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## Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>African Elephant Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES</td>
<td>African Elephant Summit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfESG</td>
<td>African Elephant Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AfrSG</td>
<td>African Rhino Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARP</td>
<td>WWF-African Rhino Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARREST</td>
<td>Africa’s Regional Response to Endangered Species Trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN-WEN</td>
<td>Association of South East Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWF</td>
<td>African Wildlife Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRREP</td>
<td>Black Rhino Range Expansion Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPFIRE</td>
<td>Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBNRM</td>
<td>Community-based Natural Resource Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Conservation Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEED</td>
<td>Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Convention on Migratory Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoP</td>
<td>Conference of Parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPI</td>
<td>Corruption Perceptions Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>Endangered Species Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETIS</td>
<td>Elephant Trade Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FANR</td>
<td>Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FZS</td>
<td>Frankfurt Zoological Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environmental Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLTP</td>
<td>Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAWEN</td>
<td>Horn of Africa Wildlife Enforcement Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCF</td>
<td>International Conservation Caucus Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCWC</td>
<td>International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFAW</td>
<td>International Fund for Animal Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IIED</td>
<td>International Institute for Environment and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERPOL</td>
<td>International Criminal Police Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for the Conservation of Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAZA</td>
<td>Kavango-Zambezi TFCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LATF</td>
<td>Lusaka Agreement Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEAP</td>
<td>SADC Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT</td>
<td>Lowveld Rhino Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDGs</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEFDD</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry Economy and Sustainable Development (DRC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE</td>
<td>Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NACSO</td>
<td>Namibia Association of CBNRM Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPAD</td>
<td>New Partnership for African Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORGAN</td>
<td>Organ for Politics, Defence and Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAEAS</td>
<td>Pan African Elephant Aerial Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PES</td>
<td>Payments for Ecosystem Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBM</td>
<td>Ranger Based Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RISDP</td>
<td>SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPRC</td>
<td>Regional Programme for Rhino Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARPCCO</td>
<td>Southern African Regional Police Chiefs Co-operation Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIPO</td>
<td>Strategic Indicative Plan for Organ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPO-NRM &amp; Wildlife</td>
<td>Senior Programme Officer - Natural Resources and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SULi</td>
<td>Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>Technical Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TBNRM</td>
<td>Transboundary Natural Resources Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFCA</td>
<td>Transfrontier Conservation Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC</td>
<td>Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWIX</td>
<td>Trade in Wildlife Exchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNODC</td>
<td>United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environmental Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USF&amp;WS</td>
<td>US Fish and Wildlife Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCPC</td>
<td>SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>World Customs Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEN</td>
<td>Wildlife Enforcement Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WENSA</td>
<td>Wildlife Enforcement Network for Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Executive Summary

The SADC Region is facing the challenge of increased poaching of elephants, rhinos and other wildlife for illegal financial gain. In recent years, the trend for poaching has accelerated due to the high value of ivory and Rhino horn on the international black market, especially in south East Asia where markets provide a significant incentive for poaching. For example, a total 3,668 rhinos have been poached in South Africa since 2009. Worldwide, large-scale seizures of ivory, mostly originating in Africa had exceeded sustainable limits by 2013. Nevertheless, southern Africa still supports the largest remaining populations of elephants and rhinos in the world, challenging SADC Member States to collectively engage with both the region and the Asian consumer states to combat this unsustainable and illegal harvesting of wildlife.

Numerous international initiatives are being undertaken to combat the illegal killing and trade of wildlife as it has become a global issue beyond just a country or regional problem. These initiatives include international and inter-governmental meetings highlighting the crisis and garnering bi- and multi-lateral aid support, specific actions of UN bodies such CITES, ODC-ICCWC, INTERPOL and IUCN as well as international NGOs such as TRAFFIC and WWF.

Against this background, a meeting of SADC Ministers responsible for Environment and Natural Resources held on 3 October 2013 in Maputo, Mozambique resolved to:

(i) develop and adopt a comprehensive anti-poaching strategy;
(ii) establish a co-ordination Unit, within the Secretariat, whose primary role will be to coordinate natural resources related law enforcement and monitoring illegal harvesting of the resources;
(iii) invest in a robust education and communication program with a view to engage communities effectively to participate in national and cross-border efforts to fight poaching;
(iv) strengthen the institutional capacity at national levels for efficient and effective enforcement; and
(v) take advantage of existing opportunities through Transfrontier Conservation Areas, national action plans and relevant agreements to eliminate Illegal harvesting and unregulated exploitation of wildlife in SADC Member States.

The Ministers responsible for Environment and Natural Resources and the Ministerial Committee of the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Cooperation further resolved that the SADC Secretariat must work in collaboration with Members States to develop the strategy in countering the serious poaching occurring in the region. To this end a SADC Regional Consultative Workshop was held in Johannesburg, in October 2014 to develop a SADC Anti-Poaching Strategy. SADC Member States presented synopses of the current law enforcement and anti-poaching situation in their respective countries, including details of institutional arrangements, opportunities, and success factors amongst wildlife and other enforcement agencies in dealing with poaching and wildlife crime. Participants identified the main components of the law enforcement and anti-poaching strategy
including a draft set of strategic options that informed the development of the Strategy.

The SADC Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy (SADC LEAP) is embedded in the Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement.

The Vision of the Strategy is a SADC Region with thriving populations of wildlife species which are sustainably conserved for present and future generations.

Its Mission is to facilitate co-ordination and co-operation among Member States in the active protection and effective enforcement of laws relating to natural resources and wildlife conservation through sound policy guidance, the application of requisite knowledge and skills, and the best available technology for the benefit of the Region’s peoples.

The Purpose of the Strategy is to provide a framework for country and regional cooperation, together with international engagement on natural resource management and wildlife-related law enforcement and anti-poaching issues; paying special attention to issues that transcend national boundaries and to encourage concerted action by SADC Member States in the protection, management, conservation and sustainable use of their wildlife and other natural resources.

The Strategic Programme Areas to be addressed are:

1. Enhancement of legislation and judicial processes,
2. Minimization of wildlife crime and illegal trade,
3. Integration of people and nature,
4. Sustainable trade and use of natural resources, and
5. Improvement and strengthening of field protection.

In addition, the Strategy includes the establishment of a SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit.

To this end all SADC Member States are actively encouraged to participate in the government-led application and use of the UNODC ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit. Moreover, the Member States are encouraged to establish Task Forces at the national level to coordinate wildlife-related law enforcement and anti-poaching issues.

The Strategy serves as a guiding instrument that defines the roles and responsibilities of a Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit (WCPC) in meeting a clear set of strategic objectives aimed at enforcing the law more effectively, minimizing wildlife crime and illegal trade, integrating people and nature into conservation and development processes, ensuring sustainable trade and use of natural resources, locally, nationally and regionally, and improving and strengthening field protection of wildlife resources.
1 INTRODUCTION

The need for developing a SADC driven wildlife law enforcement and anti-poaching strategy comes from the growing global awareness of a wildlife crisis in Africa. At the forefront of the international debate are the unprecedented poaching levels of the African elephant and rhino. The crisis is not limited only to these charismatic species but also many others that are affected by increasing human population growth and associated habitat loss.

This document serves to inform the Member States of SADC of the need for a collective strategic approach to wildlife conservation and protection in the region, and how best to coordinate this strategy amongst the different wildlife conservation actors, within and outside SADC. Key issues include: the increasing pressure on land where the most intact assemblages of Africa’s wildlife are found; accommodating the fact that African people living in wildlife-rich areas need to receive tangible benefits from the sustainable use of this wildlife; and recognising that to tackle the international illegal trade requires the concerted actions of all Member States.

The Ministers responsible for Environment and Natural Resources and the Ministerial Committee of the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Cooperation, understanding the complexity of the causes and the rationale of poaching, resolved that the SADC Secretariat must work in collaboration with the Members States to develop a comprehensive law enforcement and anti-poaching strategy to counteract the alarming poaching going on across the network of protected areas in the region (Figure 1).

Figure 1: The national parks of southern Africa, December 2013 (Source: Peace Parks Foundation)
To achieve this it is essential to ensure that SADC has access to good quality and up-to-date information in order to inform the strategic options chosen and to monitor the outcomes. It is through this approach that SADC will be in a strong position to inform its members of what strategic institutional, policy and legal changes will be required to ensure the long term future of Africa’s wildlife heritage.

The strategy will serve as a guiding instrument that clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of the relevant regional institutions and stakeholders including the SADC Secretariat, which will coordinate the law enforcement anti-poaching activities. This will be achieved through the establishment and commissioning of a *SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention Coordination Unit* whose primary role will be to coordinate the efforts of Member State Task Forces responsible for enforcement of natural resources related laws and monitoring of illegal harvesting of these resources.

The SADC Protocol on Wildlife and Law Enforcement provides the framework for the development of the SADC Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy. Implementation of the LE&AP Strategy will directly address the Protocol’s scope, principles and objectives. Furthermore the strategy is aligned with its Articles underpinning legal instruments for the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife, wildlife management and conservation programmes, information sharing, cooperation in wildlife law enforcement and capacity building. Finally it complies with required institutional arrangements.

1.1 Transboundary use and protection of natural resources in the SADC region

The Transfrontier Conservation Area (TFCA) concept made its debut in Africa with the first Peace Park in 1990. It is defined by the Southern African Development Community’s (SADC) Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement as: ‘the area, or component of a large ecological region, that straddles the boundaries of two or more countries, encompassing one or more protected areas as well as multiple resources use areas’.
The platform of the TFCA initiative combines policies on wildlife conservation, community development and the promotion of culture and peace under one umbrella. It brings together a complex and diverse mosaic of land uses under a shared, joint management structure.

The SADC Member States have taken the lead in the formal designation, establishment, and political recognition of TFCAs in southern Africa. With strong political support, TFCAs are increasingly being embraced at all levels of society – local communities, governments, conservation and tourism organizations, bilateral and multilateral aid agencies, the private sector and NGOs. As of 31 May 2013, SADC had 18 existing and potential TFCAs in various stages of development (Figure 2). The TFCAs range in size from the Kavango-Zambezi (KAZA) TFCA of > 500,000 km² (number 3 on the map) to the Chimanimani TFCA of 2,056 km² (number 9 on the map). Together they cover an area of c. 1,006,170 km².

1.2 Overview and challenges facing SADC Wildlife Resource protection

Whilst the focus of the strategy is on two of Africa’s most charismatic species, elephant and rhino, this should not detract from components of the strategy addressing other endangered plant and animal species, including the great apes, pangolin, marine mammals and turtles, fresh- and salt water fish and a range of bird species, including important migratory birds such as vultures.

The loss of important habitats and their plant species through destruction, deforestation, illegal logging and commercial timber trade is no less important, and where wildlife crime involves one or more of these commodities being illegally traded together, crime issues affecting one species should not be at the expense of another. Applying the law should be equal in the case of all natural resources.

While the overall trend in west and east Africa reflects a decline in wildlife numbers as a result of a combination of encroachment, illegal hunting and the reduction in availability of suitable habitat, the assembly of large mammal species in southern Africa is relatively stable. For example, the region supports between 250,000 to 300,000 elephants whilst lion, leopard, buffalo, kudu, zebra and other antelopes also occur in large numbers. Although rhino are present in relatively small numbers, the region still has a high proportion of the world’s population of this species.

This is partly due to the expansion of protected areas but also a result of southern Africa subscribing to two long-term overarching conservation principles – ecosystem conservation and sustainable use of natural resources. Ecosystem-scale conservation is needed to protect and maintain ecological processes, such as migration and ecological succession. This requires the implementation of innovative community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) policies outside of protected areas, while the natural capital inherent in natural resources within functioning ecosystems in protected areas is crucial to the economic growth of communities and the private sector. The synergy between wildlife conservation and rural development is achieved by integrating sustainable use of natural resources with ecosystem conservation.
1.2.1 Status, distribution and numbers of elephant

The African Elephant (Loxodonta africana) occurs in at least 35 Range States in all four African regions (Table 10). Many savannah populations have suffered heavy poaching losses since 2009 but an up-to-date continental dataset is not yet available. The distribution of elephants varies considerably across the four regions, with small fragmented populations in West Africa, and large tracts of range remaining in southern Africa. Southern Africa has by far the largest known number of elephants in any region, holding just over 52% of the continent’s DEFINITE plus PROBABLE elephants. Eastern Africa holds just over 28%, Central Africa 17% and West Africa 1.6%.

Table 1: African Elephant numbers: continental and regional totals 2013 (Source 2013 Africa Analysis-African Elephant Database 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Speculative</th>
<th>Range Area (km²)</th>
<th>% of Continental Range</th>
<th>% of Range Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>20,159</td>
<td>65,104</td>
<td>24,423</td>
<td>49,083</td>
<td>1,005,234</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>130,921</td>
<td>12,966</td>
<td>16,700</td>
<td>7,566</td>
<td>873,318</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>254,937</td>
<td>12,486</td>
<td>13,051</td>
<td>49,317</td>
<td>1,312,302</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>7,107</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>175,552</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>422,955</td>
<td>82,027</td>
<td>44,859</td>
<td>109,015</td>
<td>3,366,405</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the SADC Member States (Table 2), Botswana (154,271 DEFINITES plus PROBABLES) holds by far the largest population followed by Zimbabwe (51,141 DEFINITES plus PROBABLES, although this latter number needs to be revised upwards in the light of recent findings). Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa and Zambia also hold large elephant populations but data are scanty for Angola. Smaller populations persist in Swaziland and Malawi. While numbers seem to be increasing in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, there appear to be large declines in some of the populations in Mozambique and Tanzania. Tanzania with a known elephant range of 387,538 km² supported an estimated 105,629 elephants (DEFINITES plus PROBABLES) according to the 2012 African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG) African Elephant Database (AED). The vast majority of Eastern Africa’s known elephants are in just two countries, Tanzania and Kenya.

Table 2: African elephant numbers in the SADC elephant range states 2013 (Source 2013 Africa Analysis-African Elephant Database 2012)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Definite</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Speculative</th>
<th>Known Range Area (km²)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>851</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>406,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>133,088</td>
<td>21,183</td>
<td>21,183</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100,253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The AfESG collates all available survey data and works to standardise and improve the precision of the aerial and ground count methodologies used. Survey costs are invariably high and are seldom financed by Governments without external assistance. Thus securing funding for surveys is a perennial challenge, and so the recent announcement of a $7m grant from the Paul G. Allen Foundation to the Botswana-based NGO Elephants Without Borders to implement a series of aerial surveys across the elephant’s range in partnership with Governments and a number of other competent NGOs is an important contribution to the overall monitoring effort. Known as the Pan African Elephant Aerial Survey (PAEAS), this exercise covered savannah populations throughout much of eastern and southern Africa, as well as some savannah areas in central and West Africa during 2014.

