abridged Proceedings of the Eleventh Meeting of the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group held at Naro Moru River Lodge, Kenya from 17-22 February 2013 (Cathy Dean – compiler 2013).

Lunstrum, E. (2013) 'Articulated sovereignty: Extending Mozambican state power through the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park,' *Political Geography*, 36: 1-11.

Mace, G.M., et al. (2000) 'It's time to work together and stop duplicating conservation efforts'. *Nature* 405:393.

Maisels F, Strindberg S, Blake S, Wittemyer G, Hart J, et al. (2013) 'Devastating Decline of Forest Elephants in Central Africa'. *PLoS ONE* 8(3): e59469. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059469

Marris, E. (2013) 'Drones in science: Fly, and bring me data'. *Nature* 498: 156-158.


Martin, R. (2012) *A Legal Trade in Rhino Horn: Hobson's Choice* (Rhino Survival Trust).

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA). 2005. *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Biodiversity Synthesis*. World Resources Institute, Washington DC, USA.

Milliken, T. (2013) *Rhino horn trade: Demand Reduction Lessons from the Past* in Confidential Full and Abridged Proceedings of the Eleventh Meeting of the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group held at Naro Moru River Lodge, Kenya from 17-22 February 2013 (Cathy Dean – compiler 2013).

Milliken, T. and Shaw, J. (2012) *The South Africa–Viet Nam Rhino Horn Trade Nexus: A deadly combination of institutional lapses, corrupt wildlife industry professionals and Asian crime syndicates*. (TRAFFIC, Johannesburg).

Milliken, T., Emslie, R.H. and Talukdar, B. (2009) *African and Asian Rhinoceroses – Status, Conservation and Trade*, A report from the IUCN Species Survival Commission (IUCN/SSC)



African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC to the CITES Secretariat, pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP14) and Decision 14.89, CoP15 Doc. 45.1.

MET (2012) *Species Management Plan: White Rhinoceros* (Windhoek: Ministry of Environment and Tourism).

NASCO (undated) *Living With Wildlife: The Story of Namibia's Communal Conservancies* (The Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations: Windhoek, Namibia)

Nasi, R., Brown, D., Wilkie, D., Bennett, E., Tutin, C., van Tol, G., and Christophersen, T. (2008). *Conservation and use of wildlife-based resources: the bushmeat crisis*. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Montreal, and Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor. Technical Series no. 33.

Neumann, R. P. (2004) 'Moral and discursive geographies in the war for biodiversity in Africa', *Political Geography*, 23: 813–37.

Nowell, K. (2012) *Species trade and conservation Rhinoceroses: Assessment of rhino horn as a traditional medicine* (CITES and TRAFFIC).

Ostrom, E. (2010) Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *American Economic Review* 100 (June 2010): 641–672.

PALF (2013) *PALF Annual Report 2013*

Pearce, F. (2012) *The Land Grabbers: The New Fight for Who Owns the Planet* (London: Random House)

Peluso, N. L. (1993) 'Coercing conservation?: The politics of state resource control', *Global Environmental Change*, 3(2): 199–218.

Project Rhino KZN (2013) *Annual Review 2013* (Project Rhino, KZN: Pietermaritzburg, South Africa)

Rademeyer, J. (2013) *Killing for Profit: Exposing the Illegal Rhino Horn Trade* (Cape Town: Zebra Press/Random House Struik).

Ramutsindela, M., Spierenburg, M. and Wels, H. (2011) *Sponsoring Nature: Environmental Philanthropy for Nature Conservation* (London: Earthscan).

Reeve, R. (2002) *Policing the international trade in endangered species: The CITES treaty and compliance* (Royal Institute of International Affairs/Earthscan, London).

Roe, D., Milledge, S., Cooney, R., 't Sas-Rolfes, M., Biggs, D., Murphree, M., Kasterine, A. (2014) *The elephant in the room: sustainable use in the illegal wildlife trade debate*. Briefing Paper (IIED: London).


Roe, D. (2014) *Poverty and biodiversity: evidence about nature and the nature of evidence*. Briefing Paper. (IIED: London).

Roe, D. et al (2010) *Conservation and human rights: the need for international standards*. *Policy Briefing* (London: IIED).

