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Executive Summary

Southeast Asia (SEA) is well-known for its abundant biodiversity, but at the same time, it is considered a hotspot for illegally traded wildlife and wildlife products (Blair et al., 2017; TRAFFIC, 2008). Responding to the severity of the situation in which countless traded species are at the brink of extinction, the number of initiatives combating illegal wildlife trade (IWT) in the region has been increasing over the last decade. The Philippines plays a key role in this debate, as it is considered a source, transit, and destination country for IWT (ADB, 2018; FATF, 2020; Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020).

To date, there have been very few analyses of initiatives and projects combating IWT in SEA, affecting various stakeholders adversely. For the Philippine government, this lack of information on other country’s best practices affects the country’s speed and quality of response to wildlife crime. The national Wildlife Law Enforcement Action Plan (WildLEAP) (2018-2028) offers a structured path forward, however, the targets and indicators included in the Plan could be more specific with regard to the challenges the country is currently facing. For donors, implementing organizations, and other stakeholders, this dearth of information complicates the design of new projects, as a significant amount of time is spent on compiling data on aspects covered by previous projects, and it may lead to funding decisions based on an incomplete perception of the project landscape. Therefore, the Philippine government, as well as prospective donors and implementers, will benefit from the report by having access to a consolidated list of interventions that are specific and actionable, by learning from best practices in the spirit of South-South cooperation, by receiving a compendium of knowledge with relevant resources linked in the report, and by learning about a newly developed tool to facilitate donor coordination, project design, and funding – the IWT Project Map and Database.

This report has two main objectives: 1) To assess past and present counter-IWT projects in SEA and to present recommendations for the potential replication of counter-IWT interventions in the Philippines, and 2) to facilitate donor coordination, inform project design, and guide investment decisions for future counter-IWT projects in the region. The results of both objectives are hoped to stimulate efficient cooperation with other countries in the region and beyond, as well as learning partnerships in terms of methodologies and tools used and expertise acquired.

1 The report adopts a clear definition of illegal wildlife trade, or wildlife trafficking, as trade in wildlife or wildlife parts, derivatives, or by-products that violates either international legal frameworks or the national legislation of affected countries, thereby encompassing both domestic laws and CITES regulations (Haenlein and Smith, 2016; OECD, 2019; TRAFFIC, 2020a). It comprises wild species of fauna and flora, excluding illegal fishing (OECD, 2019). Illegal wildlife trade encompasses the entire illegal supply chain of wildlife crime, thereby including activities such as illegally killing or poaching, transporting, smuggling, exchanging, selling, purchasing, and possessing, fauna and flora. This definition further includes the various forms of money laundering, corruption, and marketing of illicit goods necessary for these transactions to occur (TRAFFIC, 2020a).

2 The term "counter-IWT" refers to activities that mitigate or halt illegal wildlife trade and can focus on demand or supply reduction, strengthening of wildlife law enforcement, or change of relevant legislation, among others.
To meet the abovementioned objectives, the Consultant searched numerous project databases, organizational websites, factsheets, and projects reports; developed a structured Excel template to record projects in; developed a designated website to present detailed project information, prepared the launch, and sent out emails for project verification; interviewed subject matter experts; conducted in-depth interviews with three projects under the Global Wildlife Program; conducted literature research; participated in webinars; and underwent several feedback cycles, incorporating suggestions into the report.

In the following, the key results are presented by Chapter.

Chapter 2 places IWT into the regional context, examines the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Community, assesses the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the use of counter-IWT tools in the region, and lists relevant regional and international cooperation mechanisms. The ASEAN Working Group on CITES and Wildlife Enforcement, and the Seniors Officials Meeting on Transnational Crime Working Group on Illicit Trafficking of Wildlife and Timber, were identified as the key ASEAN bodies addressing IWT. This commitment is also reflected in the numerous advancements in counter-IWT legislation that came into effect in several AMS, as well as in regional and international cooperation mechanisms, such as ASEAN’s Parliamentary Organization, and the United Nations Convention against Corruption. The Corruption Perceptions Index of 2020 is applied to selected AMS, with Brunei, Malaysia and Singapore scoring above 50 points, and Lao People’s Democratic Republic (PDR) (29) and the Philippines (34) scoring lowest (Transparency International, 2021). The utilization of tools, such as the Analytical Toolkit and Indicator Framework, was assessed, which both remain underused, as well as the Parties’ legislative progress to mirror CITES at the national level, with three AMS in categories 2 and 3.

Chapter 3 examines the Philippine IWT context, analyzes challenges and shows some of the efforts undertaken to address these, and gives an overview over regional agreements. The main legislation in the Philippines to combat IWT is the Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act, or Republic Act 9147, accompanied by Department Administrative Order (DAO) 2019-09 and DAO 2017-11 for the classification of fauna and flora, respectively. The lead agency to implement these is the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR), whereas the on-the-ground operations combating IWT are carried out by the DENR Regional Offices, and through the Philippine Operations Group on Ivory and Illegal Wildlife (POGI), a multi-agency task force. Between 2010 and 2019, a total number of 511 wildlife seizures was recorded in the Philippines, with most of the species belonging to the taxonomic group of reptiles (n=16,237), followed by birds (n=6,042), whereas pangolin scales were the most frequent and quantitative largest derivative seized (>2,100 kg) (Sy, 2021). The Philippines has been active in combating wildlife crime, however, recent confiscation reports, continued violence against wildlife law enforcers, and an on-going high number of illegal wildlife sales unveil that there are still gaps that remain to be addressed (De Vera-Ruiz, 2020; DENR-BMB, 2020a; Tiburcio, 2020). It is thus apparent that effective law enforcement needs to be supported by i)

\[\text{The term “counter-IWT” refers to activities that mitigate or halt illegal wildlife trade and can focus on demand or supply reduction, strengthening of wildlife law enforcement, or change of relevant legislation, among others.}\]
due diligence, especially in terms of wildlife permit and certificate issuance; ii) capacity building activities; iii) international collaboration for repatriation; iv) gathering and sharing of intelligence; v) innovative approaches to tackle IWT on social networks and e-commerce platforms; vi) a well-drafted legislative regulatory framework; vii) a judicial system that can effectively prosecute persons involved in wildlife crimes; and viii) by innovative financing mechanisms. Regional agreements analyze the Coral Triangle Initiative – Regional Plan of Action, among others.