Overall, the species is currently listed as Vulnerable on the IUCN Red List. An increasing number of populations are being reduced to critically low numbers as a result of a range of threats including large scale poaching and the illegal ivory trade. This is confirmed by data derived from two key CITES monitoring programmes namely, Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) and the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS). Other threats include habitat destruction, human-wildlife conflict and drought. All populations of African elephant have been listed on CITES Appendix I since 1989, except for four national populations that were transferred to Appendix II, namely Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe in 1997, and South Africa in 2001.

### 1.2.2 Status, distribution and numbers of black and white rhino

Two subspecies of white rhino are recognized: the Southern White Rhino (*Ceratotherium simum simum*) in southern Africa, and Northern White Rhino (*C. s. cottoni*), with currently only one confirmed population of four animals of the latter subspecies residing on a private Kenyan conservancy.

The Southern White Rhino is now the most numerous of the rhino taxa, with South Africa (~19,000) remaining the stronghold for this subspecies despite increased poaching. There are smaller reintroduced populations within the historical range of the species in Namibia, Botswana, Zimbabwe and Swaziland. Populations of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>1,708</td>
<td>3,036</td>
<td>5,099</td>
<td>3,831</td>
<td>276,209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>7,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>17,753</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>3,383</td>
<td>2,297</td>
<td>342,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>16,054</td>
<td>4,472</td>
<td>4,492</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>22,889</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>95,351</td>
<td>10,278</td>
<td>10,927</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>387,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>14,961</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,111</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>201,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>47,366</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>45,375</td>
<td>76,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SADC</strong></td>
<td>350,888</td>
<td>50,078</td>
<td>53,039</td>
<td>54,048</td>
<td>1,976,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Southern White Rhino have also been introduced outside of the known former range of the subspecies to Kenya, Uganda and to Zambia (Table 3).

The Black Rhino (Diceros bicornis) was the most numerous of the world's rhino species but relentless hunting of the species and clearances of land for settlement and agriculture reduced numbers and by 1960 only an estimated 100,000 remained. Between 1960 and 1995, large-scale poaching caused a dramatic 98% collapse in numbers.

Three recognized subspecies of Black Rhinoceros now remain, occupying different areas of eastern and southern Africa.

- The stronghold for *D. b. bicornis* is in Namibia and South Africa. Following translocations from Namibia and subsequent population growth, numbers of this subspecies are increasing in South Africa with its distribution covering more arid areas in the south west of the country, and expanding into the Eastern Cape.
- *D. b. michaeli* was distributed from southern Sudan, Ethiopia, and Somalia, through Kenya into northern-central Tanzania and Rwanda. Its current stronghold is Kenya with smaller numbers occurring in northern Tanzania.
- *D. b. minor* is believed to have occurred from southern Tanzania through Zambia, Zimbabwe, and Mozambique to the northern, north-western and north-eastern parts of South Africa. It also probably occurred in southern Democratic Republic of the Congo, northern Angola, eastern Botswana, Malawi, and Swaziland. Today, its stronghold is South Africa and to a lesser extent Zimbabwe, with smaller numbers remaining in southern Tanzania. It is probably now extinct in Angola and Mozambique. The subspecies has also been reintroduced to Botswana, Malawi, Swaziland and Zambia.

The latest available data on the status of all rhino species and sub-species extant in southern Africa today are given in Table 3.

Table 3: Numbers of white and black rhinos in southern Africa as of 31 Dec 2012 by country and subspecies (Source AfRSG³)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Subspecies</th>
<th>White Rhino <em>Ceratotherium simum</em> C.s.simum</th>
<th>Black Rhino <em>Diceros bicornis</em> D.b.bicornis</th>
<th>D.b.michaeli</th>
<th>D.b.minor</th>
<th>Total BR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angola</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td></td>
<td>185</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown, the majority of Africa’s (black and white) rhinos are conserved by just three SADC range states: South Africa, Namibia, and Zimbabwe. The White Rhino as a species is currently listed as Near Threatened on the IUCN Red List, but its status is under review because if current poaching trends continue unabated it could soon qualify for re-classification as either Vulnerable or Endangered. The Black Rhino is listed as Critically Endangered.

All African rhino species were listed on CITES Appendix I by 1977, and all international commercial trade in rhinos and their products was prohibited. However, following a continued increase in numbers, the South African population of Southern White Rhino was downlisted in 1994 to Appendix II, but only for trade in live animals to “approved and acceptable destinations” and for the (continued) export of hunting trophies. In 2004, Swaziland’s Southern White Rhino were also downlisted to CITES Appendix II, but only for live export and for limited export of hunting trophies according to specified annual quotas. Both South Africa and Namibia have secured hunting quotas for Black Rhino; however only Namibia has issued hunting permits including that for a single Black Rhino that was auctioned as a hunting trophy in Namibia in 2013.

2 RATIONALE FOR THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ANTI-POACHING STRATEGY

Poverty in rural Africa as indexed by child mortality has led to unprecedented levels of ivory, rhino horn and bushmeat harvesting, mostly unregulated or illegal, resulting in major wildlife declines. This is exacerbated by increasing demands for bushmeat by the urban poor so that it becomes an easy step to commercialising an otherwise basic rural household need to provide cash to meet the cost of other material or worldly goods.

Given the current black market prices that can be realised for a number of high-valued natural resources ranging from ivory and horn to bones and other body parts, the shift from commercial bushmeat trade to poaching and trade in these resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Swaziland</th>
<th>Tanzania</th>
<th>Zambia</th>
<th>Zimbabwe</th>
<th>SADC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>18,933</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>1,792</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>127</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>20,021</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>2,323</td>
<td>4,451</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The AFRSG are in the process of updating this data set in preparation for CITES COP16

---

is simple and straightforward for bush-savvy rural entrepreneurs who view poaching and wildlife crime as a “high reward-low risk” business undertaking. The extremely high value in particular of elephant ivory and rhino horn has led to the collapse of a number of elephant sub-populations and less than 5,000 surviving black rhinos on the continent.

The increasing costs of protection estimated at US$200-400 km² together with the loss in biodiversity and monetary terms of this wildlife, the potential impact on tourism receipts and the elevation of illegal wildlife activity to that of serious global crime is now of major concern to international organisations and national governments.

2.1 Overview of current levels of rhino and elephant poaching in the SADC region

Land use pressure, range and habitat loss, human elephant conflict, and illegal killing for both meat and ivory all pose threats to the long-term survival of elephant populations across Africa. However, by far the most acute threat facing African elephants arises from large scale poaching and the illegal ivory trade as confirmed by data derived from the CITES monitoring programme Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) and Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS).

This was highlighted in a report prepared by the CITES Secretariat, IUCN / SSC African Elephant Specialist Group and TRAFFIC International in 2013. This report confirmed the resuscitation of poaching that started to increase again in the mid-2000s following an easing in the 1990s. The rate of increase jumped dramatically from 2009 to unsustainably high levels as indicated by the overall weight and number of large-scale ivory seizures (more than 500kg) in 2013 that exceeds any previous year in the ETIS data (Figure 3).

![Figure 3: ETIS data showing trends in large-scale ivory seizures world-wide (number of seizures >500 kg) 2009-2013. Values along vertical axis in kg](image-url)
The MIKE analysis of PIKE (Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants) values suggests that >12,000 elephants were illegally killed at the 42 monitored MIKE sites between 2009-2013 and that the estimated poaching rate of 7.4% in 2012 exceeds natural population growth rates (usually no more than 5%).

The AfRSG has provided updated rhino poaching numbers up to the end of June 2014 (Table 4). Poaching at a continental level continued to escalate with just over 1,100 being recorded poached in 2013 and 1,250 in 2014. South Africa, which conserves 82% of Africa’s rhinos, experienced the most poaching in absolute terms since 2009.

Table 4: Reported numbers of white and black rhinos poached in Africa from 2010 to 2014 (http://www.stoprhinopoaching.com/statistics.aspx)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1 (min)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>1,004</td>
<td>1,215</td>
<td>3,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>432</strong></td>
<td><strong>525</strong></td>
<td><strong>752</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,108</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,248</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,065</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.1.1 Trade Patterns in Ivory and Rhino Horn

The ETIS data indicates that in the period from 2009 through 2013, at least 77 large-scale ivory seizures occurred (Fig. 3). Whether this constitutes an increase in actual illegal trade volumes or reflects improved law enforcement in particular countries remains to be determined. It is known however, that the upward surge in terms of the weight of ivory seized from 2009 through 2011 does represent increased illegal activity that is being driven by consignments in the large-scale weight class. Further, such seizures are indicative of the presence of organised crime in the illicit ivory trade, which often involves Asian-run, Africa-based sourcing of ivory.

According to TRAFFIC, the raw data on large-scale ivory seizures represent the salient evidence of ivory trade crime orchestrated by transnational criminal operatives. Because large-scale seizures of ivory typically generate media coverage and become known soon after they occur, tracking them serves as a crude early indicator of the illicit ivory trade as a whole. For this reason, the 2013 data are regarded with considerable alarm as they suggest that the illegal trade in ivory is continuing to increase. Furthermore the ETIS seizure data allows an analysis of the routes followed by illegal ivory when in transit between supply countries in Africa.
and consumer countries in SE Asia, and show how these keep changing in order to elude detection.

The MIKE programme has statistically evaluated relationships between PIKE levels and a wide range of ecological, biophysical and socio-economic factors at the site, national and global levels. Three factors consistently emerge as very strong predictors of poaching levels and trends.

**Poverty at the site level:** Infant mortality emerged in successive MIKE analyses as the strongest indicator linking high levels of poverty with high levels of elephant poaching. More recently the proportion of people living in extreme poverty (defined as people living with less than US$ 1.25 per day) in and around MIKE sites was tested and found to be as strong a predictor of PIKE at the site level as the infant mortality rate.

**Governance at the national level:** At the national level, the strongest correlate of PIKE is governance, as measured by Transparency International’s Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) or the World Bank’s Worldwide Governance Indicators. High poaching levels are more prevalent in countries where governance is weaker, and vice versa. This is likely to be a causal relationship, with poor governance facilitating the illegal killing of elephants and movement of illegal ivory, be it through ineffective law enforcement or active aiding and abetting by unscrupulous officials.

**Demand for illegal ivory at the global level:** The illegal killing of elephants for ivory is driven and sustained by demand from consumers who are willing to pay for illegal ivory. ETIS analyses indicate that, in recent years, China has become the world’s largest consumer of illegal ivory. This is corroborated by the fact that that temporal PIKE trends are strongly related to patterns in consumer spending in that country. This relationship does not hold for other traditional destination markets for ivory (Europe, USA or Japan) or for countries known to be important transit points in the ivory trade chain (Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand or Viet Nam).

Currently the four SADC elephant range states with elephant populations on Appendix II of CITES (Zimbabwe, Botswana, South Africa and Namibia) may not apply to sell ivory until after 2017. This implies that they cannot submit a proposal to CITES until CoP 18 (in 2019) at the earliest. States with elephants on Appendix I (Tanzania, Zambia and Mozambique) may not apply to sell ivory. The earliest any Appendix 1 state may apply to downlist its elephant populations to Appendix II would be at the next CoP17 in South Africa (in 2016). No seized illegal ivory may ever be sold.

There is, however, a considerable divergence of opinion amongst professional conservationists as to whether or not totally banning the trade in ivory is in the elephants’ best interests. This often heated debate has been raging since the CITES ban of 1989, and continues to this day. The related literature is extensive. Amongst the latest pro-trade inputs are arguments (which are largely driven from within southern Africa) based on claims that the massive increase in ivory poaching in Africa
is not being driven by rising demand for carved ivory in China, but by speculative stockpiling of ivory in China, and that the current policies of stamping down on the illegal ivory trade are actually fuelling the main driving force behind poaching, creating a counter-productive positive feedback loop. On the anti-trade side (which by and large originate from outside of Africa and are driven by powerful foreign based NGOs), recent inputs based on advanced economic analyses of market and trader behaviour indicate that a properly controlled and supervised legal trade as a mechanism for balancing supply and demand can never be attained in a corrupt world.

Clearly there is no simple solution to the ivory trading dilemma as both camps are deeply entrenched in their opinions. This is fundamental to the position that SADC as a whole adopts: whether to trade and improve in situ protection, governance and poverty alleviation or whether to work towards stopping or at least minimising the demand by imposing far greater draconian and costly law enforcement programmes than those that are currently in place.

Ultimately the decision of the Conference of the Parties of CITES will determine this: SADC should therefore be in a position to put forward sound recommendations based on adequate consensus among its members and on scientifically informed opinion.

2.1.2 Bushmeat Crisis

The single most important cause of wildlife declines in most of Africa is a result of the uncontrolled commercial bushmeat trade. Central and Western Africa are arguably the most affected with demand greatly outweighing the sustainable level of production of the forest ecosystems. In countries with high levels of urbanization (e.g. Dar es Salaam, Nairobi, Lusaka, Maputo), the demand for bushmeat is high as it is consumed as a “luxury” item in urban areas.

Developing regulated and sustainable systems to counter the demand for bushmeat in socio-economic environments with acute poverty levels is extremely complex and time consuming. This requires fundamental changes to existing legal frameworks and developing the capacity of local communities to manage wildlife. Some CBNRM programmes have embraced this (in Namibia for example) but in instances where communities occur in high densities (Mozambique, Tanzania) there is a fear that by the time the regulatory frameworks are in place and capacities of local communities for sustainable wildlife harvesting have been built, most of the wildlife will already have disappeared from areas outside of protected areas. Unfortunately under this scenario it will be necessary to maintain an active law enforcement regime in parallel with testing pilot schemes to develop models for the regulated participatory management of bushmeat harvesting in rural areas.