Roe, D. 2008. The origins and evolution of the conservation-poverty debate: A review of key literature, events and policy processes. *Oryx* 42:491-503.



- Rogers, P. (2013) 'Security by 'Remote Control'. *The RUSI Journal* 158: 14.
- Schiffman, R. (2014) Drones flying high as new tool for field biologists. *Science* 344, 459.
- Smith, R.J., Veríssimo, D., Isaac, N.J.B. and Jones, K.E. (2012) 'Identifying Cinderella species: uncovering mammals with conservation flagship appeal'. *Conservation Letters*, 5: 205-212.
- South, N. and Wyatt, T. (2011) 'Comparison of the illicit wildlife and drug trades: an exploratory study'. *Deviant Behavior* 32 (6), pp. 338-561.
- Standley, S. and Emslie, R.H. (2013) *Population and Poaching of African Rhinos across African Range States 2007-2012*, Consultancy Report for DFID, August 2013. Evidence on Demand Report (no. HD078).
- St. John, F.A.V., Edwards-Jones, G., Gibbons, J.M., Jones, J.P.G., (2010) Testing novel methods for assessing rule breaking in conservation. *Biological Conservation* 143, 1025-1030.
- Stiles, D. (2004) 'The ivory trade and elephant conservation' *Environmental Conservation*, 3: 309–321.
- t' Sas Rolfes, M. (2012) *The Rhino Poaching Crisis* <http://www.rhino-economics.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/The-Rhino-Poaching-Crisis-by-Michael-t-Sas-Rolfes-Final.pdf>
- t' Sas Rolfes, M. (2011) 'CITES and the trade in rhino horn', *Wildlife Ranching*, 4(2): 17-19.
- TRAFFIC (2008) *What's Driving the Wildlife Trade? A Review of Expert Opinion on Economic and Social Drivers of the Wildlife Trade and Trade Control Efforts in Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR and Vietnam* (Cambridge: TRAFFIC International/Washington DC: World Bank).
- United Nations (2013) *Report of the Secretary General on the Activities of the United Nations Regional Office for Central Africa and on the Lord's Resistance Army affected areas* (New York: UN). Report reference S/2013/297.
- US Senate Committee on Foreign Relations (2012) *Ivory and insecurity: the global implications of poaching in Africa*. US Government Printing Office, Washington DC <<http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/>> (accessed January 2014).
- Vigne, L. and Martin, E. (2013) 'Demand for rhino horn declines in Yemen' *Oryx*, 47(3): 323–327.
- White House (2014) *National Strategy for Combatting Wildlife Trafficking* (Washington, DC: US Government)
- Wilson, K.A., Cawardine, J., Possingham, H.P. (2009) 'Setting conservation priorities'. *Annals of the New York Academy of the Sciences* 1162: 237–264
- Wolford, W., Borrás, S.M., Hall, R., Scoones, I. & White, B.N.F. (2013). Governing Global Land Deals: The Role of the State in the Rush for Land. *Development and Change*, 44(2), 189-210.



Wyatt, T. (2012) 'Uncovering the significance of and motivation for wildlife trafficking', in South, N. and Brisman, A. (eds.) *Routledge international handbook of green criminology*. London: Routledge.

Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority (2011) *Zimbabwe Rhino Policy and Management Framework 2011-2016* (Harare: Government of Zimbabwe).



Appendix 1 Donors and implementing agencies

ASIA

MAJOR INITIATIVES:

Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT)

CAWT partners seek to address the growing threats to wildlife from poaching and illegal trade, working individually and jointly toward achieving the Coalition's goals, with each partner acting where it can contribute most effectively. The CAWT organisation is not directly involved in any enforcement activities (see <http://www.cawtglobal.org/>).

Government members:

- Australian Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population, and Conservation
- Environment Canada
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Chile
- Ministry of Environment and Forests, India
- Department of Interior, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Law Enforcement
- UK Department EFRA etc

TRAFFIC International is also a founder member.

ASEAN-Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN)

Bangkok based ASEAN-WEN is the world's largest wildlife law enforcement network that involves police, customs and environment agencies of all 10 ASEAN countries – Brunei, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Singapore, Vietnam and Thailand. ASEAN-WEN is: A regional intergovernmental law-enforcement network designed to combat the illegal wildlife trade; A proactive response to Southeast Asia's alarming levels of wildlife trafficking and loss; A mechanism by which countries can share information and learn from each other's best practices.