Chapter 4 presents legal and illegal trade flows, both involving the Philippines. To know about legal trade flows of wildlife can prove to be an invaluable starting point for further investigations, as IWT is often concealed by legal trade. Legal trade flows from the Philippines to selected AMS, and vice versa, and from the Philippines to the People’s Republic of China (PRC), and vice versa, were extracted from the CITES database and analyzed for the years 2015 to 2018:

i. For legal wildlife trade from the Philippines to selected AMS, a total of 799 entries of wildlife legally shipped were recorded, of which 43 entries classified as Appendix I, and 756 entries classified as Appendix II listed species. Most species were destined for Singapore (372), followed by Thailand (241), and by Indonesia (146). A majority belonged to the taxonomic group of plants (638), with almost all species being part of the Orchidaceae family, or orchids. This taxonomic group was followed by traded birds (102), and traded reptiles (53). The dominant state that specimens were traded in is live (737 specimens). The purpose of the trade was mostly for Commercial trade (634), and the most common source of traded species were Plants that are artificially propagated (638), followed by Animals bred in captivity (120).

ii. For the legal trade from AMS to the Philippines, a total of 233 entries of wildlife were recorded. Of these, 30 entries were classified as Appendix I, 198 entries as Appendix II, and five entries were classified as Appendix III listed species. The majority stemmed from Singapore (131), followed by Indonesia (54), Malaysia (45), and Viet Nam (3). Most of these AMS were transit countries themselves, with many species originating from Indonesia, the United States of America (USA), Viet Nam, Lao PDR, Australia, and Bolivia. The taxonomic group imported most was reptiles (165), followed by plants (29), and fish (20). Most species were traded live (107), followed closely by leather products (95). With 185 entries, most of the trade was of a Commercial nature. The sources varied, with most wildlife stemming from Animals bred in captivity (83), followed by Specimens taken from the wild (57), which concerned almost exclusively reptiles.

iii. For the legal trade from the Philippines to the PRC, 522 entries of wildlife were recorded, with 12 entries classified as Appendix I, and 510 entries classified as Appendix II listed species. The majority of the shipments were destined for Taiwan, China (436). Most entries comprised flora (426), the majority belonging to the Orchidaceae family, followed by birds (90). With 516 entries, almost all entries (99%) were recorded as containing live species, with 488 entries stating commercial reasons as the purpose, and the sources of wildlife mostly being Plants that are artificially propagated (426), followed by Animals bred in captivity (90).
Regarding wildlife legally shipped from the PRC to the Philippines, 136 database entries were recorded. Of these, five entries were classified as Appendix I, 129 entries were classified as Appendix II, and two entries were classified as Appendix III listed species. Mostly, the PRC acted only as a transshipment country, with species originating from 30 different countries. Most wildlife/wildlife products were shipped from the USA (19), followed by the Seychelles (12), and Indonesia (10). Most entries were recorded for the taxonomic group of reptiles (118), followed by flora (14). The CITES category traded most was live specimens (95). The main purposes of wildlife traded from the PRC to the Philippines were recorded as Commercial (77), and Breeding in captivity or artificial propagation (56), and the main source was indicated as Animals bred in captivity (85).

With regard to the illegal trade flows and confiscations, numbers vary due to differences in methodology. Whereas seizure records of DENR-Biodiversity Management Bureau (BMB), the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development, the Philippine National Police-Maritime Group, DENR regional offices, and open source media recorded 511 seizures between 2010 and 2019, the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal reported only 236 incidents in the same time period. Of these entries, the Philippines is “Country of Incident” in 196 cases and “Country involved” in the remaining 40 cases. The Global Environmental Crime Tracker recorded a total of 53 incidents in the Philippines between 2010 and 2019, with an arrest rate of 50.9% and a conviction rate of 1.9% (EIA, 2021). ROUTES, a USAID partnership that tackles IWT in the transport sector, reported 51 incidents in the Philippines between 2009 and 2020 with a country enforcement index of 65%, and the four top smuggling routes being Manila – Taipei, Manila – Japan, Philippines – Jakarta, and Philippines – USA. The top Philippine cities where seizures were reported were Manila, Cebu City, Puerto Princesa, and Bacolod. The number of incidents recorded was highest for Thailand (218) and the country enforcement index was best for Viet Nam (71%). Checked luggage is the transport method used most for wildlife trafficking at airports, followed by air freight, with most of the goods trafficked being ivory and reptiles. One major illegal wildlife import link that was recognized by Krishnasamy and Zavagli (2020) is the illegal inflow of species into the Philippines from Indonesia, with at least at least four seizures of 462 parrots endemic to Indonesia between 2013 and 2017 (TRAFFIC, 2018).

Chapter 5 presents the first part of the stocktaking. This includes an analysis of counter-IWT projects and activities in selected AMS, which forms the basis for recommendations derived for and tailored to the Philippines for potential replication. Apart from AMS, five African States (Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Republic of Congo, and South Africa) and one South Asian State (Afghanistan) were included. Country abbreviations were added to each recommendation and allow for tracing them back to the more comprehensive narrative. All recommendations (number of recommendations in brackets) were allocated to one of the six Strategies of the WildLEAP.

---

4 The Country Enforcement Index gives an approximation of enforcement success rates and “(…) is a quantitative representation of each country’s ability to detect and seize illicit wildlife products traveling through its airports (Utermohlen and Baine, 2016). A lower number indicates that the country is not able to detect the majority of illicit products that are smuggled through its airports, whereas a higher index number indicates a more effective enforcement. The Index is calculated by dividing the number of total seizures by the successfully attempted trafficking instances (Utermohlen and Baine, 2016). The latter can e.g. be derived from IWT shipments intercepted in the destination country, counting as a “miss” in the country of origin.

5 The mix of countries and capitals is deliberate as this is the information displayed on the ROUTES homepage.
whereas some of the Strategy Titles were expanded (in italics): Strategy 1: Policy and System Development (16); Strategy 2: Networking, Coordination, and Partnerships (15); Strategy 3: Capacity Building (24); Strategy 4: Communication, Education and Public Awareness (12); Strategy 5: Improving Governance, Curbing Corruption, and Establishing Structures (26); and Strategy 6: Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation, Research and Technologies (25).

Chapter 6 presents the second part of the stocktaking. Based on, but not limited to, the assessment and analysis conducted in the previous Chapter, counter-IWT projects in SEA were mapped and recorded in an IWT Project Map and Database. This tool was embedded in a designated website, which was launched together with numerous organizations and donors in May 2021. It aims to facilitate donor coordination, guide investment and funding decisions, assist in project design, and strengthen transboundary and inter-organizational cooperation. A data analysis on the number of counter-IWT projects per country, per selected taxonomic group, and the amount of funding spent on counter-IWT projects are presented for selected AMS.

i. In total, 252 unique counter-IWT projects completed in 2015 or after have been implemented at the national level, 15 at the regional level, and 27 at the international level. Most unique national-level projects have been implemented in Indonesia (60), followed by Cambodia (37), and Viet Nam (35). Only 10 unique national-level Projects have been implemented in the Philippines, and none have been implemented in Brunei Darussalam and in Singapore so far. Indonesia (6), Thailand (6), and Viet Nam (5) have been the countries included most often in regional projects, and Viet Nam (16) and Lao PDR (10) have the best track record in being part of international projects.

ii. The recorded counter-IWT projects were then analyzed with regard to protecting tigers, elephants, rhinos, and pangolins. It was found that Indonesia implements a high number of projects to protect tigers (10), elephants (11), and rhinos (11), and that Thailand has the highest number of projects protecting tigers (13) among all selected AMS. Projects focusing on pangolins are underrepresented (15), as well as projects focusing on the protection of these specific taxonomic groups in the Philippines (1). The highest total number of projects for all selected AMS focuses on the protection of tigers (39).

iii. The total funding recorded for unique national-level projects implemented in selected AMS amounts to $502,622,340. Most of the funding was allocated to Indonesia ($179M), followed by Lao PDR ($81.2M) and Malaysia ($74.9M), and least funding was allocated to Viet Nam ($17.0M). The latter is explained with the average funding amount being quite low (median = $83,677). Brunei Darussalam and Singapore did not receive any funding for counter-IWT projects at the national and international level. The total funding for unique counter-IWT projects at the regional level amounts to $6.6M, and the funding for unique counter-IWT projects at the international level to $203.4M.