In Southern Africa the bushmeat problem, while still less acute than that found elsewhere in Africa, is rapidly growing and impacting on wildlife populations in and around protected areas. This can only undermine community wildlife management programmes and needs to be addressed.
2.2 Responses to managing elephant populations and the poaching crisis

Preceding the current wave of elephant and other poaching, a number of regional and national planning initiatives took place:

The African Elephant Action Plan was finalized and approved as a consensus document by all 35 African Elephant Range States at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Doha, 2010. The document was facilitated by the AfESG and the CITES Secretariat in response to a Decision of the CITES Parties to develop such a plan and an African Elephant Fund with an indicative budget of US$97 million to implement the eight priority objectives aimed at securing, and restoring where possible, sustainable elephant populations throughout their present and potential range in Africa. Unfortunately insufficient attention was paid to this plan and implementation of the eight priority objectives has still to take place.

At both SADC and national levels, action plans and strategies have been developed by 15 countries over the last ten years. The existing strategies relevant to SADC include:

- Southern Africa Regional Elephant Conservation and Management Strategy, 2005
- Zimbabwe (2014, in prep.)
- South Africa does not have a national strategy, but undertook a comprehensive assessment process in 2008.

2.3 SADC obligations and current international responses

SADC Member States are signatory to and members of a number of international Conventions and Organisations which include:

*UN Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora – CITES*

CITES regulates international trade in specimens of species of wild fauna and flora, i.e., export, re-export and import of live and dead animals and plants and of parts and derivatives thereof, based on a system of permits and certificates which can only be issued if certain conditions are met and that have to be presented before
consignments of specimens are allowed to leave or enter a country. Each Party must designate one or more Management Authorities responsible for issuing these permits and certificates, subject to the advice from one or more Scientific Authorities designated for that purpose. The animal and plant species subject to different degrees of regulation are listed in three appendices:

- **Appendix I** includes species threatened with extinction, for which trade must be subject to particularly strict regulation, and only authorized in exceptional circumstances.
- **Appendix II** species are not necessarily now threatened with extinction but may become so unless trade is strictly regulated. Appendix II further contains so-called look-alike species, which are controlled because of their similarity in appearance to the other regulated species, thereby facilitating a more effective control thereof.
- **Appendix III** contains species that are subject to regulation within the jurisdiction of a Party and for which the cooperation of other Parties is needed to control the trade.

SADC Member States signatory to the Convention are obliged to implement the resolutions of the CITES CoP.

**Convention on Biological Diversity - CBD**

The Convention has three main goals: conservation of biological diversity (or biodiversity); sustainable use of its components; and fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising from genetic resources.

The CBD Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is an international agreement which aims at sharing the benefits arising from the utilization of genetic resources in a fair and equitable way. It entered into force on 12 October 2014.

**Convention on Migratory Species – CMS**

The Convention on Migratory Species, also known as the Bonn Convention, aims to conserve terrestrial, aquatic and avian migratory species throughout their range.

**International Criminal Police Organisation – INTERPOL**

The International Criminal Police Organization (OIPC - ICPO), or INTERPOL, is an intergovernmental organization facilitating international police cooperation. It was established as the International Criminal Police Commission (ICPC) in 1923.

**UN Office on Drugs and Crime – ODC**

UNODC is a global leader in the fight against illicit drugs and international crime. Established in 1997 through a merger between the United Nations Drug Control
Programme and the Centre for International Crime Prevention, UNODC operates in all regions of the world through an extensive network of field offices.

2.3.1 United Nations

United Nations Environment Assembly Decision on Illegal Trade in Wildlife

A resolution on the Illegal Trade in Wildlife was adopted by the Inaugural Meeting of the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA) of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), which took place in Nairobi, Kenya 23-27 June 2014. The resolution strongly encourages member states and regional economic integration organizations to:

- Implement their commitments already taken in other forums;
- Provide leadership and mobilize resources;
- Take targeted action to eradicate the supply, transit of and demand for illegal wildlife products;
- Support work to reinforce the legal framework and strengthen capacity of the entire enforcement chain;
- Promote cross-agency cooperation at all levels to tackle the environmental, economic, social and security dimensions of the illegal trade in wildlife and its related products;
- Initiate and promote action to further strengthen regional and international cooperation between source, transit and destination countries;
- Promote and implement policies of zero tolerance toward all illegal activities, including associated corruption;
- Support the development of sustainable and alternative livelihoods for communities affected by the illegal trade in wildlife and its adverse impacts with the full engagement of communities; and
- Enhance cooperation for the timely and cost-efficient repatriation of live illegally-traded wildlife.

2.3.2 Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

The Millennium Development Goals were adopted by the World Summit to reduce poverty and improve human wellbeing. They comprise of quantitative goals, time targets over a 25 years period (1990-2015) and numerical indicators of poverty reduction, combating HIV and AIDS and improvements in health, education, gender equality and women empowerment, the environment and other aspects of human wellbeing (UNDP, 2004). Goal number 1 (Eradication of extreme poverty and hunger) and goal number 7 (Ensuring environmental sustainability) are the key goals addressed by the wildlife sector to which all SADC Member States commit themselves.

Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)

The development of the Sustainable Development Goals is intended to support the Post-2015 Development Agenda. The 17 Sustainable Development Goals are accompanied by targets and will be further elaborated through indicators focused on
measurable outcomes. They are action oriented, global in nature and universally applicable to all countries, while taking into account different national realities, capacities and levels of development and respecting national policies and priorities. These goals constitute an aspirational set of global priorities for sustainable development. Targets are defined as global targets, with each government setting its own national targets guided by the global level of ambition but taking into account national circumstances. The goals and targets integrate economic, social and environmental aspects and recognize their interlinkages in achieving sustainable development in all its dimensions.

This Strategy supports the objective of Goal 15: Protect and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, halt desertification, land degradation and biodiversity loss.

2.3.3 European Union

The European Union (EU) has commissioned a six-volume report that describe how the EU can assist in building an inclusive strategic approach to the conservation of African wildlife that involves all political and organisational stakeholders working for the benefit of Africa, its wildlife heritage and its peoples. In developing its strategic approach, the EU recognizes the growing global awareness of a wildlife crisis in Africa that is not limited to a few iconic African wildlife species such as elephant and rhinos but a wide range of species in all biomes. The approach recognises the importance of maintaining the protected area network but also emphasizes that African people living in wildlife-rich areas need to receive tangible benefits as a result of their efforts in the conservation of Africa’s wildlife. Thirdly efforts to tackle the international illegal trade require concerted actions to stop the killing, stop the trafficking and stop the demand for wildlife and forest products. Fourthly good quality and up-to-date information is essential in order to inform the choice of strategic options and monitor outcomes. Lastly, all of the above will require a whole raft of institutional, policy and legal improvements or changes to occur in parallel.

Thus the EU strategic approach primarily targets the conservation of large functioning ecosystems or landscapes supporting key African wildlife populations. A secondary tactic is to make conservation funds available to agencies and projects protecting small important sites that cannot be contained in the large key landscapes identified. The indicative priority actions include:

- In situ support for key landscapes for conservation and important individual sites;
- Institution building - strengthening sectoral management and coordination for wildlife conservation at the national and regional level;
- Dismantling wildlife crime networks and curbing the demand through actions to strengthen policies and laws, actions to stop the killing, actions to stop the trafficking and actions to stop the demand;
- Tackling the issue of unsustainable wild animal protein use;
- Research and monitoring;
- Awareness raising and communication;
- Funding;
The European Parliament adopted a comprehensive resolution in January 2014 calling for an EU Action Plan. February 2014, the Commission adopted a Communication on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking (COM(2014) 347)14, which launched a broad stakeholder consultation and led to an expert conference in April 2014. Most contributions, including those received from 16 Member States, called for stepping up efforts and supported an EU Action Plan. Other relevant policies with which coherence and consistency needs to be ensured are existing EU policies with a link to illegal trade in natural resources, such as the EU policy on Forest Law Enforcement, Governance and Trade (FLEGT) and the EU Roadmap towards eliminating illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds, or the EU policy against Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing, as well as EU initiatives against trafficking in waste, drugs, counterfeit goods, firearms or human beings.

2.3.4 United Kingdom

The rapid escalation of illegal wildlife trafficking galvanised a number of high-level international meetings, such as the London Conference on the Illegal Wildlife Trade in February 2014. Emerging from this meeting was a declaration by the countries attending the meeting to stamp out illegal wildlife trade. These included actions to:

- Eradicate the market for illegal wildlife products,
- Ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents.
- Strengthening law enforcement
- Sustainable livelihoods and economic development

The meeting concluded that the way forward to successfully tackling the illegal wildlife trade and its impacts needed concerted political leadership, community engagement and international cooperation over a sustained period. To support these efforts further research is needed into the scale of the environmental, political, social and economic implications of the trade, as well as an improved understanding of the illegal trade itself and the impact of measures taken to prevent and combat it.

2.3.5 United States

The Tanzania declaration is underpinned by the United States National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking released in February 2014 that established the guiding principles and strategic priorities for U.S. efforts to stem illegal trade in wildlife. This Plan follows the structure and objectives of the three Strategic Priorities identified in the Strategy:

- Strengthen Enforcement – Implementing this Strategic Priority entails improving efforts in the United States to stop illegal trade in wildlife and to enforce laws prohibiting and penalizing wildlife trafficking, including requiring forfeiture of the financial profits and instruments of that illegal
activity. In addition to improving coordination and prioritizing wildlife trafficking across enforcement, regulatory, and intelligence agencies in the United States, this Strategic Priority also calls for improving global enforcement efforts by supporting partner countries to build enforcement capacity and to undertake multinational enforcement operations targeting illegal trade in wildlife.

• Reduce Demand for Illegally Traded Wildlife – As a Strategic Priority, reducing demand for illegally traded wildlife calls for raising public awareness of the harms done by wildlife trafficking through outreach in the United States and public diplomacy abroad. Efforts here will seek to enlist individual consumers in the US and other nations in this fight through education and outreach to reduce demand for these products, and change consumption patterns that drive wildlife trafficking.

• Build International Cooperation, Commitment, and Public-Private Partnerships – Implementing this Strategic Priority will use diplomacy to mobilize global support for, and encourage active participation of partners in, the fight against wildlife trafficking, commit to strengthening implementation of international agreements that protect wildlife, and build partnerships to develop and implement innovative and effective approaches to combating this crime.

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USF&WS) wildlife regulations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) may restrict the import of certain wildlife products irrespective of their classification under CITES.

2.3.6 Africa


The African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, also known as the Algiers Convention, was originally formulated in 1968 and revised and adopted by the African Union (AU) in Maputo in July 2003 to take into account more modern international developments in approaches to the management of biological diversity and natural resources, such as the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Convention on Combating Desertification (UNCCD). The main objective of the African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources is to encourage individual and joint action for the conservation, utilization and development of soil, water, flora and fauna, for the present and future welfare of humankind. The Convention has the following objectives:

• To enhance environmental protection;
• To foster the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources; and
• To harmonize and coordinate policies in these fields with a view to achieving ecologically rational, economically sound and socially acceptable development policies and programmes
It aims to:

- Adopt effective measures to conserve and improve the soil; and to control erosion and land use;
- Establish policies to conserve, utilize and develop water resources; to prevent pollution; and to control water use;
- Protect flora and ensure its best utilization; ensure good management of forests; and control burning, land clearance and overgrazing;
- Conserve fauna resources and use them wisely; manage populations and habitats; control hunting, capture and fishing; and prohibit the use of poisons, explosives and automatic weapons in hunting;
- Tightly control traffic in trophies, in order to prevent trade in illegally killed and illegally obtained trophies; and
- Reconcile customary rights with the convention.

The Convention has been signed by a number of AU Member States but has yet to come into force.

**African Elephant Summit**

The African Elephant Summit (AES) co-hosted by Botswana and IUCN took place in Gaborone in December 2013. It addressed a conviction that, given the magnitude of the problem, and the fact that illegal trade is increasingly entrenched in organized crime networks, the African elephant crisis required political commitments at the highest level of government to secure viable elephant populations across the continent and to halt the illegal ivory trade at all points along its value chain. The AES brought together senior representatives of African elephant range States, ivory transit states, and the States that are the major consumers of ivory to secure their commitment to take urgent measures designed to remove barriers to effective elephant protection and significantly reduce the amounts of illegal ivory in trade. The Summit adopted a set of 14 Urgent Measures required over a 12 month period from both supply and consumer states.

This was followed by a similar high-powered regional summit held in Arusha, Tanzania called by the International Conservation Caucus Foundation (ICCF) in November 2014. This meeting was attended by high-level delegates from the region and around the world and included Ministers and senior officials from Burundi, Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Malawi, Mozambique, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe, as well as development partner nations such as Belgium, China, the European Union, France, Germany, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States to discuss issues of regional wildlife crime. Eight of the 11 countries that attended this meeting signed a declaration to combat illegal wildlife trafficking.

**Kasane Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade**
Heads of State, ministers and officials from 31 governments met in Kasane, Botswana in March 2015 to reaffirm their determination to scale up their response to the global poaching crisis, and adopt new measures to help tackle the illegal wildlife trade.

The governments reported on their progress since the London Conference on Illegal Wildlife Trade in February 2014. All participants committed to provide the political leadership and practical support needed to:

- Eradicate the market for illegal wildlife products
- Ensure effective legal frameworks and deterrents
- Strengthen law enforcement
- Develop sustainable livelihoods and economic development

2.4 Response from within Southern African Range States in SADC

At the Ministerial Committee Meeting of the Organ (MCO) held in July 2012, the Parks and Wildlife Sub-Sub Committee address the issue of cross border poaching of rhino and elephant, noting that the increase in incidents called for the need to strengthen joint operations and cross border cooperation among Member States. The decision reached by MCO directed the Secretariat to convene a meeting of experts to developed Cross-Border Wildlife Anti-Poaching Strategies by October 2012; and urged Member States to commit themselves to joint operations and sharing of information.

Following up on this meeting in July 2015, the MCO recalled that, at its meeting held in Swakopmund, Namibia, in July 2014, it noted that the Secretariat, through the Directorate responsible for Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR) was in the process of developing the Cross Border Wildlife Anti-Poaching Strategy, and that a Conference on Anti-Poaching was convened in July 2014, in Johannesburg, South Africa. It also noted that the Police Chiefs meeting held in May 2015 in South Africa, observed with concern the increased crime of poaching of elephants and rhinos. Moreover MCO noted that criminals continue to take advantage of the Region’s porous border systems.