Through annual meetings, workshops and trainings, ASEAN-WEN facilitates increased capacity and better coordination and collaboration of law enforcement agencies between Southeast Asian countries, regionally and globally. Links with the Convention of International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) offices, Interpol, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of Justice and other wildlife law enforcement groups has broadened the Network's reach. Along with an increase in ASEAN-WEN's visibility, the region has also experienced a recent increase in wildlife law enforcement actions in Southeast Asia.

<http://www.asean-wen.org/index.php/about-us/what-is-asean-wen>

South Asia Wildlife Enforcement Network (SAWEN):


Kathmandu-based. (Members: Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka: **NB: no members of ASEAN-WEN**). Set up with help from TRAFFIC and CAWT in 2011. Weblink to the organisation is dead.

<http://www.traffic.org/home/2011/1/30/south-asia-wildlife-enforcement-network-sawen-formally-launc.html>. Similar model to ASEAN-WEN.

TRAFFIC- South East Asia

Regional office of TRAFFIC International

<http://www.traffic.org/overview/>



TRAFFIC, the wildlife trade monitoring network, is the leading non-governmental organization working globally on trade in wild animals and plants in the context of both biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.

TRAFFIC specializes in:

- Investigating and analysing wildlife trade trends, patterns, impacts and drivers to provide the leading knowledge base on trade in wild animals and plants;
- Informing, supporting and encouraging action by governments, individually and through inter-governmental cooperation to adopt, implement and enforce effective policies and laws;
- Providing information, encouragement and advice to the private sector on effective approaches to ensure that sourcing of wildlife uses sustainability standards and best practice;
- Developing insight into consumer attitudes and purchasing motivation and guiding the design of effective communication interventions aimed to dissuade purchasing of illicit wildlife goods.

ARREST: Asia's Regional Response to Endangered Species Trafficking

Program sponsored by the United States Government (2011-2016) in partnership with ASEAN and over 50 governmental and non-governmental organizations including USAID, US Department of Justice (DoJ), ACRES (Animal Concerns Research and Education Society) in Singapore, and Conservation International (CI), International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW): implemented by Freeland NGO.

<http://www.usaid.gov/asia-regional/fact-sheets/lmi-asias-regional-response-endangered-species-trafficking-arrest>

ARREST fights trafficking in illegal wildlife in Asia in three ways:

- Reduce consumer demand;
- Strengthen law enforcement; and
- Strengthen regional cooperation and anti-trafficking networks.

ARREST unites the efforts of governments, NGOs and the private sector in the Lower Mekong nations together with China, ASEAN and South Asia countries. Together, these dedicated people and organizations are helping Asia respond to the challenge of protecting its unique wildlife.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES IN THE LOWER MEKONG BASIN

Target Countries: Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam

Demand Reduction Campaigns: ARREST will use its extensive media and advertising resources to support campaigns in Vietnam, Thailand and other countries that work to eliminate the consumption of protected wildlife. Where monitoring shows these efforts are succeeding, the program will expand upon them.

Mainstreaming Wildlife Crime in Law Enforcement: ASEANWEN's activities have already placed wildlife crime on the agenda of major national and regional law enforcement organizations, such as INTERPOL and ASEANAPOL—the ASEAN region's police organization. ARREST will help police chiefs across the Lower Mekong region include cross-border wildlife enforcement cooperation in their work plans.

Law Enforcement Capacity Building: ARREST will work with the region's law enforcement trainers and institutions to improve regional and national courses and materials on the following subjects:

- Prevention: Protected area enforcement and management;

- Detection: Nature crime investigation, forensics, and border inspection; and
- Prosecution: Judicial awareness.

Developing Law Enforcement Managers: ARREST will also strengthen law enforcement capacity by focusing on law enforcement leaders and training managers to lead front line staff in reducing wildlife crime. This should put large areas of biologically-significant habitat under improved management. Sustaining the ASEAN-WEN Secretariat: ARREST will mentor ASEAN-WEN Program Coordination Unit staff and promote new technology that helps raise awareness and combat illegal trade in wildlife. This should help the Bangkok-based Secretariat become a stronger, more independent, and service-oriented institution that connects directly with enforcement agencies across the Lower Mekong region and other countries.