Chapter 7 concludes the report and suggests next steps that may be needed in order for this report to be utilized in the best manner possible and to institutionalize both, its recommendations as well as the IWT Project Map and Database.
1. Introduction

In early 2021, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) declared that 37,480 of all assessed species are threatened with extinction (IUCN, 2021). In 2019, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) even went a step further in its Global Assessment, which takes into account the entirety of our planet’s species. The IPBES estimated that as much as 1 million species face extinction, many of them within decades, with the global rate of extinction being “at least tens to hundreds of times higher than the average rate over the past 10 million years” (IPBES, 2019). The two main drivers causing this development are Land and sea use change, i.e. habitat destruction, and Direct exploitation (IPBES, 2019). Both pressures together “account for more than 50% of the global impact on land, in fresh water and in the sea” (IPBES, 2019).

One form of direct exploitation is Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT), which is by now considered to be the fourth largest illegal trade globally, after arms, drugs and human trafficking (UNODC, n.d.). Consequences of unsustainable, unregulated, and illegal wildlife trade can be dire, affecting not only the survival of species and biodiversity as a whole, but equally that of humans, whether directly through the loss of livelihoods and food security, or indirectly through negative impacts on the economic development of a country or through heightened national security risks and conflict (UNODC, n.d.). Efforts to achieve poverty alleviation and sustainable development may thus be undermined (TRAFFIC, 2008). But the repercussions from IWT can also take on a much more tangible shape – as they did with the Covid-19 pandemic. High-risk wildlife markets, often keeping animals in cramped and unhygienic conditions, are a breeding ground for zoonotic diseases. However, these markets are only the last link of a wide-reaching clandestine supply chain, exploiting natural resources for the benefits of a few, to the detriment of many. Whether violators are involved in poaching, smuggling, or buying, they all are cogwheels in the greater machinery of exploitation. Several international organizations have become active in advocating a One Health approach and have formed alliances, where multiple sectors and disciplines are involved to monitor and to collaborate to control public health threats, and to address the root causes of zoonotic diseases - with IWT among them (Davis, 2020; EndPandemics, 2020).

Especially concerning are the numbers of confiscated wildlife in so-called hotspots, which have been skyrocketing in the last decade, and yet, they are only the tip of the iceberg, as it is estimated that not more than 10% of IWT is detected and confiscated (van Uhm, 2016).

---

6 The report adopts a clear definition of illegal wildlife trade, or wildlife trafficking, as trade in wildlife or wildlife parts, derivatives, or by-products that violates either international legal frameworks or the national legislation of affected countries, thereby encompassing both domestic laws and CITES regulations (Haenlein and Smith, 2016; OECD, 2019; TRAFFIC, 2020a). It comprises wild species of fauna and flora, excluding illegal fishing (OECD, 2019). Illegal wildlife trade encompasses the entire illegal supply chain of wildlife crime, thereby including activities such as poaching, transporting, smuggling, exchanging, selling, purchasing, and possessing, fauna and flora. This definition further includes the various forms of money laundering, corruption, and marketing of illicit goods necessary for these transactions to occur (TRAFFIC, 2020a).

7 Poaching is defined as the illegal hunting, killing, capturing, harvesting, collection or removal of wild fauna or flora or any of its parts, derivatives, or by-products (TRAFFIC, 2020a).
Southeast Asia (SEA) is one of these IWT hotspots, as it harbors one of the most abundant and stunning biodiversity worldwide, and, at the same time, is also well-known for its consumers, desiring exotic wildlife products, which renders the region a source, transit, and destination point for illegally traded wildlife and wildlife products (Blair et al., 2017; TRAFFIC, 2008). This can only be addressed by an equally strong alliance of countries. The most prominent economic union promoting and facilitating inter-governmental cooperation in SEA is the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Under the motto “One Vision, One Identity, One Community”, ASEAN affirms its resolve to act in unity and to offer a concerted regional response to matters that affect all ASEAN Member States (AMS). Even though economic and political affairs have dominated the discussions for many decades, environmental matters, including IWT, seem to have gained traction (CITES, 2019a; The ASEAN Post, 2020a).

The Philippines, one of ASEAN’s founding members, has shown its resolve to combat IWT early on, with the destruction of about five tons of seized elephant ivory illegally smuggled into the Philippines in 2013 (Hranjski, 2013). But even though numerous counter-IWT initiatives have been implemented in the country, this endeavor has been complicated by a scarcity of resources, outdated environmental legislation, and a lack of capacity and tools. The Philippines is already experiencing the immanent and long-term consequences of biodiversity loss today, but the ecosystem gaps caused by species that already went extinct are nowadays not noticed as such. Few people know of the former presence of various elephant, rhinoceros and tiger species in the archipelago (Corlett, 2010), with these early extinctions often not considered in the urgency and severity of present-day interventions – the phenomenon of shifting baselines. Still, to succeed in curbing IWT in the Philippines means to succeed in closing down a pivotal hub of the trade. Investing into counter-IWT activities to this effect should hence be considered a worthwhile undertaking to be actively continued rather sooner than later, seeing the economic losses that can occur (The World Bank, 2019). Since many of these activities may have already been implemented by other countries, they may possess valuable lessons learned that could give the Philippines a decisive advantage over criminal networks by hitting the ground running.

With this report, the Philippines and other countries in SEA and beyond receive a tool they may consult for guidance on the design of project activities, allocation of funding, or simply to learn more about best practices in other countries. This repository of knowledge may also be used by key stakeholders to continue their efforts in implementing national counter-IWT8 legislation, species conservation action plans, or to inform themselves about legal trade among countries in the SEA region. It is hoped that the report will contribute to creating an environment for wildlife in the Philippines and in the region to thrive, and that its recommendations will result in actions giving wildlife the protection it deserves, and, by implication, improving human well-being.

---

8 The term “counter-IWT” refers to activities that mitigate or halt illegal wildlife trade and can focus on demand or supply reduction, strengthening of wildlife law enforcement, or change of relevant legislation, among others.
2. Southeast Asia and IWT: A Regional Approach

2.1. The Southeast Asian IWT Context

The SEA\(^9\) region is well-known globally for its abundant biodiversity and high rate of endemism, encompassing about 20% of global plant, animal and marine species (Subramanian et al., 2011). However, these diverse natural resources are threatened by numerous human-made pressures (Subramanian et al., 2011), of which habitat destruction and the overexploitation of natural resources are among the most severe ones. Over the last decade, it has been repeatedly confirmed by several independent studies that SEA is a hotspot for IWT (Blair et al., 2017; TRAFFIC, 2008), including the most recent World Wildlife Crime Report (UNODC, 2020).