The MCO directed that:

(i) The Secretariat to finalise the above Anti-Poaching Strategy for consideration by MCO in 2016;
(ii) Urged Member States to provide written inputs to the Secretariat for consolidation by August 2015;
(iii) Urged Member States to carry out surveillance and share information/intelligence on the movement of suspects involved in poaching;
(iv) Urged Member States to establish a regional DNA database for rhinos and elephants at the Regional Bureau based in Harare, for the management of these endangered species; and
(v) Urged Member States to continue engaging in simultaneous and bilateral operations targeting elephant and rhino poaching.

Disposal of Ivory Stockpile

With regard to ivory stockpiles held by Member States, the MCO recalled that, at its meeting held in Swakopmund, Namibia, in July 2014, it noted that there is a need for Member States to develop a common approach on the disposal of the ivory stockpile and urged Member States to do so in line with the Convention for International Trade of Endangered Species of fauna and flora (CITES). The PSSC held in June 2015, Pretoria, South Africa discussed the above and urged the Secretariat in collaboration with the Directorate responsible for Food Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR) to convene a meeting to develop common approaches for the management of ivory stockpile in line with CITES and for Member States to volunteer to host a meeting in that regard. MCO also noted that the Republic of Namibia volunteered to host a meeting to develop common approaches for the management of ivory stockpiles in line with CITES.

In addition to the above, several in-country and local SADC initiatives have taken place that address the common theme raised at international meetings.

The Tanzania Government in collaboration with UNDP has formulated a National Strategy to Combat Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade. The strategy provides an effective program of support to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trafficking in Tanzania through a three-pronged approach: (i) Strengthening law enforcement through investing in capacity building to strengthen law enforcement; establish and maintain national cross-agency mechanisms; and streamlining cross-border and regional cooperation through better coordination; (ii) Increase capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities and eradicate poverty; iii) Raising awareness in supply, transit and destination countries to help change attitudes towards wildlife crime and building international support.

A review was undertaken of Mozambique’s capacity to deal with the upsurge in ivory poaching. At the national level, Mozambique has established an Inter-ministerial Task Force in 2011 which includes various key Ministries (Police, Customs, Military, Environment, Tourism and Forestry). The key institution is the newly established parastatal Administration for Conservation Areas (ANAC) that is mandated to implement the new Conservation Law recently promulgated in Mozambique (Law of Conservation and Biodiversity, Lei n.º 16/2014 de 20 de Junho). Other key institutions are the Ministério Público that is responsible for prosecutions and training of prosecutors to deal with poaching particularly at the District level.

Current staffing levels in the field are approximately 6 times lower than recommended (50 km² per scout). Moreover the very low State budget allocations needed for effective law enforcement with the Parks and Reserves is a major challenge.
The key recommendations to emerge from the review were:

- **Interventions in Law enforcement:** To reinforce the capacities of the Law Enforcement Force in the Conservation Areas in terms of effectiveness, as well as in quality of training, provision of equipment and the appropriate technology.

- **Awareness Interventions:** Awareness at governmental and political levels that raise awareness with regard to the negative impacts of poaching on the country's image and international reputation, on economic development and with respect to national security by way of the presence of foreign and local illegal armed groups leading to the establishment of crime networks.

- **Community-based Interventions:** Using the recently promulgated Conservation Law to introduce of community-based initiatives and mechanisms for managing wildlife.

The KAZA TFCA hosted a Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy Development Workshop in June 2014 for the five partner countries of Angola, Botswana, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Also in attendance were representatives from GIZ, USAID, FZS, PPF and TRAFFIC. This has been the first locally driven transnational initiative to tackle poaching and illegal wildlife crime. Some components of the developing strategy are currently being implemented such as wildlife crime investigations training.

Other specific initiatives include:

**Mozambique:** Joaquim Chissano Wildlife Preservation Initiative

The Joaquim Chissano Wildlife Preservation Initiative was launched in November 2013. The initiative is driven by rising concern over the high level of poaching of protected wildlife species, particularly rhino and elephant, for illegal trafficking of their trophies by international criminal syndicates. The initial focus of the initiative will be on important Mozambique conservation areas, such as the Limpopo National Park and its adjacent areas, including the Kruger National Park, the Niassa Reserve, the Quirimbas National Park and the Maputo Special Reserve.

**Mozambique – South Africa:** Memorandum of Understanding in the field of Biodiversity, Conservation and Management
South Africa and Mozambique signed a Memorandum of Understanding in the field of Biodiversity Conservation and Management at Skukuza in the Kruger National Park on 17 April 2014. This is within the context of the strengthening of relations between the two countries to enhance the protection of endangered species, such as the rhino, while working towards a common and coordinated management approach for the GLTP. This is particularly with respect to addressing the scourge of rhino poaching within the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park (GLTP), as escalating incidences of poaching have become a major challenge within the GLTP to rhino populations.

**South Africa:** Integrated Strategic Management of Rhinoceros in South Africa.

The South African Government will implement an integrated strategic management plan for rhinos in South Africa under the stewardship of the Minister of Environmental Affairs. Linked to this is the establishment in early 2015 of a high-level committee working to a Terms of Reference to investigate the feasibility of legalising the sale of rhino horn in South Africa.

Furthermore, South Africa has signed a number of MoUs with other countries to promote cooperation in wildlife management and conservation and management of trade in wildlife and wildlife products, including Cambodia, China and Vietnam.

**Tanzania:** Rhino Conservation Strategy

The current strategy is to translocate and reintroduce black rhinos that were originally from East Africa in order to increase genetic diversity. Translocations to Tanzania include: 10 animals from South Africa between 1997 and 2001; two black rhinos from the UK in 2007; three black rhinos from the Czech Republic in 2009 and in 2010, 32 black rhinos from South Africa.

**Zambia:** North Luangwa Conservation Project

The Public-Private Partnership (PPP) between the Zambian government and the Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS) is conserving Zambia's last black rhino population and 21,000 km² of wilderness.

**Zimbabwe:** Rhino Policy: 2011-2016

The long-term vision is to increase Zimbabwe’s black and white rhino populations to levels of at least 2,000 individuals of each species through meta-population management in suitable habitats throughout the country. While the overall rhino population is increasing in the south-east lowveld of the country, this is not the case for other areas, especially in the State-managed Parks and Wildlife Estate. While over 300 rhinos have been illegally killed since 2007, in recent years there have been fewer poaching incidents. Much of this success has been in the lowveld as a result of the efforts to translocate rhinos from high-risk areas to safer locations; treating rhinos with snare and bullet wounds; assisting authorities with prosecuting
poachers; and intensive tracking and monitoring of rhinos to confirm their ongoing wellbeing. Work in engaging rural communities more closely in rhino conservation is also underway.

Bilateral agreements were signed between Tanzania and Mozambique on the management of the Selous – Niassa Corridor in 2015, and between Zambia and Tanzania on conservation of the shared Miombo Ecosystem.

**Conservation NGOs:**

International and local conservation NGOs have also engaged in addressing the poaching and wildlife crime crisis. TRAFFIC and WWF have developed a global Strategic Plan for a Wildlife Crime Programme and the Frankfurt Zoological Society (FZS) commissioned a study on “What works, what doesn’t work” in law enforcement in Africa that was undertaken by the Conservation Development Centre (CDC) in Kenya. A number of smaller in-country locally-driven NGO initiatives are underway in for example, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe. A consortium of NGOs, (IUCN’s SULi, IIED, TRAFFIC), academic institutions (University of Queensland’s CEED) and the Austrian and German governments (GIZ) recently hosted a Symposium “Beyond Enforcement: Communities, governance, incentives and sustainable use in combating wildlife crime”.

---
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3 POLICY FRAMEWORK FOR A SADC LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ANTI-POACHING STRATEGY

3.1 SADC Treaty
The Declaration and Treaty of SADC (1992) recognizes the dependence of SADC communities on agriculture and natural resources for their livelihoods. It identifies food security, sustainable utilisation of natural resources and effective protection of the environment as some of the key objectives of SADC in sustaining its development process. It emphasizes that the exploitation and utilisation of natural resources requires good management and conservation to ensure that development does not reduce or impair the diversity and richness of the region’s natural resources base and the environment. The Treaty therefore recognizes wildlife as a key natural resource and a major component of the environment, which should be managed for the benefit of SADC communities.

3.2 THE SADC Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement
The genesis of the SADC Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy (SADC LEAP) is embedded in the Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement that was signed by the 14 members in 1999. The specific objectives relevant to the SADC LEAP Strategy include:

- Facilitate the harmonisation of the legal instruments governing wildlife use and conservation;
- Promote the enforcement of wildlife laws within, between and among States Parties;
- Facilitate the exchange of information concerning wildlife management, utilisation and the enforcement of wildlife laws;
- Assist in the building of national and regional capacity for wildlife management, conservation and enforcement of wildlife laws;
- Promote the conservation of shared wildlife resources through the establishment of transfrontier conservation areas; and
- Facilitate community-based natural resources management practices for management of wildlife resources.

The institutional mechanisms to implement the Protocol are outlined in Article 5; the Wildlife Sector Coordinating Committee and the Technical Committee are the two key bodies with the former acting as the Secretariat responsible for implementing the Protocol at the regional level. The Technical Committee consists of the Directors of the various wildlife agencies who, in terms of the Protocol, are required to meet annually “... to co-ordinate development of policy guidelines for common regional approaches to the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife resources.” These committees report back to the Committee of Ministers who is responsible for adopting regional wildlife policies and development strategies, and taking into consideration and approving any recommendations to amend or adopt policies and strategies.
3.3 The SADC Protocol on Forestry

The SADC Protocol on Forestry (2002) provides the over-arching policy framework for forestry collaboration amongst Member States. In the context of wildlife, the Protocol lays out a number of guiding principles on the protection, management and utilisation of all types of forests and trees which in turn benefits wildlife conservation. Legal harvest and trade in forest products serve to alleviate poverty and generate economic opportunities, a key component of community conservation. This further supports the achievement of effective environmental protection, safeguarding the interests of both present and future generations.

3.4 The SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan

The SADC Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP) was approved by the SADC Council of Ministers in August 2003 and launched in March 2004. The RISDP is a blueprint for deeper regional integration and poverty reduction, providing strategic direction to SADC programmes, projects and activities. In fact, the ultimate objective of the RISDP is to deepen the integration agenda of SADC with a view to accelerating poverty eradication and the attainment of other economic and non-economic development goals.

Furthermore, it embraces the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and the New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). At the SADC Council of Ministers meeting in Mauritius in 2004, it was recommended that the SADC and NEPAD Secretariats should work closely with the latter providing a pivotal role of translating NEPAD objectives into practical implementable programmes, projects and activities at the sub-regional level. Similarly, the conservation, management and use of natural resources are listed in the RISDP as a major component to Ensure Food Availability. In addition, SADC wildlife provides a significant amount of products, mostly in the form of bushmeat, to many people in the region.

3.5 Strategic Indicative Plan of the Organ (SIPO)

Signed on 5 August 2010 in Maputo, Mozambique, SIPO guides the activities of the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Cooperation and recognise the need to strengthen the fight against transnational organised crime. The strategy identifies among others poaching as a serious challenge facing the State Security, Public Security and the Police. In this regard the Strategy recommends collaborations
among security agencies and the need for among others joint operations aimed at the fight against crime.

3.6 Protocol on Politics, Defence and Security
The Protocol operationalises the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security and among its general objectives is the promotion of regional coordination and cooperation on matters related to Security and Defence and establish appropriate mechanisms to this end.

3.7 SADC FANR Operational Plan
To operationalize the RISDP, the SADC Secretariat developed 5-year operational plans, for which one component, the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR) Directorate has articulated short term (1 year) and medium term (5 years) perspectives. Emerging activities are identified and incorporated in the FANR Operational Plan during annual reviews. The business plan recognises contributions from the wildlife sector as regards food provision, tradable natural resource commodities and ecosystem services in the business plan.

3.8 The SADC Biodiversity Strategy
The purpose of the Regional Biodiversity Strategy is to provide a framework for regional cooperation in biodiversity issues that transcend national boundaries, stimulating the combined efforts and creating greater synergy amongst SADC Member States and their communities in addressing biodiversity conservation and its sustainable use. Consequently it contributes to the achievement of SADC’s goals of social and economic development and poverty eradication as embedded in the Regional Indicative Strategic Development Plan (RISDP); the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD) Environmental Action Plan; and the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). As such it provides a framework for cooperating with relevant international instruments, in particular the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as well as the Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Law of the Sea, the Convention on Migratory Species, the UN Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.

The location of the Member States in the central southern part of the African continent and Indian Ocean means that they are rich in biological resources, a number of which have global significance. Most biodiversity issues in SADC transcend national boundaries and several species of mammals, birds, butterflies and fish exhibit trans-boundary migration patterns. The Regional Biodiversity Strategy covers all fifteen SADC Member States who are also signatories to the CBD. However, it does not assume individual country responsibilities under the Convention, or indeed the other Conventions.

Over 50% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of SADC Member States comes from primary sectors of production such as agriculture, mining, forestry and wildlife. Furthermore, between 40% and 85% of their citizens live in rural areas where they
depend on natural resources for survival. This underscores the overriding importance of biological resources in southern Africa. Although the region is endowed with natural resources, it is characterized by high levels of poverty that emanate from its inability to effectively transform this biological capital into goods and services for social and economic development and poverty eradication. Furthermore, SADC is facing serious environmental challenges and threats largely arising from increasing human populations relative to resource availability; agricultural expansion coupled with declining land productivity; continued reliance on wood fuel; increasing land degradation; and climate change which are all contributing to the decline and loss of wildlife habitat.

3.8.1 SADC Biodiversity Action Plan

The SADC Technical Committee on Environment endorsed the new SADC Biodiversity Action Plan for approval by the SADC Ministers of Environment in May 2013 that facilitates achieving a more harmonized approach to biodiversity conservation in the SADC region. Through the implementation of the Action Plan, SADC seeks to ensure that the region’s citizens enjoy a healthy environment and enhanced quality of life derived from effective conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in line with international and regional commitments, while respecting national spiritual and cultural values. The Action Plan outlines concrete activities within six strategic areas, namely: biodiversity governance, biodiversity based livelihoods, biodiversity for economic development, biodiversity management systems, biodiversity and climate change, and biodiversity and other development initiatives (such as energy and mining). These activities are aligned with the 10 year biodiversity strategic plan including the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, as well as national priorities and strategies of the member states.