Promoting Regional Cooperation: Through regional program events - exchanges, regional investigation meetings, and training courses - officers from the new South Asian Wildlife Enforcement Network (SA-WEN), and China's Task Force will join ASEAN-WEN to learn from each other, and exchange information, intelligence, and best practices.

PARTNERS

ASEAN-WEN, FREELAND Foundation, ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity, ACRES, AsiaWorks TV, Conservation International China Program, Education for Nature Vietnam (ENV), GreenEyes China, INTERPOL, JWT, National Geographic, MTV-Exit, Wildlife Alliance, U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of Justice, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and the U.S. Forest Service.

WWF Asia Rhino and Elephant Action Strategy (AREAS).


http://wwf.panda.org/what_we_do/angered_species/elephants/asian_elephants/areas/
Takes a 'landscape approach stating that, 'the only chance to maintain or rebuild rhino and elephant populations in many areas is to foster a rational and coherent approach to land-use planning, taking wildlife and human needs into account. This landscape approach to conservation includes expanding existing reserves, creating new reserves where possible, and linking protected areas by restoring habitat corridors. To be successful, this approach must also address the needs and concerns of local people and other stakeholders, aim to reduce human-wildlife conflicts, and lead to policies at the national, provincial and local levels that help make conservation a sustainable land-use choice'

(Project Locations):

- Central Terai Arc, Nepal.
- Western Terai Arc, Nepal.
- Nilgiris, India.
- Kaziranga-Karbi, India.
- 'North Bank' of Arunchal Pradesh, India/Bhutan.
- Cat Tien, Vietnam.
- Lower Mekong Forests, Cambodia/Lao PR, Vietnam.
- Tenasserim, Thailand/Myanmar.
- 'Heart of Borneo', Malaysia.
- Peninsular Malaysia/southern Thailand.
- Riau, Sumatra.
- Bukit Barisan, Sumatra.
- Ujung Kulon, Java.

The Elephant Family:

UK based, started by Mark Shand
<http://www.elephantfamily.org/>



Primarily focused on fundraising and awareness campaigns for a range of Asian elephant issues,. Funding is then used to support specific projects. Those specifically focused on the wildlife trade include a campaign to stop elephant smuggling and a recent 'Emergency Appeal' Systematic Slaughter by Ivory Mafia (in India) to raise funds. Work with a range of implementing partners including Wildlife Trust of India, Wildlife Protection Society of India, Hutan, Vesswic, Dinau Girang Field Centre, Golden Triangle Asian Elephant Foundation.

COUNTRIES:

BHUTAN:

Project: Royal Manas National Park/ all national parks

Implementers: Bhutan Trust Fund for Environmental Conservation (parastal)

CAMBODIA:

Project: Cambodia Elephant Conservation Group

Donor/implementer: Fauna and Flora International

Project: Northern Plains

Donor/implementer: Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

Project: Southern Mondulkiri

Donor/implementer: WCS

CHINA:

We have not listed many projects here as it does not fall under the definition of lower income countries for DFID. However a few indicative projects are listed, mostly based around campaigning.

Project: demand reduction awareness campaign

Donor: Implementer: WildAid:

campaign to reduce demand for rhino horn and ivory 'When the buying stops, the killing can too'.

TRAFFIC- International

Changing consumer behaviour, including market surveys to understand consumer behaviour, work with private sector retailers, local artists,

<http://www.traffic.org/home/2013/9/2/e-commerce-logistics-firms-commit-to-protect-endangered-spec.html>

<http://www.traffic.org/home/2013/10/16/artist-makes-a-splash-with-vanishing-treasures.html>

Work with youth sector and TCM sector

<http://www.traffic.org/home/2014/6/5/top-traditional-medicine-companies-and-doctors-renounce-use.html>

INDIA:

(General): Key actors

- Wildlife Protection Society of India (WPSI)
- Wildlife Conservation Network: US-based
- Conservation International: US-based, local offices.
- Elephant Family: London-based, started by Mark Shand