The countries in SEA are strongly connected to each other through the regional body of ASEAN. The association was founded as a regional organization in 1967 by five Southeast Asian States, with the last country joining in 1999, to mitigate regional conflicts and to promote economic and social benefits (Lee and Oh, 2020). Some of its most prominent goals are to “maintain and enhance peace, security and stability (…); to enhance regional resilience (…); and to enhance the well-being and livelihood of the peoples of ASEAN” (ASEAN, 2008). The organization places special importance on the concept of State sovereignty, by ensuring its members the “non-interference in the internal affairs of ASEAN Member States”, and by ruling that “decision making in ASEAN shall be based on consultation and consensus” (ASEAN, 2008). These sections from the ASEAN Charter are called the “ASEAN Way” and are characteristic for the form of collaboration between the AMS. This is complemented by preferring informality over formal arrangements or treaties, and the tendency to rely on personal relations rather than on institutions to influence peers (Severino Jr., 2006). All of these traits showcase the association’s strengths, such as respect, trust, and a close-knit network of peers leading to political stability, but also its weaknesses, such as the assimilation of opinions for the greater good, thereby relying on the smallest common denominator for decision-making.

Already more than a decade ago, Morrison et al. (2007) estimated that only 1% of the entire land area in tropical Asia still supported an intact fauna of mammals greater than 20kg. Still, IWT within ASEAN has continued, even increased over the last decade (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). Improved hunting technologies, infrastructure encroaching into formerly pristine habitats, and an increasing affluence among the people in the region leading to a growing demand for wildlife, put pressure on wildlife in the region (Robinson and Bennett, 2000 in Harrison et al., 2016). In addition to native wildlife facing the above mentioned threats, exotic species face a similar plight if they are in demand. The African-ASEAN IWT Nexus is well-described and represents one of the major illegal trade route for numerous species (UNODC, 2020). One of the products highly in demand was, and still is, elephant ivory, originating from

---

\(^9\) Even though the geographical region of this report and its assessments is SEA, detailed analysis centers on selected countries that make up ASEAN and therefore excludes Timor-Leste. As of the writing of this report, Timor-Leste is not yet a Party to CITES and there is only little information available about the country’s involvement in IWT.
African elephants (Loxodonta africana) and, to a lesser extent\textsuperscript{10}, from Asian elephants (Elephas maximus). At the CITES COP16 in 2013, eight countries were identified as significant source, transit, or destination points for illegal ivory trade: the PRC, Kenya, Malaysia, the Philippines, Tanzania, Thailand, Uganda, and Viet Nam (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2013). These countries agreed to develop time-bound National Ivory Action Plans (NIAPs) to actively address illegal ivory trade. In addition, CITES Parties were divided into Category A, B, and C Parties\textsuperscript{11}: Currently, Malaysia and Viet Nam are still considered Category A Parties; the PRC and Hong Kong, China, are considered Category B Parties, but are not participating in the NIAP process; and Cambodia and Singapore are considered Category C countries, with Singapore not participating in the NIAP process either (CITES, n.d.). The Philippines, Thailand, and the PRC (excluding Hong Kong, China), among other original members, are not obligated anymore to submit NIAPs and exited the process. This was decided at the 70\textsuperscript{th} Standing Committee meeting of CITES in 2018, since these Parties reported that they “substantially achieved” their NIAPs (CITES, 2019b). Even though there may have been significant reductions, ivory may still find its way into and out of these countries. Even though the Philippines and Thailand exited the process, Krishnasamy and Zavagli (2020) still consider the Philippines to be both, a transit and consumer country, and Thailand to be a source, consumer, and transit country for ivory.

This shows that the SEA region still faces various challenges in combating IWT, but governments have begun to put their commitments into action, to protect their resources and thus their people. All AMS are Parties to CITES, which is the most well-known international agreement that aims to regulate wildlife trade. CITES has been complemented by agreements that specifically seek to curb IWT, such as the London Declaration of 2018 (updated in 2019), which in turn adopted the London Declaration of 2014, the Kasane Declaration of 2015, and the Hanoi Declaration of 2016 (Signatories to the Declaration, 2019). Moreover, there have been numerous recent developments in the legislation of countries in the region that will most probably advance counter-IWT efforts significantly. These legislative advancements are summarized for selected AMS and the People’s Republic of China (PRC) below:

**Brunei Darussalam**’s *Wildlife Protection Act of 1984* lists only 34 species so far, but it has been announced that an amendment to the Act is underway (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020).

**Cambodia** added 12 non-native species that are heavily affected by IWT to its list of protected species through the passage of a new regulation, *Praka No. 240*, in 2018, which also included seven species of pangolins, African elephants, and four species of rhinoceros (UNODC, 2018a). A challenge mentioned was the lack of advanced investigation techniques and thus the enforcement of wildlife protection laws (UNODC, 2018a). An effective response is the deployment of the Wildlife Rapid Rescue Team, consisting of a unique combination of NGO workers and government staff, which has been very effective in seizing illegal wildlife and

\textsuperscript{10} In African elephants, both male and female animals carry tusks, whereas in Asian elephants only some male individuals carry tusks, narrowing the poaching of ivory in Asia to male elephants.

\textsuperscript{11} “Category A” Parties consist of Parties most affected by the illegal trade in ivory; “Category B” Parties consist of Parties markedly affected by the illegal trade in ivory; and “Category C” Parties consist of Parties affected by the illegal trade in ivory. The classification can change over time depending on how illegal ivory trade is addressed by the country.
apprehending poachers. It received the “Best Wildlife Law Enforcement Unit in Asia Award” from the United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) in 2015 (Wildlife Alliance, 2017) and tackles new challenges, such as IWT on social media and the rise in IWT due to newly set up Chinese resorts and casinos, “many of which appear to be developed under the banner of the Belt and Road Initiative”12 (Wildlife Alliance, 2017). Moreover, the Ministry of Environment was reported, as of March 2018, to be in the process of revising all environment protection related legislation in order to align laws to international standards and to raise penalties (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). Part of the new legislation from 2018 is the introduction of strict penalties for anyone who is caught with ivory (ASEAN Today, 2019).

Indonesia sported two landmark court cases convicting wildlife law violators under Indonesia’s Quarantine Act, fines were increased by 800% in the judiciary system of Kalimantan, and Government Regulation No. 20 (P.20/2018) was introduced in 2018, expanding Indonesia’s protected species list from 677 to 921 species of flora and fauna. This is in contrast to the main wildlife laws, which are still from 1990 (Act No.5/1990) and 1999 (Regulation No. 7/1999), and do not provide adequate regulation and protection of species (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). Nevertheless, the country finds other ways how to apprehend, convict, and change the behavior of its people. In 2014, Indonesia’s religious leadership passed an unprecedented Muslim edict (fatwa), which prohibits IWT and calls on Indonesia’s Muslim population to halt IWT activities (see Chapter 5.3). Elephant ivory trafficking is punishable by law in Indonesia, with a maximum penalty of five years imprisonment and a maximum fine of $10,000 (WCS, 2015).