4 ASSESSMENT OF LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ANTI-POACHING CAPACITY

4.1 Current inter-governmental and inter-agency collaboration

The response from the SADC Member States, and in particular the elephant and rhino range states to the wildlife trafficking crisis has largely been uncoordinated with each individual member preferring to tackle the issue in-country rather than cooperating as a network of states that all face a common problem. For example, even though SADC has a Southern Africa Regional Elephant Conservation and Management Strategy this has not been effectively implemented and is in urgent need of updating.

On numerous occasions at enforcement meetings and workshops, SADC Member States have expressed the need to collaborate and share information at different levels, especially across borders in pursuit of poachers and wildlife criminals but are still failing to engage effectively. Unstated though, is the confidence and trust needed both within and between countries enforcement agencies to achieve this collaboration and exchange of what is invariably sensitive information. Furthermore,
wildlife agencies tend to dominate these meetings numerically and financially as meetings are usually convened by, or through these agencies. Consequently there is insufficient presence and input from other enforcement agencies, namely police, customs, immigration and security agencies. Altogether neglected appears to be finance ministries and those dealing with economic crime. For example, seizures are often the result of cooperation between customs and wildlife agencies, or wildlife and security agencies.

Where there has been some success fighting wildlife trafficking, this has been achieved by using professional units that are not linked with conservation e.g. anti-drug units. Furthermore, using outside intelligence staff can be more effective than training and using internal wildlife agency intelligence personnel. NGOs can also play a key role in the management of informant networks, and in the gathering of intelligence, notwithstanding the sensitivities of such arrangements. If wildlife crimes are seen as security issues, this helps greatly in achieving results.

4.2 Field operations

Nevertheless, so far as field based anti-poaching operations are concerned, there are an encouraging number of joint operations between the paramilitary wings of wildlife agencies, police and/or army. In some cases the latter may be the navy. An important element of regional networking should be to develop agreements to facilitate cross-border cooperation to pursue, arrest and extradite poachers and illegal traders. Ideally such measures should be mandated in formal regional Protocols. Such protocols can be linked to international organisations such as Interpol, World Customs Union (WCU) and others that can support and assist crime that is essentially now global in nature.

The SADC Secretariat and the consulting team received responses from nine SADC Member States to the questionnaire survey instruments designed to establish their capacity to deal with illegal wildlife crime (see 5.1 below). Additionally, indirect data and information relevant to individual member states was gathered and collated from various sources to understand the problems and challenges facing these countries. It would appear unlikely, however that elephant and rhino range states within SADC are currently meeting the generally accepted field levels of manpower requirements, i.e. 1 man per 25-50 km², or have adequate budgets to meet recurrent annual wildlife law enforcement and anti-poaching costs reliably estimated at US$200-400 per km². Judicial processes remain weak, especially along the apprehension, arrest, prosecution, conviction and sentencing chain.

4.3 The Lusaka Agreement and Task Force

The Lusaka Agreement on Co-operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora (The Lusaka Agreement) traces its origins to a meeting of wildlife law enforcement officers from eight Eastern and Southern African countries in Lusaka, Zambia in December 1992. This led to formal inter-governmental negotiations under the auspices of UNEP, with the final Agreement eventually coming into force in December 1996. Currently, there are seven Parties
to the Agreement: The Republics of Congo (Brazzaville), Kenya, Liberia, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and the Kingdom of Lesotho. The Republics of South Africa, Ethiopia, Mozambique and the Kingdom of Swaziland are signatories. Notable exceptions to this are Zimbabwe, Botswana and Namibia. The Agreement provides for a Governing Council, National Bureaux and a permanent Task Force to implement its objectives of reducing and ultimately eliminating illegal trade in wild fauna and flora in Africa.

The Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF) was established in June 1999 with headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya. It comprises seconded law enforcement officers from Party States and locally recruited support staff. Its mission is to work with the National Bureaux in order to:

- Facilitate cooperative activities in undertaking law enforcement operations
- Investigate violations of national wildlife laws
- Disseminate and exchange of information on illegal trade activities, and
- Build capacity for awareness promotion

Essentially these correspond to Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) functions, so the idea of a WEN for Africa is not new.

4.4 Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN)

The Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) is a US Government-led initiative that aims to establish a series of regional WENs across the globe. The first of these was established in 2005, known as the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN-WEN). Further US-initiated networks were developed for Central Africa similar to those operational or under development in Central America, Europe, South and South-East Asia.

Another new African WEN is being promoted under a comprehensive programme entitled ARREST, standing for “Africa’s Regional Response to Endangered Species Trafficking”, based on a concept jointly developed by African Wildlife Foundation (AWF), the Freeland Foundation and International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW). These organisations have prepared with US assistance, a proposal that seeks funding for the recent initiative of eight African governments to create a new Horn of Africa Wildlife Enforcement Network (HAWEN). HAWEN member countries currently consist of Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Uganda.

The ARREST model is designed to be a holistic continent-wide program that increases capacity and communication channels between the Horn of Africa with other parts of Africa and the rest of the world. The ARREST partnership is already engaging other regions of Africa and expects these to benefit from the initial action in the Horn of Africa, which is intended to serve as a pilot that will inspire development of similar WENs such as that proposed for the Southern Africa (see below).
As presented in the ARREST proposal, these WENs will serve as facilities to build the enforcement capacities of member states - at the national level - for protection of key wildlife populations, wildlife crime investigation and evidence collection, the use of legal tools and prosecuting procedures, and identification of species targeted for illegal trade. As such their principal focus will be on the delivery of a variety of training courses including:

- Protected area operational and tactical enforcement conservation training (PROTECT)
- Detection of environmental crime training (DETECT)
- Legal training for prosecutors and the judiciary
- Species ID training
- Care for confiscated wildlife training

An important element of regional networking is to develop agreements to facilitate cross-border cooperation to pursue, arrest and extradite poachers and illegal traders. Ideally such measures should be mandated in formal regional Protocols.

4.4.1 *Wildlife Enforcement Network for Southern Africa (WENSA)*

The US Embassy in Botswana facilitated a *Southern Africa Regional Wildlife Trafficking Workshop* in Gaborone in October 2013. Officials of wildlife enforcement authorities from Angola, Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe resolved, but in principle only, to recommend the establishment of a network of national wildlife law enforcement agencies to be known as the Wildlife Enforcement Network for Southern Africa (WENSA). This meeting was followed up at a subsequent workshop in October 2014 when provisional terms of reference were developed to establish WENSA.

Subject to the agreement of the participating countries, the first step will be to form a Secretariat in order to raise awareness within government agencies in Southern Africa and appoint an “Interim Coordinator”. The objectives of WENSA are:

- Implement relevant SADC wildlife protocols and strategies, including the SADC anti-poaching strategy;
- Improve the extent and quality of information shared among government agencies and departments within countries and across borders in relation to criminal exploitation of wild flora and fauna;
- Strengthen the capacity and increase the effectiveness of relevant agencies through coordinated, multi-national training, and the development of collegial relationships between officials;
- Participate in and conduct joint operations and capacity building exercises among agencies within country and between countries;
- Facilitate collection, collation and analysis of information relevant to criminal exploitation of flora and fauna and disseminate this information to focal
points in each country in a timely manner so that appropriate action may be taken to counteract illicit activities.

Membership of WENSA is open to all SADC Member States. Membership of the Network is open to officials from CITES Management Authorities, Customs, Immigration, Police, Prosecutors, Financial Intelligence Units, Defence, specialized governmental wildlife-law enforcement organizations, and other relevant national law enforcement agencies.
5 SADC LAW ENFORCEMENT AND ANTI-POACHING STRATEGY

5.1 Approach to preparing this strategic plan

To understand the magnitude of the poaching problem and the capacity of each of the SADC countries to combat the illegal trade, a SADC Regional Consultative Workshop on the Development of a SADC Anti-Poaching Strategy was held in Johannesburg from 21-22 October 2014. Representatives of most SADC Member States attended this meeting and were given the opportunity to present a synopsis of the current law enforcement and anti-poaching situation in their respective countries. The meeting also provided details of institutional arrangements, opportunities and success factors amongst SADC Member State wildlife agencies in dealing with poaching and wildlife crime. Participants identified the main components of the law enforcement and anti-poaching strategy including a draft set of strategic options that have very usefully informed the development of this SADC LEAP Strategy.

The facilitators also took advantage of the meeting to circulate a detailed questionnaire designed to establish:

1. Manpower resources for wildlife protection i.e. staff establishments.
2. Vehicle and equipment resources available for wildlife protection.
3. Allocation of financial resources for wildlife protection i.e. annual budgets.
5. Value of wildlife benefits (cash or kind) to community conservation areas over the past 3 years 2012-2014.

This questionnaire was translated into French and Portuguese and circulated by the SADC Secretariat to all SADC Member State Ministries representing the wildlife sector.

In addition, visits were made to five SADC countries (Namibia, Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe and Mozambique) to meet with Wildlife Directorates and other stakeholders to hold more in depth discussions regarding their problems and challenges. Advantage was also taken to meet or contact individual persons and organizations actively involved in law enforcement and anti-poaching operations.

The consultants participated in parallel meetings and workshops that discussed other initiatives such as the inaugural Southern Africa Regional Wildlife Trafficking Workshop held in Gaborone, October 22 – 23, 2014 attended by Angola, Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. These countries jointly agreed to establish a network of national wildlife law enforcement agencies to be known as the Wildlife Enforcement Network for Southern Africa (WENSA) and prepared Terms of Reference to take this forward.
The opportunity was taken to attend training workshops where new technologies were presented such as SMART. Information and approaches to law enforcement and anti-poaching strategies were also drawn from the KAZA TFCA LEAP Strategy Development Workshop held in Katima Mulilo in June 2014 referred to above.

Finally numerous news items that profiled the illegal wildlife trade across Africa were tracked on the internet to provide additional information.

5.2 Vision, Mission and Guiding Principles

**Vision:**

A SADC Region with thriving populations of wildlife species which are sustainably conserved for present and future generations.

**Mission:**

In the face of increasing global wildlife crime, the mission of SADC with respect to the Law Enforcement and Anti-Poaching Strategy (LEAP) is to facilitate co-ordination and co-operation among Member States in the active protection and effective enforcement of laws relating to natural resources and wildlife conservation through sound policy guidance, the application of requisite knowledge and skills, and the best available technology for the benefit of the Region’s peoples.

**Guiding Principles for the LEAP Strategy:**

The LEAP Strategy will be guided by the following principles:

1. Ensure cooperation at national level among governmental authorities, NGOs, and private sector;
2. Cooperate as far as possible to develop common approaches to the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife; and
3. Collaborate to achieve the objectives of international agreements which are applicable to the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife and to which they are party.

These principles underpin the importance of SADC reinforcing its position in respect of sustainable wildlife use and regulated trade. Natural resource demand reduction initiatives could seriously jeopardise sound long-term conservation and development policy and practice in the region. Hence individual SADC Member States, while retaining their prerogative to make decisions regarding use and trade, should nevertheless act collectively in the wider best interests of the region.

5.3 Purpose and Objectives of the SADC LEAP Strategy 2015-2020

**Purpose:**
The purpose of the strategy is to provide a framework for country and regional cooperation, together with international engagement on natural resource management and wildlife-related law enforcement and anti-poaching issues; paying special attention to issues that transcend national boundaries and to encourage concerted action by SADC Member States in the protection, management, conservation and sustainable use of their wildlife and other natural resources.

To this end all SADC Member States are actively encouraged to participate in the government-led application and use of the UNODC ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit. Moreover, the Member States are encouraged to establish Task Forces at the national level to coordinate wildlife-related law enforcement and anti-poaching issues.

**Overall Objective**

The overall objective is to significantly reduce the level of poaching and illegal trade in wildlife fauna and flora and enhance law enforcement capacity in the SADC Region by 2021.

**The specific objectives are:**

1. To enhance legislation and judicial processes
2. To minimize wildlife crime and illegal trade
3. To integrate people and nature into conservation and development processes
4. To ensure sustained trade in, and use of natural resources
5. To improve and strengthen field level protection of wildlife resources

**5.4 Strategic Programme Areas**

**5.4.1 Enhancement of legislation and judicial processes**

**1.1 Legislation**

Most countries have good legislation with poor implementation. Legislation needs to include mandatory minimum penalties for poaching. This removes the discretion of the courts to give light penalties. Effective magistrates and prosecutors, not the legislation, determine success.

Targeted actions should ensure the judiciary is knowledgeable of the seriousness of wildlife offences and the appropriate sentencing guidelines. Effective operationalization and implementation of relevant laws and regulations is crucial and appropriate penalties, prosecution and sentencing must be in place. Penalties prescribed should be appropriate and sufficient to deter re-offending. Wildlife legislation must adequately covers all key issues of wildlife crime and trafficking including the classification of key offences as serious crime. Wildlife crime enforcement needs to be harmonized with other legislation and international wildlife trafficking enforcement mechanisms should be domesticated.
1.2 Wildlife prosecutions

Wildlife crime is often not considered ‘serious crime’ and police pursue other crimes more vigorously. Magistrates need to be well versed in the relevant legislation, and understand the effect of wildlife crime on the local and national economy. The monitoring and tracking of court cases can motivate judges and maintain momentum in court proceedings.

Targeted actions must ensure key enforcement agencies and prosecuting authorities collaborate effectively and efficiently. Specialist prosecutors should be knowledgeable of all relevant wildlife crime-related legislation and the appropriate prosecution of offenders with wildlife agency staff trained as specialist prosecutors. Clear procedures for arrest and charging of suspects, including responsibilities of different agencies must be established with systems in place for monitoring wildlife crime cases. Urban and rural public must be aware of the seriousness of wildlife crimes and associated penalties.

1.3 Wildlife crime investigations

There is a need to focus on crime scene interpretation for court proceedings as prosecutions often fail due to mishandling of crime scenes. Evidence handling has been the single most important factor in loosing cases in some countries with corruption and/or ignorance being responsible.

Actions should ensure sufficient well-trained wildlife crime investigators are in place and able to handle of wildlife crime scenes and cases appropriately and effectively. There must be systems and repositories in place for managing and preserving evidence as well as providing for wildlife forensic analysis. Systems and repositories for managing and storing confiscated wildlife products must also be included and access to a DNA database for wildlife products while not essential, is highly desirable.

5.4.2 Minimization of wildlife crime and illegal trade

2.1 Intelligence

Good intelligence, well-analysed and informing operations is the single most effective tool for law enforcement but it requires substantial funding and capacity. Importantly, informant networks must be well managed and preferably separated from all other parts of the law enforcement team and management.