Project: (Assam): Manas National Park, Kaziranga National Park

- Key actors
- Aaranyak (local NGO)
- Assam Forest Department
- The Bodoland Territorial Council (BTC)
- WWF-India
- International Rhino Foundation (IRF)
- **US Fish and Wildlife Service**

Project: Western Ghats

Donor/implementer: WCS

INDONESIA:

Project: ‘Sumatra Elephant Conservation Programme’

Donor/implementer: Fauna and Flora International

Project: Barisan Mountains, Sumatra

Donor/implementer: WCS

Project: Gunung Leuser

Donor/implementer: WCS

Project: Elephant Training camps, Riau Province, Sumatra

Donor/implementer: WWF

Project: Elephant Health Care Programme, Sumatra

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer: Veterinary Society for Sumatran Wildlife Conservation

Project: Capacity building for elephant conservation: north Sumatra

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer (local): *Lembaga Permata Rimba Damar Hitam.*

Project: Way Kambas Conservation Response Unit

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementers:

- Nature Conservation Agency (BKSDA)
- Veterinary Society for Sumatran Wildlife Conservation

Project: Sumatran Elephant Tracking Project

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer: Sumatran Elephant Conservation Initiative

Project: Sumatran Conservation Drones

Donor/Implementer: The Elephant Family/Fauna and Flora International

LAO PR:

Project: Northern Annamites

Donor/implementer: WCS

MALAYSIA:



Project: Endau-Rompin Landscape

Donor/implementer: WCS

Project: Wildlife Warden and Conflict Mitigation Unit: Sabah

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer: Sabah Wildlife Department

Project: Bornean Elephant Research Unit: Sabah

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer: Sabah Wildlife Department

Project: Sabah River Keepers

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer: Sabah Wildlife Department

MYANMAR:

Project: Conservation and Development Programme in Chin and Kachin states (northern Myanmar):

Major donor:

- EU

Implementers

- Flora and Fauna International.
- (local): Biodiversity and Natural Conservation Association (BANCA)
- (local): Resources and Conservation Foundation (PRCF)

Project: Northern Forest Complex

Donor/implementer: WCS

Project: Ranger Training

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer: Myanmar Forest Department

NEPAL:

Project: Chitwan National Park/ other parks and protected areas

Implementers: Ministry of Forests and Soil Conservation, Department of National Parks and Wildlife Conservation/ National Trust for Nature Conservation, Nepal

THAILAND:

Project: Tenasserims

Donor/implementer: WCS

Project: The Elephant Rescue Programme

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer (local): The Golden Triangle Asian Elephant Foundation

Project: The Thailand Habitat Programme

Donor: The Elephant Family

Implementer (local): Thailand Department of National Parks

VIETNAM:

Project: rhino protection

Donor: Save the Rhino International (SRI)

Implementer: (local) Education for Nature Vietnam (ENV)

Project: Capacity building of grassroots conservation organisations.

Donor: Fauna and Flora International.

Implementer: (local) Pan Nature

AFRICA

MAJOR STRATEGIC PARTNERS: AFRICA (elephant and rhino) (Contributions over \$1million)

(1): African Parks: Johannesburg based

Donors:

- Adessium Foundation: Netherlands based, €1.05 million (2010-2013).
-: for running costs, €718,275 annual. Based on €25million donation from deceased businessman, Paul van Vlissingen (also see 'Stichting African Parks Foundation' below).
- Dutch Postcode Lottery: €4.5million (2010-2014): non specific.
- European Union: see DRC projects.
- RAPAC: see DRC projects.
- Stichting African Parks Foundation: Netherlands based main funding body of African Parks, starting with funds provided by Paul van Vlissingen (as above). In 2012 an additional €1.7 million came from the 'stichting'.
- Swedish Postcode Lottery: see Zambia projects.
- Walton Family Foundation: see Rwanda project.
- The World Bank (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development): see Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) projects.
- UNEP Global Environmental Fund: see Zambia projects.
- US Fish and Wildlife Service: see Chad and DRC projects
- WWF Netherlands: €2million (2011-2013): see projects in DRC and Zambia.

(2): Clinton Global Initiative (CGI): Partnership to save Africa's elephants: New York based.