Lao People’s Democratic Republic (PDR) issued Prime Minister’s Order No. 05 in 2018, which prohibits the import, transit, trade, and export of all wildlife body parts, as well as the hunting of all wild animals, and stops the establishment of wildlife farms (WWF, 2018). In addition, wildlife and wildlife products that are owned by individuals and organizations are to be registered, hunting weapons used in poaching collected and destroyed, and increased vigilance is demanded at international checkpoints and borders (WWF, 2018). Moreover, a revision of the Penal Law came into force in 2018, which carries higher fines and jail times for wildlife trafficking violations (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). In 2019, the Department of Forest Inspection signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) Lao PDR, which aims to help strengthen law enforcement through meetings and trainings and to increase cross-border collaboration (USAID and MCR Society, 2021). Lao PDR is considered the world’s fastest growing ivory market due to issues with enforcement and corruption (Leithead, 2017), and there seem to be no appropriate controls in place with regard to the management of elephant trophies (hunting) and ivory registration in the country (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020).

Malaysia has three strong legislations criminalizing wildlife trade: Wildlife Conservation Act, 2010; International Trade in Endangered Species Act, 2008; and the Customs Prohibition Act, 2012. The country’s biggest challenge is that among its three administrative regions of

12 The Belt and Road Initiative is a transcontinental investment program and long-term policy, which aims at infrastructure development and an acceleration of the economic integration of countries that are located along the route of the historic Silk Road (BRI, n.d.).
Peninsular Malaysia, Sarawak, and Sabah, domestic wildlife protection laws are not harmonized (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). Malaysia is considered by TRAFFIC (2015) the primary transit country for illegal Africa-sourced elephant ivory, although ivory trafficking is prohibited under Malaysian law. As part of its efforts, the country destroyed almost four tons of elephant tusks and ivory products in 2019, estimated to be worth $3.2M (Bangkok Post, 2019).

The Philippines is currently proposing an amendment of the Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act of 2001 (Republic Act 9147), the main wildlife protection law of the country, under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)-Global Environment Facility (GEF)/Asian Development Bank (ADB) Project Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines. This venture is supported by the Environment Secretary, who called for higher penalties to curb IWT (DENR, 2020a) (see also Chapter 3.2). The amended Bill would increase jail terms from a maximum of 12 to 20 years\(^{13}\) and penalties from a maximum PHP 1M to PHP 2M ($20,791 to $41,582)\(^{14}\) or two times the proven market value, whichever is higher. Moreover, the closed USAID Wildlife Protect project launched the app WildALERT in March 2020 to help enforcers to identify traded wildlife.\(^{15}\) With POGI, the Philippines has a well-functioning multi-agency law enforcement team that frequently reports thwarted illegal wildlife sales, confiscated animals, and arrested violators (De Vera-Ruiz, 2020; DENR, 2020b; DENR-BMB, 2020a; Tiburcio, 2020). Although the trade of elephant ivory is illegal in the Philippines, with Loxodonta africana considered Critically Endangered seeing it is listed under CITES Appendix I, there has been no Department Administrative Order (DAO), yet, on the registration of ivory to distinguish between pre- and post-convention ivory (see Chapter 3.2). In case elephant ivory is claimed by the suspect to be pre-convention ivory, the person must present a certificate to this regard.

Another major victory for wildlife conservation in the SEA region was the People’s Republic of China (PRC)’s ivory ban in 2017. The import and sale of ivory were prohibited, which led to a decline in ivory sales: whereas only 50% of survey respondents stated they would refrain from buying ivory in 2017, the number went up to 72% in 2018 (Bale, 2018), and a different survey in 2018 showed that 80% of the respondents supported the ban (WWF, 2019). However, some of that trade shifted to neighboring countries, with more Chinese citizens buying wildlife abroad: In a WWF survey, 27% of Chinese respondents who travelled abroad at least twice a year admitted to have purchased ivory products in 2019, a steep increase from only 18% in the 2018 survey (Ye, 2019). In the wake of the Covid-19 pandemic, the PRC went one step further in 2020 by prohibiting the sale of terrestrial wildlife for consumption (Zhang, 2020) and it removed the use of pangolin scales as raw ingredient for Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM) (Standaert, 2020a). However, pangolin scales remain approved as key ingredient in patent medicine formulations (Mongabay, 2020). The transboundary smuggling of wildlife remains an issue.

\(^{13}\) 20 years is the maximum jail term applied to cases considered to be wildlife trafficking, as defined under the new draft bill as “committed by a syndicate or; in large scale, or the wildlife involved is bound for export or is actually exported to another country; or is imported from another country by the person or in connivance with the persons from whom the wildlife was apprehended”.

\(^{14}\) Exchange rates from 18 December 2020.

\(^{15}\) At the time of writing still in pilot phase and only fauna included. Flora to be added under DENR-ADB/GEF project.
Singapore, a major transshipment hub for IWT, promised to impose a ban on the domestic trade in elephant ivory starting September 2021, charging violators of the *Endangered Species (Import & Export) Act* with up to S$10,000 ($7,293) per specimen, not exceeding S$100,000 ($72,923) in total, and/or facing jail for up to 12 months (Choo, 2019). The ban will target not only the sale of elephant ivory and ivory products, but also their public display for commercial purposes (Choo, 2019). Even though the international trade of ivory has been banned since 1990, it is legal in Singapore to sell ivory products domestically that entered the market before 1990, which opened a loophole for recently poached ivory to “masquerade as vintage ivory” (Choo, 2019). Furthermore, the *Wild Animals and Bird Act* is currently being revised, which will include increased fines (Krishnasamy and Zavaglì, 2020).

Thailand passed a new *Wildlife Conservation and Protection Act B.E. 2562 (2019) (WARPA)* in November 2019, which included a new category for non-native CITES-listed species and increased the penalties for wildlife crime (Krishnasamy and Zavaglì, 2020; USAID and MCR Society, 2021; USAID Wildlife Asia, 2019a). The law used findings from the report Scaling Efforts to Counter-Wildlife Trafficking Through Legislative Reform, which comprises a comprehensive legislative and policy analysis developed by USAID Wildlife Asia to revise the 27-year old Wildlife Act (USAID Wildlife Asia, 2019a). Maximum fines have increased by 25 times for the trafficking of CITES-listed species, and maximum imprisonment terms equally increased – from four to 10 years (USAID Wildlife Asia, 2019a). Thailand banned the sale of African elephant ivory and regulated the domestic ivory market through the passed *Elephant Ivory Act* (Krishnasamy and Zavaglì, 2020). Any commercial trade in African Elephant ivory has been punishable by law since 2015, with a maximum fine of $171,035 and/or imprisonment of up to three years (Krishnasamy et al., 2016 in Indraswari et al., 2020).