Actions must enable operations to respond to analyses of good intelligence and information by trained intelligence staff. Functional and properly managed informant networks must be in place, but kept separate from conservation enforcement units. Inter-agency collaboration and trust is essential for the sharing of intelligence information. Systems need to be developed for verifying or analysing intelligence information and informant reward mechanisms must ensure anonymity. Confidential mechanisms for the general public to report wildlife crime incidences
need to be developed and put in place.

2.2 National and regional operations

Whilst good inter-agency collaboration is vital, generally collaboration within and between countries, especially between agencies of staff at ports, exit points and transit routes, is poor or weak. Seizures are often the result of cooperation between customs and wildlife agencies, or wildlife and security agencies. If wildlife crime issues are seen as security issues, this helps greatly in achieving results. Immigration authorities are also important.

Targeted actions must attain strong inter-agency collaboration and cross-border inter-agency collaboration in sharing intelligence and carrying out investigations is crucial. Specialised wildlife crime and trafficking staff must be posted in key agencies with sufficient staff at ports, exit points and transit routes with skills in detecting wildlife contraband. Innovative equipment and methods can aid customs and port officers to detect wildlife contraband. Data on wildlife crime arrests and prosecutions must be consolidated and analysed at the site-level. Further consolidation and analysis of nation-wide data on wildlife contraband trafficking, seizures and prosecutions should be undertaken and contributed to regional information sharing and databases.

5.4.3 Integration of people and nature

3.1 CBNRM

Legal provisions, which are often lacking, are critical to enable direct community involvement in wildlife management. Nevertheless, good governance and leadership remains essential. This can be achieved through strong partnerships with support organisations. Community rangers can be trained and equipped to support enforcement related activities and paid through income generated from natural resources and other funding sources which may vary from country to country. Integration of rehabilitated poachers requires consideration. Other opportunities for income generation at community level should be explored including incentives to discourage poaching and corrupt practices. Community owned and managed structures with associated wildlife related benefits are also important for long term engagement, support and continuity. Integrated management planning tools (e.g. Fairwild Standards) are available to guide development of specific community based natural resource management projects and programmes.

Actions must achieve an enabling policy and legislative environment for devolved natural resource management to be successfully and sustainably implemented. Natural resource stewardship that includes responsibility, accountability and good governance should be embedded in community institutions, including collaborative co-management frameworks. Legal instruments (legislation, managerial setup, financial guidelines) empowering communities to manage wildlife and other natural resources must be put in place. The community should be empowered to decide on the sustainable use of natural resources on their village lands. Financial, in-kind
benefits and payments for ecosystem goods and services (PES) accruing to communities are essential.

3.2 TBNRM

Actions undertaken should include functioning TBNRM Community Forums and other existing structures to be established between adjacent TFCA partner countries, including harmonization of sustainable use and other policies. The profile and mandate of TBNRM Community Forums must be raised and strengthened for them to play an active role in the policy-resource protection-management nexus. Facilitation and coordination of cross-border community conservation programmes should be agreed between countries.

3.3 Community engagement

Regular communications and consultations between park managers and adjacent communities need to be undertaken to encourage co-management of protected areas. Credible community-based organizations or forums, e.g. Regional and Country based CBNRM Forums that protected area managers and others can engage with must be established and in place. The impacts of wildlife, especially HWC on community livelihoods should be mitigated and minimized as far as possible. Where possible provision should be made for communities living adjacent to National Parks and formal protected areas to have regulated access to natural resources.

Communities need to be involved in protected area, buffer zone and/or corridor management. Communities can be and want to be, engaged in site-level law enforcement activities, especially surveillance and information networks. Communities must be made aware and become knowledgeable of protected area boundaries, rules, and penalties for violations but with controlled access to and use of natural resources in a protected area where appropriate and/or needed.

5.4.4 Sustainable trade and use of natural resources

4.1 Trade

Regional and international trade in natural resource products must continue to be aligned to international standards in order to be accepted globally. Appropriate strategies need to be developed, implemented and reviewed regularly in order to reduce poverty and wildlife crime given the linkages between the two. Advocacy demonstrating the conservation and development values of wildlife use such as nature-based tourism, hunting and cropping are crucial including their economic and financial benefits. Targeted actions will need to include campaigns and awareness, lobbying and appropriate branding and marketing.

Active engagement with CITES on trade-related issues must be maintained and continued with SADC support. For example, those countries with stockpiles of ivory and rhino horn and who may wish to legally trade in these products in the future need to ensure that the stockpiles are kept and managed in line with CITES Resolutions.
4.2 Use

Actions to be taken must address poverty, livelihoods and sustainable use issues. Regulated and well monitored safari hunting needs to be managed as a focused conservation tool providing user rights and benefits to all land occupiers. Sustained yield cropping of wildlife that provides an alternative food should be recognized as a legitimate use where appropriate.

Participatory and collaborative quota setting should follow best practices and involve the local stakeholders including communities and landowners in the decision making process.

4.3 Benefits

Key actions include demonstrating the comparative economic advantages of wildlife as a land use and the financial benefits of wildlife that can accrue to those living with wildlife.

5.4.5 Improvement and strengthening of field protection

5.1 Ranger patrols

Good, motivated and committed ranger leadership requires tough recruitment and vetting process to identify committed individuals and build cohesion. The ranger’s basic provisions of uniforms, housing, rations, equipment (at least as good if not better than that of poachers) and medical care must be ensured. Incentives linked to results can include non-financial motivators such as study tours to other sites, role expansion, ex-situ training and long-term career development prospects. Standard operating procedures on discipline, grievances, appeals, and legal protection from prosecution are essential. A clear understanding of performance objectives evaluated against clear objectives need to be contained in job descriptions.

Targets actions to be achieved should be directed towards motivated and skilled patrol leaders. These men must be confident and disciplined scouts/rangers who are well trained and operational and adequately equipped, rationed, mobile and with radio communications. A sufficient number of scouts/rangers must be in place in line with accepted norms, i.e. 1 man/50km² with adherence to clear, enforced Standard Operating Procedures and Codes of Conduct. Patrols require adequate arms and ammunition capable of matching that of poachers, and rangers must be skilled in local knowledge, map reading, GPS usage and data collection, including preserving evidence at the crime scene for wildlife forensic analysis.

5.2 Field site operations

Senior management needs the authority to discipline, and hire/fire staff without lengthy bureaucratic processes. Management teams are preferred in order to cover all aspects of site management and administration. Independent assessments of
performance can help motivate senior managers at the site level. Whilst mobile patrols are often more effective, outposts can reduce travel time and logistics but need to be equipped so that staff based their can perform their duties. Outpost location is secondary to the leadership, motivation and capacity of staff that need to be rotated regularly to maintain performance. Whilst routine patrols remain essential, proactive assessment of poachers’ tactics and movement patterns is needed to plan responses including adaptations to intelligence or extreme situations.

Targeted actions include training and placing skilled and motivated law enforcement team leaders or managers. Patrol strategies must be developed and adapted to the nature of the threat. Effective communications between patrols and base enabled with sufficient ranger outposts in place if needed. There must be good collaboration with other security agencies with innovative law enforcement strategies or tactics deployed. Ongoing support from a committed organizational partner may need to be secured.

5.3 Ranger Based Monitoring (RBM)

The importance of management oriented monitoring cannot be over-emphasised. In law enforcement anti-poaching patrols, measures of success can only be assessed through good, simple but robust monitoring. Thus the collection of management-relevant monitoring data is crucial, as is management’s understanding of the monitoring information provided. Well-trained, site-based data management staff, and user-friendly appropriate mechanisms for storing and analyzing information is very important.

Targets will include the competent collection by rangers of LEAP-relevant minimum data sets and information needed for monitoring with site level managers fully trained and understanding the need for, and use of the monitoring information collected. User-friendly and appropriate mechanisms and systems for storing and analysing such information collected needs to be in place. These can be paper- or digital-based systems depending on site specific requirements and capacity. Accurate and timely data entry into the system needs to be achieved allowing rapid information exchange between management and patrol leaders.

5.5 Establishment of a SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit

Poaching is multi-layered and thus requires different skill sets to effectively control and minimize the illegal activities that, for ease of understanding, are broken down into five levels.

The internationally accepted standard to categorise the crime chain is according to the following classification:

Level 1: These are crimes committed at the field level where a Scout/Ranger force trained in paramilitary tactics to patrol protected areas are used to apprehend
poachers. Individuals or groups of poachers apprehended are then prosecuted and convicted in terms of the governing wildlife laws and regulations.

Level 2: Refers to incidents where poachers are not apprehended in the field, and the wildlife products are in most cases removed from the protected areas. The products are then horded, stored or concealed by local receivers and/or couriers before progressing to the next stage of the crime chain.

Level 3: This refers to the transportation of illegal products by national/transnational couriers. In the case of high value products (e.g. ivory, rhino horn, leopard skins etc.).

Level 4: These high value illegal products are generally collected until sufficient quantities can be packed in suitable containers for export. All this requires higher levels of organisation, financial backing and often protection by corrupt officials at various levels.

Level 5: The final link in the chain is at the receiving end to which the illegal products are destined. Here importers, traders and consumers constitute syndicated criminals at this level.

Most SADC wildlife agencies are capable of dealing with Levels 1 and 2 with varying levels of success and efficiency but break down when they are required to deal with Levels 3 as they do not have the training or capacity to investigate and prosecute sophisticated wildlife criminal syndicates and secure deterrent convictions. Nor do they have the ability to deal with or address the driving forces behind Levels 4 and 5. Moreover, virtually all wildlife agencies are not able to address organised crime syndicate members that operate at Level 5 who are located in transit/consumer countries and beyond the reach of enforcement authorities in the supply countries.

It is generally agreed among strategists that identifying, apprehending and convicting those persons operating at the Level 3 and 4 are essential to disrupting illegal wildlife activities. In order to achieve this requires inter-agency intelligence-led approaches that are both proactive and reactive, and which can penetrate the layers of secrecy and corruption that protect these people and facilitate their activities. These skills are not well developed by most SADC wildlife agencies. For this reason the SADC Secretariat wishes to establish a Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit within the Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources (FANR) Directorate. Its purpose will be to coordinate the response of Member States to combat illegal trade in wildlife.

5.5.1 Structure and staff Requirements

In terms of the SADC-LEAP, a Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit (WCPC) will be established within FANR (see Figure 4). This Unit will be headed by a Senior Programme Officer (SPO-WCPC) who will sit alongside the SPO-NRM and Wildlife. Through the Director of FANR, the SPO – WCPC will liaise on a regular basis with the Organ on Politics, Defence and Security Cooperation via FANR.
The SPO –WCPC will be supported by two Programme Officers: The PO-Task Force Coordination will be responsible for liaising with the respective chairpersons of National Wildlife Crime Task Forces in each Member State. This person will also liaise closely with the Programme Officer (TFCA); the PO-Intelligence will be responsible for liaising with security and other intelligence organizations at the country level (e.g. Interpol Bureaus) as well as wildlife trade and monitoring institutions such as CITES and TRAFFIC both at the national and international level.

The Unit is to be housed within the FANR of the SADC Secretariat which would provide it institutional and political support.

National Wildlife Crime Prevention Task Forces

For this Unit to be effective it is essential that each Member State appoints a National Wildlife Crime Prevention Task Force comprising senior Police, Wildlife (including National TFCA Coordinators), Defence, Customs, Immigration, Security and Judiciary officials as required or needed. Country Wildlife Directors will act as Focal Points for Task Forces; however each country will decide on the membership and functions of each Task Force (Figure 5).
Figure 4: The institutional structure of FANR indicating the level of the SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit in relation to the SPO Natural Resources and Wildlife. These two Units will liaise closely to ensure that their respective mandates are implemented.
Figure 5: The institutional structure of the SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit in relation to the Task Forces established in each Member State. The Task Force Coordinator will liaise with the PO TFCA.
**5.5.2 Roles and responsibilities**

The SPO-NRM Wildlife will oversee the attainment of all 5 LEAP Objectives that help give effect to Articles 2 through to 10 of the Protocol. The SPO-WCPC is specifically responsible for dealing with Objectives 1 and 2 of the LEAP strategy, which address in particular, Articles 6 and 9 of the Protocol.

The PO-NRM Wildlife will be responsible for dealing with Objectives 3, 4 and 5 of the LEAP strategy, which address Articles 7 and 8 of the Protocol. Where and when appropriate in relation to cross-border wildlife crime within TFCAs, PO Task Force Coordination will liaise with and through PO TFCA.

**5.5.3 Role of the SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention Coordination Unit**

The primary role of the SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit will be, across all Member States, to coordinate the enforcement of natural resources related laws, and detection and monitoring of the trafficking, trading and harvesting of illegal wildlife resources, especially at Levels 3, 4 and 5. This will include:

1. Liaison with National and International Law Enforcement agencies:
   a. Liaison with Interpol, WCO, WENSA, TWIX, LATF;
   b. Foster inter-agency cooperation (i.e. Country Task Forces e.g. Namibia Protection of Resources Units (PRU) and Namibia Central Intelligence Service (NCIS);

2. Information sharing:
   a. Understanding better legal and illegal trade, and trade routes;
   b. Awareness amongst judiciary of seriousness of national, regional and global wildlife crime;
   c. Coordinate with CITES, including country management and scientific authorities.
   d. Share and exchange good practices on e.g. technology, methodologies, toolkits, etc.

3. Improving capacity of SADC Secretariat and Member States to respond to:
   a. Existing legal frameworks, laws and regulations (prosecutions, sentencing, judicial awareness);
   b. Ability, capacity and willingness to apply the law (institutional lapses, political interference, private sector involvement, corruption);
   c. Resource allocations to law enforcement and anti-poaching (staff capacity, available manpower and equipment etc.);
   d. Cross border and inter-agency collaboration.

4. Monitoring:
   a. Establish database of Member State capacity (staff, operational budgets, equipment etc.);
   b. Implementation of UNODC ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit upon request of a Member State;
   c. Regulation and enforcement;
d. Maintain databases on illegal activity, seizures, convictions, DNA analyses;

e. Incorporating data from CITES MIKES SMART sites;

f. Liaison with the African Elephant Specialist Group, Rhino Specialist Group, TRAFFIC, CITES ETIS and MIKE, Elephant and Rhino Security Group etc.

g. Establish regional database for collation of aerial survey results for SADC elephant range state countries drawing on the AfESG African Elephant Database.