Three year (2013-2016) initiative with CGI as funding 'broker/leverager' to raise \$80million focused on 50 wildlife poaching 'hotspots' in Africa. So far: \$10million from the US Presidential Taskforce on Wildlife Trafficking (announced July, 2013)

Overall the money will be broadly disbursed as follows:

- fund additional 3,100 park rangers
- strengthen intelligence gathering
- increase legal enforcement
- train sniffer dog teams
- demand reduction programmes

Tier One partners:

- Wildlife Conservation Society
- African Wildlife Foundation
- World Wide Fund for Nature

- International Fund for Animal Welfare
- The Nature Conservancy
- Conservation International

Tier Two partners:

- African Parks Network
- Association of Zoos and Aquariums
- Frankfurt Zoological Society
- Freeland Foundation
- International Conservation Caucus Foundation
- National Geographic
- Save the Elephants
- TRAFFIC
- WildAid
- WildLifeDirect
- Howard Buffett Foundation

(3): Paul G. Allen Family Foundation: Seattle based.

Project (1): Elephants without Borders: located in Botswana, ongoing.

Project (2): Great Elephant Census (2014-2015): Two year Africa-wide elephant census, \$8million.

Donor/Implementer: Allen was co-founder of Microsoft with a wide range of philanthropic causes, investing \$ 10million dollars in African projects since 2008.

(4): MIKES: Minimising the Illegal Killing of Elephants and other Endangered Species.

Donor: EU, €12.3million (announced December 2013).

(5): Howard G. Buffett Foundation (HGBF): Decatur, Illinois based.

- \$70 million in conservation/agriculture projects in South Africa.
- \$175million in Great Lakes initiatives: peace-building and conservation.

- Project: Kruger Park Intensive Conservation Protection Zone

- Donation: \$23.7million (2014-2017)

Implementers:

- South African National Parks Service (SANParks).
- Nature Conservation Trust: South Africa based.
- Leadership for Conservation in Africa (LCA).

(6): Elephant Crisis Fund:

(Joint initiative by Kenya-based Save the Elephants and San Francisco-based Wildlife Conservation Network). Target: \$5million

Major donor:

Leonardo DiCaprio Foundation, \$1million.

Implementers:

- Save the Elephants (Dr Iain Douglas-Hamilton).
- Wildlife Conservation Network.

(7): Google's Global Impact Awards: \$5million (globally)

Implementer: World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).



(8): SMART

Donors:

IUCN SOS
GEF

Implementers: CITES-MIKE, the Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS), the North Carolina Zoo (NCZ), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the Zoological Society of London (ZSL).

SMART is free open source software to measure, evaluate, and improve the effectiveness of wildlife law enforcement patrols and site-based conservation activities

(9) International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime

Donor: EU, is the main donor (EURO 1.73 million)

Implementers:

CITES
Interpol
UNODC
World Bank
World Customs Organisation

COUNTRIES: elephant and rhino

ANGOLA:

Project: Quicama/Kissama National Park (NB: only national park in Angola)

Donor:

- The Wild Foundation (Colorado based)

Implement:

- Quicama/Kissama Foundation

BOTSWANA:

Project: Elephants without Borders:

Donor/implementer:

- Paul G. Allen Foundation: ongoing

CAMEROON:

Project: Monitoring elephants in Cameroon:

Donors:

- US Fish and Wildlife Service.
- African Elephant Conservation Fund.
- Chester Zoo.

Implementer:

- ZSL (Zoological Society of London).
- African Wildlife Foundation.
- Societe Pallisco
- Ministere des Forets et de la Faune de la republique du Cameroon (MINOF).
- Societe Forestiere et Industrielle de la Doume (SFID).



Project: Dja Conservation Complex:

Donors:

- IUCN Save Our Species (SOS).
- Rufford
- Maurice Laing Foundation

Implementers:

- ZSL.
- Ministere des Forets et de la Faune de la Republique du Cameroon (MINOF).
- African Wildlife Foundation.

Urgent Conservation Action to Safeguard Elephants from Poachers in Cameroon's Bouba-Ndjidda National Park (Cameroon) April 2013-March 2014.