Viet Nam, an important destination for illegal wildlife products such as rhino horn, pangolin scales, and elephant ivory, banned imports of wildlife and wildlife products in 2020, eliminating wildlife markets, including online sales (Nguyen, 2020). The ban further explores additional destruction of rhino horn and elephant ivory stockpiles, and includes the establishment of a database of captive bred farms/facilities (TRAFFIC, 2020b). Even though this seems to be rather comprehensive, the wildlife ban only covers wildlife for consumption: The uses of wildlife for medicine and as pets are not covered by the directive (BBC, 2020). With its in 2018 revised *Penal Code No. 100/2015/QH13*, Viet Nam expanded species protection (TRAFFIC, 2017). In addition, five Decrees were passed in 2019 to enhance the implementation of wildlife protection legislation and an MOU exists to phase out bear farming by 2020 (Krishnasamy and Zavaglì, 2020). Both African and Asian Elephant ivory are fully protected against any kind of commercial exploitation under Viet Nam’s main wildlife protection law, *Decree 06/2019/ND-CP*, since 2019 (Indraswari et al., 2020). However, processed ivory crafted before Viet Nam’s 1992 ivory trade ban took effect remains eligible for legal trade (Stiles, 2008 in Indraswari et al., 2020).

The AMS met for a landmark meeting on IWT in March 2019, where the countries adopted the *Chiang Mai Statement of the ASEAN Ministers Responsible for CITES and Wildlife Enforcement on the Illegal Wildlife Trade*. The statement outlines ASEAN’s commitments on law enforcement, wildlife cybercrime, increased action-oriented policy, and demand reduction.
(USAID Wildlife Asia, 2019b). It also sets out the main commitments for AMS to reduce their domestic wildlife markets and reaffirmed their commitment to tackle IWT on a global scale. A summary of model provisions in Southeast Asian countries, e.g. on Enhancing enforcement efficacy or Harmonizing protected species lists are provided in the report *Scaling Efforts to Counter-wildlife Trafficking through Legislative Reforms* (USAID and AIPA, 2019). A detailed overview of IWT country profiles is presented in the report *Southeast Asia: At the heart of wildlife trade* (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020).

### 2.2. The ASEAN Community

Under the motto “*One Vision. One Identity. One Community.*”, ASEAN introduced an all-comprising strategy in 2015, stipulating objectives and strategic measures for a variety of themes. The three Pillars of the ASEAN Community encompass the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community, the ASEAN Economic Community, and the ASEAN Political-Security Community, presented in three blueprints (ASEAN Secretariat, n.d.). Each of these pillars has an institutional framework in the form of a Council, a Ministerial Meeting, and Senior Officials, and operates through various Working Groups.

#### 2.2.1. ASEAN Political-Security Community

The ASEAN Political-Security Blueprint relates directly to IWT, in that it includes ASEAN’s ambitions on addressing transnational crime, with the illicit trafficking of wildlife mentioned in:

- **Section B: PEACEFUL, SECURE AND STABLE REGION**
  - Sub-section B.3. Enhance ASEAN capacity to address non-traditional security issues effectively and in a timely manner
    - Chapter B.3.1.v – Strengthen cooperation in addressing and combating transnational crimes: Enhance cooperation in addressing other emerging transnational crimes, including illicit trafficking of wildlife and timber as well as people smuggling, in accordance with relevant international conventions; and
    - Chapter B.3.9.ii – Enhance ASEAN capacity to address transnational crimes and transboundary challenges: Convene special meetings, as and when necessary, at Senior Officials’ level to address challenges of transboundary or transnational nature such as haze pollution, pandemics, transnational organized crimes, irregular movement of persons, hazardous waste, oil spill incidents, trafficking in wildlife and timber (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016a).

In addition, the Political-Security Blueprint mentions anti-money laundering (AML) measures in three instances, which is relevant as IWT is considered a predicate offense to AML:

- **Section A: RULES-BASED, PEOPLE-ORIENTED, PEOPLE-CENTRED COMMUNITY**
  - Sub-Section A.2. Strengthen democracy, good governance, the rule of law, promotion and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as combat corruption
• Chapter A.2.3.viii – Enhance and encourage cooperation among financial intelligence/authorized units of ASEAN Member States in the areas of collection, analysis and dissemination of information regarding potential money laundering;

• Section B: PEACEFUL, SECURE AND STABLE REGION
  o Sub-Section B.3. Enhance ASEAN capacity to address non-traditional security issues effectively and in a timely manner
    • Chapter B.3.1.iii – Implement effectively the Work Program of the ASEAN Plan of Action to Combat Transnational Crimes covering terrorism, illicit drug trafficking, trafficking in persons, arms smuggling, sea piracy, money laundering, international economic crimes and cybercrimes; and
    • Chapter B.3.2.vii Continue to develop the capacity of financial intelligence/authorized units and other relevant agencies involved in anti-money laundering/counter-terrorism financing efforts, to better detect, analyze and investigate the laundering of proceeds of crime, in accordance with the Financial Action Task Force’s Recommendations (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016a).

In the ASEAN Political-Security Community Council, the relevant body for IWT discussions is the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Transnational Crime (AMMTC), specifically the Seniors Officials Meeting on Transnational Crime (SOMTC). The SOMTC was established in 1999 and meets annually. Several working groups were established under the SOMTC, each attending to a specific area of crime (see Figure 1). In 2015, the SOMTC endorsed the “Illicit Trafficking of Wildlife and Timber” as a new area of transnational crime under the AMMTC/SOMTC (ASEAN Secretariat, n.d.; UNODC, 2018b). Recognizing the increasing seriousness of wildlife and timber crimes in the ASEAN region, a Working Group on Illicit Trafficking of Wildlife and Timber (SOMTC WG on ITWT) was established during the 11th AMMTC, held in Manila, Philippines, in 2017. The objectives are to strengthen regional and international law enforcement cooperation, e.g. through facilitating the information exchange related to combating wildlife and timber trafficking (ASEAN Secretariat, n.d.).
The first meeting of the SOMTC WG on ITWT took place in Thailand in 2018, and in addition to representatives from AMS, the meeting was also attended by the Anti-Smuggling Bureau of the PRC Customs (UNODC, 2018b). The work of the SOMTC WG on ITWT is foreseen to complement the efforts of the AWG CITES and WE (see below) (UNODC, 2018b), thus combining approaches in combating organized crime and violations under CITES.

### 2.2.2. ASEAN Economic Community

The ASEAN Economic Blueprint does not refer explicitly to wildlife and/or wildlife crime, but mentions Sustainable Economic Development, and thus generally the need for the protection of the environment and natural resources under:

- **Section B: A COMPETITIVE, INNOVATIVE AND DYNAMIC ASEAN**
  - **Sub-Section B.8. Sustainable Economic Development**
    - **Chapter B.8.vi** – Develop new and appropriate technologies, best practices and management systems to ensure food safety and address health/disease and environmental issues, particularly in the fast growing aquaculture, livestock and horticulture sub-sectors;
    - **Chapter B.8.vii** – Promote good agriculture practices to minimize the negative effects on natural resources such as soil, forest and water, and reduce the greenhouse gas emission; and
Chapter B.8.viii – Promote forest management involving the community living within and surrounding the forest for the sustainability of the forest and prosperity of the people (ASEAN Secretariat, 2015).