5. Supporting public awareness:
   a. Communities, traditional leaders, finance ministers, politicians and “consumer country” embassies and other representations, companies, NGOs and other stakeholders;
   b. National CITES authorities;
   c. Animal rights groups.

6. Liaison with national and regional CBNRM institutions and forums, e.g. CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe, Namibian Association of CBNRM Support Organisations (NACSO) and the Regional CBNRM Forum and its constituent national forums.

7. Facilitating training:
   a. Law enforcement techniques, crime investigation, judicial systems, prosecution, transport of illegal products;
   b. Identify new opportunities

5.5.4 **Roles of National Wildlife Crime Prevention Task Forces**

At the national level, each Wildlife Crime Prevention Task Force consisting of senior Police, Customs, Security and Judiciary as well as National TFCA Coordinators, will be chaired by the Director of the Wildlife agency and will operate under approved terms of reference that, among others, include:

1. Monitor the status and trends of illegal wildlife crime, paying particular attention to high value products e.g. ivory, rhino horn, leopard skins, pangolin etc.
2. Identification and monitoring of key players involved with high profile poaching of and trade in commercial products.
3. Develop intelligence information to monitor nature and type of hunting, who is conducting hunting operations (including intermediaries), identification of transport routes, means of transport etc.
4. Review of current practices used to combat illegal wildlife crime, including effectiveness of detection methods, arrests and monitoring of court proceedings.
5. Monitor and report on organisation and value chain of commercial poaching.
6. Analysis of the nature and impact of corruption.
7. Review the current status of the legal framework related to anti-poaching, including identification of areas where the legislative process can be improved.
8. Promote regional and cross-border cooperation to foster better political involvement, technical cooperation and facilitation of joint law enforcement actions.

9. Monitor the impact of poaching on national security, through the proliferation of weapons and the potential development of armed groups.

10. Identify opportunities to mobilize the international community, donors and civil society, private sector in anti-poaching activities.

11. Promote the establishment of Task Forces at the Provincial and District level where appropriate.

5.6 Implementation plan for the strategy

Implementation of this strategy will be at the level of individual countries, with SADC Secretariat playing a strong leadership, cooperation, coordination, networking and convening role. The implementation plan covers finance and resource mobilisation, capacity development, technology development and transfer, communication, advocacy and awareness. It also identifies options to mobilise resources to establish the WCPC Unit within FANR

**Finance and Resource Mobilization**

It is acknowledged that direct government funding within the SADC to combat poaching and the illegal trade in wildlife is limited. The SADC Secretariat will therefore take action to develop a bankable proposal to present to the international donor community. Each Member State shall contribute funds from their own resources to support the implementation of the strategy within their respective countries.

**Technology Development and Transfer**

The development and transfer of appropriate technology to implement and manage anti-poaching and law enforcement programmes shall form an integral part of SADC’s efforts. Technology development and transfer includes the need for developed countries to commit to the deployment, diffusion and transfer of technologies to developing countries, based on principles of accessibility, affordability, appropriateness and adaptability, as well as to address barriers to technology transfer.

**Capacity Development**

The capacity of the SADC Secretariat to implement anti-poaching and law enforcement programmes is to be strengthened through the implementation of a capacity building framework at regional and national levels.

**Communication, Advocacy and Awareness**

Communication and dissemination of the SADC LEAP strategy to key stakeholders will be achieved through relevant sub-regional institutions to enhance cooperation,
collaboration advocacy, education and awareness about wildlife management issues, and involve potential partners and collaborators. Where possible, the WCPC Unit will use existing SADC regional media networks to communicate the key elements of the Strategy to raise awareness on the key issues related to regional anti-poaching and law enforcement programmes.

5.6.1 Establishment of the SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit

The capacity of SADC FANR is to be strengthened through the appointment of a Senior Programme Officer for WCPC who is either seconded from one of the Member States or recruited directly by the Secretariat. This person will be supported by two Programme Officers recruited from within the region: The Programme Officer – Task Force will liaise with and coordinate the activities of the National Wildlife Crime Prevention Task Forces while the Programme Officer – Intelligence will liaise with in-country police, customs and security institutions, CITES authorities and other regional initiatives (WEN, LATF etc.).

In the short term, the technical specialists may be recruited from outside SADC (Far East, EU, Americas) and preferably have strong links to international agencies such as INTERPOL, EUROPOL and WCO. For the Unit to be effective these specialist technicians will work closely with relevant National Wildlife Crime Prevention Task Forces in order that they receive on-the-job training.

The commissioning of the SADC Wildlife Crime Prevention and Coordination Unit will require SADC Secretariat through FANR to prepare a project motivation concept and proposal to be presented to donors for support in the interim. Under the proposal, the donor(s) would fund the salaries and expenses of the Programme Officers (TAs) and provide the necessary administrative and operational support, including computer hardware and software.

5.7 Monitoring and evaluation

The logical framework (Item 5.8) provides programme level indicators to monitor and evaluate the progress being made under each strategic objective. These will require results oriented monitoring and key performance indicators to achieve the objectives outlined in the log frame.

SADC Secretariat will need to lead the monitoring of these key indicators to ensure target outcomes are being achieved at country level where appropriate.

5.7.1 Recommended tools for application

UNODC ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit:

As a key component of this strategy and its purpose, all SADC elephant and rhino range states should be actively encouraged to participate in the application and use of the UNODC ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit. This is a government-led technical resource for Member States to undertake a national analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of preventive, law enforcement, and
criminal justice responses to wildlife and forest crime. It is aimed at evidence-based programmes for technical assistance and capacity building. It has found application in South and Central America and SE Asia. Gabon in Africa is awaiting its final report and requests for the tool have been received from Angola, Botswana, Kenya, Madagascar and Tanzania.

**EU Trade in Wildlife Information Exchange (TWIX):**

EU-TWIX is an internet tool developed to facilitate information exchange and international cooperation between wildlife law enforcement officers in the European Union. It is used by some 802 enforcement officials across the 28 European Union countries and seven neighbouring European countries from 104 EU enforcement agencies including Customs, Police, Environmental inspection services, CITES Management Authorities, Veterinary and phyto-sanitary inspection services, Prosecutors’ offices and judges, CITES Secretariat, the EC, EUROPOL, INTERPOL, UNODC and the WCO

The EU-TWIX system was established by the Belgian Federal Police, Customs and CITES Management Authority and TRAFFIC Europe in October 2005. It is managed at TRAFFIC Europe, on behalf of the four project partners.

The mailing list connects 802 officials from 35 countries via their work email address (communication in real time). It creates an international network of officials implementing the EUWT legislation at different levels (e.g. on the ground and at management levels). It is being increasingly used by European officials to exchange information quickly and efficiently and to seek help in their daily work and provides assistance with the practical application of the EU Wildlife Trade legislation.

Law enforcement officials can access the database securely by using personal codes. Currently there are over 40,000 seizure records from the 28 EU countries in the database dating back to the year 2000. There are numerous possibilities of combining search criteria and it also holds directories on European laboratories, rescue centres for seized specimens, wildlife experts and prices of specimens in the trade.

The database can be used to monitor current illegal trade patterns (e.g. species, countries, concealment methods most relevant in illegal trade) and assists determining enforcement priorities.

A SADC-TWIX would need a dedicated manager and active authorities and it would need a long-term financial commitment. This could potentially be linked to the development of an Africa-TWIX.

**CITES MIKE:**

Elephant range states have endorsed MIKE and accordingly are obligated by CITES CoP resolutions to applying MIKE at the selected in-country sites. MIKE is currently
migrating to MIKES which is an expanded monitoring programme to include other threatened species.

Objectives of MIKE

1. To measure levels and trends in the illegal killing of elephants
2. To determine changes in these trends over time
3. To determine the factors causing such changes and to assess to what extent observed trends are related to CITES changes in listings or ivory trade resumptions
4. To build capacity in range states for long-term elephant management

More than 50 sites representative of elephant ranges are located across Africa where data is collected using the same protocols so that trends can be measured. MIKE has four sub regional steering committees in Africa, with a technical advisory group for both MIKE and ETIS.

Because of the difficulties of collecting information across all the sites, data collection methods have been modified over time. In some cases, e.g. Namibia has its own monitoring system, i.e. the event book system or MOMs and such data is incorporated into MIKE. However, standards for data transfer and exchange between systems are being developed. MIKE is promoting the use of more appropriate and cost-effective hardware solutions, facilitating and building analytical capacity at the site and national level to ensure interoperability of database systems. Ranger based monitoring systems are based on a GPS system which enables rangers to collect standardized information so that reports can be generated.

Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool (SMART)

SMART, a computer-based Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool is a recent response to these needs and is being introduced initially at MIKE in-country sites with possibilities of expansion elsewhere, depending on the enabling environment in which SMART is expected to be operational. Ranger and site manager trainings in the use and application of SMART have been undertaken recently for some SADC countries, e.g. Botswana, Malawi, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Data entry into SMART can make use of tablets such as CyberTracker and Trimble for raw data collection besides traditional data collection on paper-based forms.

Aerial Survey

Standardised aerial surveys especially across SADC elephant range states, including TFCAs using CITES MIKE Approved Standards should be undertaken on a regular basis, at least every two years wherever possible. As an absolute minimum these should be completed for MIKE sites.
### 5.8 IMPLEMENTATION PLAN: OBJECTIVES, TARGETS, ACTIONS AND PROGRAMME LEVEL INDICATORS

There are 15 Articles (5 to 11) in the Protocol on Wildlife Conservation and Law Enforcement relevant to the strategic programmatic areas referred to in the Tables 5 - 9 below.

#### Table 5: Legislation and Judicial Processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame for the Outputs (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Legislation and judicial processes enhanced</td>
<td>• Number of culprits (poachers) arrested • Quality of judicial service</td>
<td>1.1 Legislation knowledgeable of the seriousness of wildlife offences and the appropriate sentencing guidelines</td>
<td>• Sensitisation of judges and magistrates on wildlife crimes • Create a forum for participation and feedback between judiciary and wildlife enforcement units, notwithstanding independence of the judiciary • Develop prosecuting and sentencing guidelines</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>SADC Secretariat, Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.1.2 Effective penalties, prosecution and sentencing in place</td>
<td>• Effectively operationalise and implement relevant laws and regulations • Update &amp;/or amend/enact domestic law regulating the wildlife sector as may be required</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1.3 Penalties prescribed are</td>
<td>•Prescribe mandatory minimum penalties for poaching</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</td>
<td>Five Year Target Output</td>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Time Frame for the Outputs (by when)</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                    |                                           |                          | appropriate and sufficient to deter re-offending | • Prescribe mandatory minimum penalties for poaching of key species  
  • Match sentence to severity of crime | |
|                    |                                           | 1.1.4 Wildlife legislation adequately covers all key issues of wildlife crime and trafficking | • Review and harmonise legislation and policies  
  • Review and identify gap in policy and legislation | Year 4 | Member States |
|                    |                                           | 1.1.5 Classification of key offences as a serious crime | Develop and harmonise typology of serious wildlife offences and associated species | Year 1 | Member States |
|                    |                                           | 1.1.6 Harmonization of wildlife crime enforcement needs with other legislation | • Harmonize wildlife regulations with those of customs, immigration and criminal and civil law, including fraud  
  • Review the classification of wildlife crimes | Year 4 | Member States |
|                    |                                           | 1.1.7 Domestication of international wildlife trafficking enforcement mechanisms | • CITES instruments embedded in domestic legislation  
  • Accession to other international conventions, i.e. UNCTOC, UNCC, CBD, CCPWCNH  
  • Participation in wildlife conventions by SADC member states  
  • Implementation of the UN General Assembly resolution on classification wildlife of as serious crimes | Year 5 | SADC Secretariat, Member States |
<p>|                    |                                           | 1.2 Wildlife prosecutions | 1.2.1 Key enforcement agencies and | • Establish close working relationship between enforcement units and prosecution authorities at national and | Year 2 | Member States, SADC Secretariat |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame for the Outputs (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prosecuting authorities collaborating effectively and efficiently</td>
<td>SADC level • Train and place specialized wildlife prosecutors in wildlife agencies where appropriate • Develop effective communication strategy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Specialist prosecutors knowledgeable of relevant wildlife crime-related legislation and the appropriate prosecution of offenders</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Train the prosecutors in prosecuting wildlife crimes effectively • Establish standards for case reporting and evidential requirements</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.3 Clear procedures for arrest and charging of suspects, including responsibilities of different agencies established</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish standard operating procedures</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.4 Systems in place for monitoring wildlife crime cases</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop monitoring and tracking systems for wildlife crime cases</td>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>SADC Secretariat. Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.5 Urban and rural public aware of the</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop effective communication strategy</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</td>
<td>Five Year Target Output</td>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Time Frame for the Outputs (by when)</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Wildlife crime investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.1 Sufficient well-trained wildlife crime investigators in place</td>
<td>• Recruit and train competent wildlife crime investigators to meet needs in enforcement agencies, e.g. police, wildlife agencies, customs and immigration</td>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.2 Handling of wildlife crime scenes and cases appropriate and effective</td>
<td>• Establish standard operating procedures for handling wildlife crime scenes</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>SADC Secretariat, Member States</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                      | | 1.3.3 Systems and repositories in place for managing and preserving evidence | • Develop and utilise existing systems, protocols and establish repositories  
• Develop and utilise national and regional laboratories and/or facilities centrally located  
• Standardisation of national accredited laboratories  
• Establish and manage the repositories  
• Standardisation of systems and repositories | Year 5 | Member States, SADC Secretariat |
|                      | | 1.3.4 Access to wildlife forensic analysis in place and available | • Develop protocols for disposal of confiscated wildlife products  
• Designate a SADC institution as a regional DNA database facility  
• Identify reference laboratories in the | Year 5 | Member States |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame for the Outputs (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>region to identify species and subspecies from Member States</td>
<td>1.3.5 Systems and repositories for managing and storing confiscated wildlife products in place and available</td>
<td>Establish in-country storage capacity, databases and records for confiscated wildlife products accessible by enforcement authorities across borders</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3.6 Access to an elephant and rhino DNA database, and other reference laboratories (e.g. museums) for identification of wildlife products in place and available</td>
<td>Ensure SADC wildlife law enforcement agencies access to accredited DNA database and other reference laboratories and/or facilities through agreement, protocol and/or MoU</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Wildlife Crime and Illegal Trade
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Wildlife crime and illegal trade | • Number of incidences of wildlife crime  
• Volume / quantity of illegal wildlife products traded | 2.1 Intelligence | 2.1.1 LE&AP operations responding to analyses of good intelligence and information by effective and well trained intelligence staff  
• Assess, recruit, hire, outsource and/or train intelligence staff and/or specialists  
• Establish links with other LE agencies and Country Task Force Coordinators, ORGAN, SADC FANR SPO WCPCU & POI  
• Build and establish on a “need to know” basis for which there is no prescribed action &/or set of activities; needs to be built on trust and confidence | Year 1 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
| | | 2.1.2 Functional well managed good informant networks in place, but separate from conservation LE&AP units | • As above | Year 2 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
| | | 2.1.3 Inter-agency collaboration and trust established in sharing of intelligence information | • Draw up joint Interagency understanding/protocols/agreements  
• Build and establish on a “need to know” basis for which there is no prescribed action &/or set of activities; needs to be built on trust and confidence | Year 4 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    |                                          | 2.1.4 Systems developed for verifying or analysing intelligence information | • Obtain specialised technical advice & support, e.g. INTERPOL  
• Procure appropriate software  
• Build and establish databases | Year 5 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
|                    |                                          | 2.1.5 Informant reward mechanisms ensuring anonymity are established and in place | • Ensure a budgetary allocation for key informants and retirement procedures  
• Build and establish on a “need to know” basis for which there is no prescribed action &/or set of activities; needs to be built on trust and confidence  
• Incorporate information into 2.1.1-2.1.4 above | Year 2 | Member States |
|                    |                                          | 2.1.6 Confidential mechanisms for the general public to report wildlife crime incidences are developed and in place | • Establish a toll free communication system to report crimes  
• Build and establish on a “need to know” basis for which there is no prescribed action &/or set of activities; needs to be built on trust and confidence  
• Incorporate information into 2.1.1-2.1.4 above | Year 3 | Member States |
|                    | 2.2 National and regional operations     | 2.2.1 Good inter-agency collaboration achieved | • Encourage and support within-country inter-agency collaboration  
• Include other country agencies, e.g. Police, Customs, Immigration | Years 2-5 | Member States |
|                    |                                          | 2.2.2 Cross-border inter-agency collaboration in sharing intelligence and carrying out | • Encourage, strengthen and support cross-border inter-agency collaboration  
• Facilitate linkages, dialogue and collaboration between ORGAN, | Year 3 | Member States |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>investigations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Interpol, Interpol NCBs, TRAFFIC • Include other wildlife crime agencies, e.g. LFTA, WENSA as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.3 Specialised wildlife crime and trafficking staff in key agencies</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess capacity, fill the gaps, capacitate (knowledge and equipment) • Assess, recruit, hire, outsource and/or train staff and/or specialists</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.4. Sufficient staff at ports, exit points and transit routes with specialist skills in detecting wildlife contraband</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Assess capacity, fill the gaps, capacitate (knowledge, skills &amp; equipment) • Put trained staff in place</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.5. Innovative equipment and methods to aid customs and port officers to detect wildlife contraband</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Explore and make use of innovative technologies, e.g. sniffer dogs, scanners • Improve detection methods and establish database of wildlife product seizures</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.6. Consolidation and analysis of site-level data on wildlife crime arrests and prosecutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish site level databases • Analysing &amp; interrogating site level data • Consolidate at national level (see 2.2.7) • Make use of Country Task Force</td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td>Member States and SADC Secretariat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.7. Consolidation and analysis of nation-wide data on wildlife contraband trafficking, seizures and prosecutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Establish database for aggregating, consolidating, analysing &amp; interrogating site to national level data</td>
<td>Year 3</td>
<td>Member States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</td>
<td>Five Year Target Output</td>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Time Frame (by when)</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2.2.8 Contribute to regional information sharing and databases | 2.2.8 Contribute to regional information sharing and databases | • Establish meta-database for aggregating, consolidating, analysing & interrogating site, national and regional level data  
• Make use of Country Task Force Coordinators and WCPCU | Year 4 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
| 2.2.9 Repatriation of evidence taking place | 2.2.9 Repatriation of evidence taking place | • See 1.3.5 Establish in-country storage capacity, databases and records for confiscated wildlife products accessible by enforcement authorities across borders and for repatriation | Year 5 | Member States |