Donor:

- IUCN Save Our Species

Implementer:

- Leo Foundation

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC:

Project: Dzanga Sangha Protected Areas

Donor/implementers: WWF

REPUBLIC OF CONGO

Project: Nouabale-Ndoki National Park

Donor/implementers: WCS

CHAD:

Project: Zakouma National Park

Donors:

- EU: \$6.9million (2011-15)
- World Conservation Society (WCS): \$100,000 (annual)
- US Fish and Wildlife Service: \$115,000 (rapid response team)

Implement:

African Parks Foundation

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC of CONGO (DRC):

Donor: The World Bank (International Bank of Reconstruction and Development - IBRD): implementing agency for Global Environmental Facility (GEF): \$7million for DRC wildlife projects

Implement: Congolese Wildlife Authority (ICCN)

Project: Garamba National Park

Donors:

- EU (€5 million 2009-2013)
- Spanish government: €145,000 (2012)
- The World Bank: \$2.1 (2011-2013)
- US Fish and Wildlife Service: \$125,000, anti-poaching

Implement: African Parks Foundation



Project: Odzalala- Kokowa

Donors:

- EU: €5million (2012-2017)
- RAPAC (Reseau Des Aires Protegees D’Afrique Centrale): regional intergovernmental initiative supported by the EU: €1.8 million (2011-13)
- WWF-Netherlands: €666,666 (2011-2014)
- US Fish and Wildlife Service, \$300,000 (2013-2014), gorilla support operations.

Implement: African Parks Foundation.

Project: Virunga Park:

Major donors:

- Howard Buffett Foundation
- Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

Implementer: ICCN (Congolese Wildlife Authority)

ETHIOPIA:

Project: Babile Elephant Sanctuary

Donors: (non project specific):

- UNEP/ Global Environmental Facility
- United States Aid
- United States Forest Service
- Born Free Foundation: UK based
- Frankfurt Zoo
- GIZ (German)
- NABU (German)

Implementer: Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority

GABON:

Project: Minkebe National Park

Donor: Elephant Crisis Fund

Implenter: Parcs Gabon

Project: Ivinde National Park

Donor: Elephant Crisis Fund

Implenter: Parcs Gabon

Project: SOS - Wildlife Law Enforcement in Gabon, March 2014-November 2015

Donor:

- IUCN SOS

Implementer:

- Gabonese Government bodies



KENYA:

NB: All conservation activity is controlled both directly and indirectly by the Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS): while a major source of revenue from national park entrance fees, it both receives funds from international bodies – such as WWF and WCS – and implements projects.

Donor

- Google Global Impact Award, £500,000

Implement:

- Zoological Society of London (ZSL)

Project: Northern Rangelands Trust

- Donor: Fauna and Flora International
- Implementer: Northern Rangelands Trust

Project: Ol Pejeta Rhino Reserve

- Donor/implementer: Fauna and Flora International (FFI): £24,425 (2012)

Project: Lewa Wildlife Conservancy

Donor: TUSK (UK)

Project: Tsavo National Park

Donor: Save the Elephants

Implementer: Tsavo Trust

MALAWI:

Project: Majete Wildlife Reserve

Donors:

- Ms Anne Hoijer: €116,000 (2013-2015)
- Blijdorp Thandiza Foundation: €62,000 (2012)

Implement:

- African Parks Foundation

Project: Protection of Thuma Forest Reserve

Donor: German based 'Save the African Elephant'

Implementer: The Wildlife Action Group (WAG) - Malawi

Project: Dedza-Salima Forest Reserve

Donors:

- German based 'Save the African Elephant'
- Abraham Foundation: US based

Implementer: The Wildlife Action Group (WAG) – Malawi

Project: Lilongwe Wildlife Centre

Donor: TUSK (UK)

Project: Law enforcement and anti poaching Malawi-Zambia Nyika TFCA

Donor/Implementer:

- Peace Parks Foundation



MALI:

Project: Mali Elephant Programme

Donors:

- (lead): Darwin Initiative: £240, 600 (2012-2015): local partner: DNEF: Mali National Directorate for Water and Forests
- (lead): International Conservation Fund of Canada (ICFC)
- Save the Elephants
- TUSK (UK based)
- Save Our Species
- Saint Louis Zoo
- Disney Corp.
- African Parks Foundation.