In the ASEAN Economic Community Council, the relevant body for IWT discussions is the ASEAN Ministers Meeting on Agriculture and Forestry (AMAF), specifically the ASEAN Senior Officials on Forestry (ASOF). The ASOF includes the AWG CITES and WE created in 2016 (see Figure 2), an inter-governmental network dedicated to combat IWT, enforce CITES, and share best practices (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). The AWG CITES and WE originated from a consolidation of the ASEAN Expert Group on CITES and the ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN). All CITES Management Authorities are focal points for this Working Group, which meets at least once a year.

![Diagram of ASEAN Economic Community Council and its Working Groups](image)

**Figure 2.** ASEAN Working Group on CITES and Wildlife Enforcement within the ASEAN Economic Community Council, Source: Own creation based on AWG CITES and WE, n.d.

### 2.2.3. ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community

In the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Blueprint, only general environmental matters are discussed. There are no specific statements on wildlife, wildlife crime or IWT. The ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity (ACB), an inter-governmental organization facilitating cooperation and coordination
among the AMS on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity (ACB, n.d.), is also included under this pillar. During the 36th ASEAN Summit in June 2020, the Philippine intervention called for enabling ACB to contribute to combating wildlife trafficking in order to prevent the spread of zoonotic diseases, such as Covid19, which ACB highly welcomed (BusinessMirror, 2020). In the Socio-Cultural Blueprint, natural resources are discussed in:

- **Section C: SUSTAINABLE**
  - Sub-section C.1: Conservation and Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Natural Resources
    - Chapter C.1.i – Strengthen regional cooperation to protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems resources, combat desertification, halt biodiversity loss, and halt and reverse land degradation;
    - Chapter C.1.iii – Promote cooperation for the protection, restoration and sustainable use of coastal and marine environment, respond and deal with the risk of pollution and threats to marine ecosystem and coastal environment, in particular in respect of ecologically sensitive areas;
    - Chapter C.1.v – v. Enhance policy and capacity development and best practices to conserve, develop and sustainably manage marine, wetlands, peat lands, biodiversity, and land and water resources (ASEAN Secretariat, 2016b).

The **ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Council** comprises the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on the Environment (AMME), ASEAN Senior Officials on the Environment (ASOEN), and seven Working Groups (ASEAN, n.d.) (see Figure 3). Although the conservation and management of biodiversity and natural resources is part of AMME/ASOEN’s mandate, these entities have no direct mandate for IWT.

---

**Figure 3.** ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Council, Source: Own creation based on ASEAN Secretariat, n.d.
The need for cross-sectoral collaboration in implementing programs and activities that support species conservation is facilitated by the ASEAN Secretariat and is recognized by ASEAN through the different Working Groups. To facilitate the collaboration among AMS, other intergovernmental law enforcement bodies were set up as essential elements in combating IWT. One of these, is the ASEAN Chiefs of National Police (ASEANAPOL), which coordinates and facilitates cross-border cooperation on information and intelligence sharing and exchange regarding criminal investigations (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). This includes building and maintenance of the ASEANAPOL database, capacity building, and the development of scientific investigative tools (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). Not a conventional law enforcement body, but nevertheless an important platform, is the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), which champions inter-sectoral cooperation. The APEC issued a “Joint Ministerial Statement, reaffirming the commitment to conserve wildlife resources and combat illicit transnational trade in protected wildlife, including timber” (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). The AMS further show their support to combat IWT through regional and global agreements, such as CITES.

2.3. CITES and the ICCWC in Southeast Asia

International treaties that safeguard the survival of species can spur collaboration among their members and provide incentives for Parties to draft and pass legislation enabling the enforcement of these treaties at the national and local levels. CITES is one of the most important international agreements with regard to wildlife trade, as it regulates international trade in over 38,700 listed species of animals and plants with the objective to ensure that “international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival” (CITES, n.d.). Currently, there are 183 Parties to CITES, with the Philippines having joined in 1981. All AMS are Parties to the Convention. ASEAN, as a regional body, is not a member to CITES, but during the CITES Conference of Parties (COP) 18 in 2019, ACB attended for the first time as Observer.

Although Parties joining the Convention commit to supporting its objectives, CITES can only be effective if national laws are passed and enforced that mirror the resolutions made during the COPs to protect the species listed in CITES’ three Appendices. The Convention is legally binding, and Parties are therefore required to adopt national legislation in order to be compliant with the agreements made under CITES. In order to monitor the implementation at the national level, Resolution Conf. 8.4 (Rev. CoP15) directs the Secretariat to “identify those Parties whose domestic measures do not provide them with the authority to”:

- Designate at least one Management Authority and one Scientific Authority;
- Prohibit trade in specimens in violation of the Convention;
- Penalize such trade; or
- Confiscate specimens illegally traded or possessed. (CITES, n.d.)

All these four requirements stipulated by the Convention need to be translated into national law, a process that is continuously analyzed by the CITES Secretariat. Based on the results, Parties are placed into one of three categories:
- Category 1: Legislation that is believed generally to meet the requirements for implementation of CITES
- Category 2: Legislation that is believed generally not to meet all the requirements for the implementation of CITES
- Category 3: Legislation that is believed generally not to meet the requirements for the implementation of CITES. (CITES, n.d.)

A summary of the Parties’ legislative progress, prepared by the Secretariat, is publicly available. The legislation of seven AMS on CITES implementation is believed generally to meet the requirements for implementation of CITES: Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, and Viet Nam (CITES, n.d.). For countries in Categories 2 and 3, CITES provides a progress summary and next steps. The Philippines is placed in Category 2, however, the last update is from 2017, when the next steps were to submit a revised legislative analysis. This concerned the Philippine policy on Introduction from the Sea, which was already responded to by the Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR), which informed the CITES Secretariat about the next steps to this regard. Lao PDR is the only ASEAN country in Category 3 and will receive further assistance, as it was identified as priority country by the CITES Standing Committee. Lao PDR seems to require rather structural changes, with CITES implementing legislation to be developed and provisions of existing laws to be amended.