Table 7: People and Nature

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3. Integration of People and Nature | 3. Integration of People and Nature | • Number of initiatives implemented to facilitate co-existence of people and nature  
• Level of community involvement | | | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 CBNRM          |                                          | 3.1.1 Enabling policy and legislative environment for devolved NRM developed and implemented | • Undertake country reviews of wildlife-related policy and legal instruments in line with an action plan developed by the Member States  
• Amend, reform, draw up statutes & regulations as required and appropriate | Years 1-3 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
|                    |                                          | 3.1.2 NR Stewardship (responsibility, accountability & governance) embedded in community institutions | • Enable direct community involvement in wildlife management  
• Develop and establish collaborative co-management frameworks between wildlife agency & community conservation entities  
• Facilitate collaborative frameworks for community participation | Year 1-2 | Member States |
|                    |                                          | 3.1.3 Legal instruments in place empowering communities to manage wildlife and other natural resources | • Amend, reform, draw up statutes & regulations as required and appropriate  
• Facilitate collaborative frameworks for community participation | Year 3 | Member States |
|                    |                                          | 3.1.4 Financial, in-kind benefits & ecosystem goods and services (PES) accruing to communities | • Provide policy guidelines and legal instruments (regulations) ensuring accrual of wildlife benefits directly to legal community institutions (e.g. Trusts)  
• Ensure mechanisms in place for direct benefits to site adjacent communities  
• Facilitate development of self-regulating financial accounting systems (e.g. Dashboard approach) | Year 4 | Member States |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.2 TBNRM          |                                          | 3.2.1 Functioning TBNRM Community Forums established between adjacent TFCA partner countries | • Extend CBNRM policy and regulatory frameworks across borders, i.e. greater harmonisation  
• Raise and strengthen the profile and mandate of TBNRM Community Forums  
• Strengthen existing Regional CBNRM Forum and associated Country Forums  
• Establish new Country CBNRM Forums where not in place | Years 1-3 | Member States |
|                    |                                          | 3.2.2 Community-based TBNRM Forums play an active role in the policy-science-resource management nexus | • Develop and establish collaborative co-management frameworks across borders and between resource management regimes, e.g. wildlife agency & community conservation entity  
• Ensure TBNRM Forums participate in policy-management-science debates | Year 4 | Member States |
| 3.3 Community engagement |                                          | 3.3.1 Regular communications and consultations with park-adjacent communities being undertaken | • Facilitate exchanges, information sharing and lessons learned in HWC mitigation techniques, LE&AP, PA regulations and general wildlife management techniques, e.g. fire management | Years 1-3 | Member States |
|                    |                                          | 3.3.2 Establish community-based forums that protected area managers can engage with, e.g. Regional TBNRM and Country | • See 3.2 above  
• Regular meetings held between PA managers and local CBOs  
• Record of meetings documented and disseminated | Year 4 | Member States |
### Programme Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>based CBNRM Forums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.3.3 The impacts of wildlife, especially HWC on community livelihoods is mitigated and minimized as far as possible | • Ensure compatible &/or harmonised HWC policies developed and in place  
• Ensure HWC tools available and training in application provided  
• Involve communities in protected area or buffer zone management, especially in PES arrangements, e.g. buffer zone maintenance | Year 4-5 | Member States |
| 3.3.4 Communities are aware and knowledgeable of protected area boundaries, rules, and penalties for violations | • Provide awareness on park rules and regulations  
• Provide controlled access to and use of natural resources | Year 5 | Member States |
| 3.3.5 Communities contributing to wildlife LE & AP activities | • Train community rangers, CBNRM coordinators and rehabilitated poachers  
• Engage communities in site-level law enforcement activities, especially surveillance and information networks | Year 5 | Member States |

### Table 8: Trade and Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Sustainable</td>
<td>• Number of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</td>
<td>Five Year Target Output</td>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Time Frame (by when)</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade and Use of natural resources</td>
<td>initiatives to promote sustainable use and trade</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4.1 Trade | | 4.1.1 Campaigns and awareness, lobbying and marketing undertaken | • Appropriate strategies to be developed, implemented and reviewed regularly  
• Records of legitimate trade in wildlife products documented | Years 1-5 | Member States |
| | | 4.1.2 Active engagement with CITES on trade-related issues maintained and continued with SADC support | • Convene regional meetings to develop appropriate strategies, e.g. for CITES COP, CBD etc. related to trade issues  
• Build database of legal trade in wildlife products, i.e. species, quantities and quality, e.g. crocodile skins as per Appendix II requirements | Year 4-5 | SADC Secretariat and Member States |
| 4.2 Use | | 4.2.1 Campaigns and awareness, lobbying and marketing undertaken | • Appropriate strategies to be developed, implemented and reviewed regularly  
• Poverty, livelihoods and sustainable use addressed through various forums  
• Ensure safari hunting and other consumptive use is managed, monitored and regulated in accordance within country policy and legal frameworks  
• Ensure sustained yield cropping of wildlife is recognised as a strategy for pro-poor protein production | Years 1-5 | Member States |
<p>| | | 4.2.2 Active engagement with CITES on use-related issues maintained | • Convene regional meetings to develop appropriate strategies, e.g. for CITES COP, CBD etc. to promote sustainable use of wildlife | Year 1-5 | SADC Secretariat and Member States |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Benefits</td>
<td>4.3.1 Comparative economic advantages of wildlife as a land use demonstrated</td>
<td>• Advocate and demonstrate conservation &amp; development values of wildlife use such as nature-based tourism, hunting and cropping across agriculturally marginal landscapes</td>
<td>Years 1-5</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3.2 Financial benefits of wildlife as a land use accrue to those living with wildlife demonstrated</td>
<td>• Provide robust data and evidence demonstrating financial benefits of wildlife use and nature based tourism reaching local communities</td>
<td>Year 2-5</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 9: Field Protection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. Field Protection</td>
<td>• No. of technical people trained • Quality of service provided by the field staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Ranger patrols</td>
<td>5.1.1 Sufficient, skilled, motivated, and disciplined law enforcement field</td>
<td>• Identify, and select field rangers and patrol leaders • Develop/amend and implement training curricula for rangers including</td>
<td>Year 1 &amp; on-going</td>
<td>Member States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme Strategy</td>
<td>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</td>
<td>Five Year Target Output</td>
<td>Key Actions</td>
<td>Time Frame (by when)</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rangers and patrol leaders in place</td>
<td>skills for equipment operation and maintenance, local knowledge, communication; norms and standards for field level LE&amp;AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide rations, basic transportation and communication equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify, procure and utilize appropriate technology (surveillance, GPS, arms and ammunition; etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Identify field ranger/equipment/area coverage ratios and allocate resources accordingly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop, test, implement and enforce field level standard operating procedures (SOP) and Code of Conduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop and implement an incentive system for field rangers and Code of Conduct and SOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Provide guidance on norms and standards for field level LE&amp;AP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| 5.2 Field site operations | 5.2.1 Skilled and motivated law enforcement team leaders or managers trained and in place | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|----------------|
|                          | • Identify, select and train site level managers | | | | |
|                          | • Use Country Task Forces and Joint Operations Command (JOC) structures | | | | |
|                          | • Support infrastructural, procurement and training services | | | | |
|                          | • Use Joint Operations Command (JOC) and/or Task Force structures at national and regional level (build on existing structures and experience such as) | | Years 1-5 | | |
|                          |                                                                                                 | | Member States | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SARCCO)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 5.2.2 Patrol strategies developed and adapted to the nature of the threat |                          | • Effective communications between patrols and base enabled  
• Sufficient, well located ranger outposts in place  
• Innovative law enforcement strategies or tactics deployed | Year 1-5 | Member States |
| 5.2.3 Secure on-going support from committed organizational partners |                          | • Build relationships with trusted NGO and private sector partners  
• Develop joint programmes of technical support, cooperation and funding support | Year 3 | Member States |
| 5.2.4 Good collaboration with other security agencies achieved within and across countries’ borders |                          | • Develop and implement standard cross border pursuit protocols and procedures  
• Ensure SOP across borders, e.g. scene of crime investigations by first respondent | Year 3 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
| 5.2.5 Improved collaboration between all agencies mandated with wildlife law enforcement (LE) |                          | • Provide inter-agency exposure and training in standard LE  
• Make use of country task forces and SADC WCPCU | Year 3 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
| 5.3 Ranger based Monitoring (RBM) |                          |                            |             |                      |               |
| 5.3.1 LE&AP-relevant minimum data set for needed monitoring information |                          | • Support implementation of SMART (Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool) at CITES MIKES sites  
• Provide training for application of | Years 1-5 | Member States |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                     |                                          | competently collected at ranger level | SMART at patrol ranger level  
- Expand sites once knowledge, skills and experience acquired  
- Apply and use SMART, MOMS (Management Oriented Monitoring System) or such similar monitoring tools and applications | | |
|                     | 5.3.2 Site level managers are “enabled” and understand the monitoring information provided |  | • Provide training for application of SMART at site manager level  
• Ensure the “enabling environment” is in provided and in place, e.g. functional computer hardware and software; GPS and related tools and ranger base stations  
• Put in place effective radio /cell phone communications systems | Year 2 | Member States |
|                     | 5.3.3 Well-trained, site-based data management and analysis staff in place |  | • Provide training for site based data management and analysis  
• Ensure correct application of SMART at site manager level  
• Ensure appropriate content and format of monitoring information for management and operations collected | Year 2 | Member States |
|                     | 5.3.5 Accurate and timely data entry into the system achieved |  | • Ensure rapid information exchange between data base manager and patrol leaders  
• Provide and ensure user-friendly and appropriate mechanism for storing and analysing information collected in place | Year 3 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Strategy</th>
<th>Strategic Programme Area Level Indicator</th>
<th>Five Year Target Output</th>
<th>Key Actions</th>
<th>Time Frame (by when)</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                    |                                          | 5.3.6 Regional exchange of monitoring data according to an agreed standard reporting format established | • Provide means and standardised reporting format for data aggregation upwards to country task forces and SADC WCPCU  
• Incorporate and triangulate country-level aerial survey data with LE&AP data | Year 4-5 | Member States and SADC Secretariat |