Implementers:

- The Wild Foundation (Colorado based)
- (local partner): DNEF: Mali National Directorate for Water and Forests

Combating Elephant Poaching in the Gourma region (Mali) Nov 2012- April 2014

Donor:

- IUCN SOS

MOZAMBIQUE:

Project: Niassa Reserve

Donor: Fondation Segre

Donor/Implementer: Fauna and Flora International (FFI), £28,000 (2012)

Project: ranger training and law enforcement Maputo Reserve

Donor:

- Peace Parks Foundation, via donations from Dutch and Swedish Postcode Lotteries

Implementer:

- Peace Parks Foundation

Project: Capacity building and law enforcement

Donor/Implementer:

- TRAFFIC

NAMIBIA

Project: Proactive Monitoring and patrolling in the Kunene Region (Namibia) 2012 ongoing

Donor:

- IUCN SOS

Implementer:

- Save the Rhino International

http://www.sospecies.org/sos_projects/mammals/blackrhino/

donor, implementing partner is SRI

Project: Saving the last wild rhinos, ongoing

Donor/implementer: David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation



NIGERIA:

Project: Omo-Shasha-Oluwa Elephant Initiative

Donors:

- Pro-Natura International (Nigeria)
- Paignton Zoo
- Ondo State Government
- Ogun State Government
- Osun State Government

Implement:

- Nigeria Conservation Foundation

TANZANIA:

Project: Selous Game Reserve

Project: Amboseli Reserve

- Donor: Big Life Foundation, US based
- Implementer: HoneyGuide Foundation

Project: Tarangire Nature Reserve

- Donor: Wildlife Conservation Service

RWANDA:

Project: Akagera National Park

Donors:

- Walton Family Foundation (WFF): \$2.5million (2010-2014)
- Rwanda Development Board (RDB): \$250,000 (annual)

Implement:

- African Parks Foundation

SOUTH AFRICA

Project: rhino poaching in Kruger National Park

Donor:

- Howard G. Buffett Foundation Rhino poaching in Kruger Park US\$24 million 2014-2017

Implementer:

- SANParks
- The Nature Conservation Trust

Project: Rhino Poaching in Kruger National Park

Donor:

- GEF, R25 million

Implementer:

- SANParks

Project: Operation Last Chance

Against wildlife trafficking in South Africa, operational since May 2012, ongoing, global scale

Donor:

- David Shepherd Wildlife Foundation

Implementer:

- FREELAND

Project: Rhino Project

Donor/Implementer:

- Endangered Wildlife Trust

Project: Rhino programme

Multi approach (antipoaching, rural development)

http://www.wwf.org.za/what_we_do/rhino_programme/

Donor/ Implementer: WWF-South Africa

Project: EKZN anti poaching

Donor:

- Peace Parks Foundation, plus funding from Dutch and Swedish postcode lotteries

Implementer:

- PPF
- EKZN-Wildlife

SOUTH SUDAN:

Project: Boma-Jongeli Landscape

Donor/implementer: Wildlife Conservation Society

ZAMBIA:

Project: Bangweulu Wetlands

Donors:

- WWF Netherlands: €666,000 (annual, 2011-2014)
- UNEP Global Environmental Fund (GEF): \$634,000 (2011-2011)

Implement:

- African Parks Foundation

Project: Liuwa Plain National Park

Donors:

- Adessium Foundation (Netherlands based): €300,000 (2012)
- WWF Netherlands: €666,000 (per annum, 2011-2014)
- Anna McWane Foundation: \$35,000 (2012)
- WWF Zambia: \$50,000 (2012)
- Swedish Postcode Lottery: \$460,000 (2014).

Implement:

- African Parks Foundation

Zimbabwe


Zimbabwe Lowveld Rhino Conservation Programme

Donor:

- International Rhino Foundation

Implementer:

- International Rhino Foundation

- 
- Lowveld Rhino Trust, local communities of Chiredzi, Beitbridge, Bikita, Mwenezi and Chipinge Districts.

Black rhino monitoring programme (2003-present, Matusadona National Park)

Donor/Implementer:

Zambezi Society

Gonarezhou Conservation Project

initial work from 2007, established 2010 to run for 10 years (2010-2020).

Donor:

FZS

Implementer:

- FZS
- ZimParks

Project: Operation Stop Poaching Now

campaign to provide training and equipment to anti-poaching units in Zimbabwe and South Africa.

Donor:

- International Rhino Foundation