CITES also forms part of one of the most significant collaborations between international agencies to support law enforcement agencies in combating IWT. The International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC) is an association of CITES, INTERPOL, UNODC, the World Bank, and the World Customs Organization (CITES, n.d.). In order to cater for the needs of States requiring assistance with regard to counter-IWT measures, the ICCWC developed tools assisting national governments to assess and analyze legislation relevant to wildlife and forest crimes, the role of enforcement agencies, judicial and prosecutorial capacities, and responses to IWT at the national level (CITES, n.d.). Two of the most prominent tools are the Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit and the Indicator Framework, with the first one being an extensive long-term assessment conducted by the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) and other international experts, and the latter being a rapid self-assessment by the government itself, based on 50 performance measures grouped into eight enforcement outcomes. These assessments can provide excellent insights into the functioning of effective law enforcement response chains, by identifying tasks left unattended, overlapping mandates of enforcement agencies, and success stories/best practices. Moreover, they can identify gaps in national and sub-national law enforcement procedures, training, personnel, equipment, and policy to be addressed. The results can then be used to guide the design, integration, and implementation of counter-IWT activities in the short- and long-term, thus creating a highly useful IWT response strategy. So far, Viet Nam has completed the ICCWC Analytical Toolkit Assessment, and Lao PRD, the Philippines, and Thailand have employed the ICCWC Indicator Framework. A more comprehensive table in Annex 1 presents a more detailed overview, showing the Implementation steps for the Analytical Toolkit in selected countries. The table reveals that Lao PDR is in the process of conducting an Analytical Toolkit assessment (Step 6) and that the Philippines equally started the process. The Philippines deferred the Analytical
Toolkit assessment to 2019, as the Wildlife Law Enforcement Action Plan (WildLEAP) was completed in 2019, which presents a roadmap from 2018-2028 on combating IWT. Thus, it can be derived that there is still great potential in SEA to employ the tools developed by the ICCWC.

It is important to keep in mind, however, that CITES faces certain limitations. Although the Convention was designed to avoid overexploitation of species through the regulation of cross-border trade, it is after all a trade agreement, and not designed to fight crime (Scanlon, 2020a). As such, CITES does not require IWT to be criminalized, it is not perceived as the appropriate forum for enforcement agencies to exchange and collaborate in addressing IWT, does not sufficiently consider the complex nature of demand, and it does neither regulate domestic trade, nor apply to poaching (Challender et al., 2015; Scanlon, 2020b). There have been suggestions to include Wildlife Crime as the fourth Protocol under the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) (Scanlon, 2020a) (see Chapter 2.4).

2.4. Regional and International Cooperation Mechanisms in Southeast Asia

The AMS display a rather high adherence to international conventions and agreements. As for CITES, these ratifications need to be accompanied by the translation of the standards and requirements into national legal frameworks via domestic laws and policies (Freeland, 2015). For some conventions, voluntary review mechanisms were established.

**AIPA: ASEAN’s Parliamentary Organization**

The ASEAN Inter-Parliamentary Assembly (AIPA) is a regional parliamentary organization of ASEAN, formed in 1977 (AIPA, n.d.). AIPA serves as the center of information and communication among Member Parliaments and aims to encourage cooperation, understanding, and close relations among AMS (AIPA, n.d.). AIPA also promotes information sharing and exchange with the aim to create proposals or common legislative ideas aimed at regional growth and cooperation (Filane M. Cervantes, 2020). The 11th AIPA Caucus was hosted by the Philippines in June 2020. In light of the Covid-19 pandemic, Member Parliaments convened to discuss the origins of the pandemic, the wildlife trade, and prevention strategies.

**UNTOC: IWT as Serious Crime**

All countries in the Southeast Asian region regard wildlife trafficking as a “serious crime”, either through references in their national laws or by compliance with the definition of that term as given by UNTOC (UNODC and Freeland, 2015): “‘Serious crime’ shall mean conduct constituting an offense punishable by a maximum deprivation of liberty of at least four years or a more serious penalty” (UNTOC, 2004). For wildlife and forest crimes, the maximum imprisonment term is with 20 years16 highest in the Philippines, and the highest fine has to be paid in Indonesia (Freeland and ASEAN-WEN, 2016). However, these are only the maximum penalties, which in many cases may not realistically reflect the sentences passed (see Chapter 3.2). The lowest maximum imprisonment term for this offense can be expected in Singapore.

---

16 The imprisonment term of 20 years is stipulated in the Fisheries Code, RA 8550, as amended by RA 10654. The maximum imprisonment term in the Wildlife Act, RA 9147, is 12 years. However, even with the 12 year term, the Philippines would still have the highest imprisonment term among all AMS.
It must be highlighted, that the complementary protocols of UNTOC so far only relate to the prevention of human trafficking, smuggling of migrants, and the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts and components and ammunition (UNTOC, n.d.). This means that so far, there is no global agreement on IWT that is embedded in the international criminal law framework.

This is why a movement has sprung up, driven by the Global Initiative to End Wildlife Crime, to add a fourth Protocol “against the Illicit Trafficking in Specimens of Wild Fauna and Flora”. If adopted, the Protocol would be the first international instrument to create specific obligations for Parties in this important area of criminal law (Global Initiative to End Wildlife Crime, 2020). Parties to the Protocol would agree to adopt legislation establishing the “illicit trafficking of any whole or part of a wild animal or plant, whether alive or dead”, as a criminal offense in violation of any domestic or foreign law or of an applicable international agreement (Global Initiative to End Wildlife Crime, 2020). At the same time, the Protocol would automatically trigger and enhance all of UNTOC’s provisions on international and law enforcement cooperation, joint investigations, and mutual legal assistance (Global Initiative to End Wildlife Crime, 2020). The Protocol was discussed during the UNTOC COP10 in October 2020 and is awaiting further consideration by the Parties. During that COP, a helpful stepping stone was the adoption of the Resolution "Preventing and combating crimes that affect the environment falling within the scope of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime", introduced by France (Permanent Mission of France, 2020; Tennant, 2020).

UNCAC: Corruption as IWT Enabler and Driver
Another major obstacle that emerged in the fight against IWT is the issue of corruption, which is addressed at the international level by the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC). Defined as “the abuse of entrusted power for private gain” (Transparency International, 2014), corruption undermines the effectiveness of laws and good governance, and, more importantly, the trust people put into agencies, which can be especially detrimental if occurring within government ranks (WWF and TRAFFIC, 2015). Furthermore, it misdirects money, deters investments, and often involves or facilitates violence (WWF and TRAFFIC, 2015). All of these impacts of corruption either directly or indirectly fuel and facilitate IWT and can take place in every step of the IWT value chain. One of the most significant forms of corruption is the bribery of enforcement personnel as well as of judges and prosecutors, which may result in lesser or no penalties for wildlife crimes, or even in no apprehensions in the first place. In the case of IWT, corruption can also be detrimental if it invades the permitting process, where, in the worst case, permits could be altered, re-used, or issued to enquiring stakeholders without them having to prove the required documentation. Wyatt and Cao (2015) list Bribery, Patronage, Diplomatic Cover and Permit abuse as corrupt acts and WWF and TRAFFIC (2015) summarize the most common forms of corruption with regard to IWT as:

- In situ failures to protect trade-restricted species
- Failures to prevent transport and trade of trade-restricted species
- Issuance of false documentation, and
- Failures to prosecute cases of wildlife crime.
Therefore, corruption does not only aggravate the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources, impacting adversely on the respective country’s biodiversity, but it equally affects sustainable development, poverty alleviation, and national security, as proceeds from IWT may be used to fund other illegal activities, such as terrorism and civil conflicts (Felbab-Brown, 2018; Save the Rhino, 2013; WWF and TRAFFIC, 2015).

All AMS ratified the UNCAC, which is the only legally binding universal anti-corruption instrument and covers five areas: Preventive measures, asset recovery, criminalization and law enforcement, international cooperation, and technical assistance and information exchange (UNODC, n.d.). The Convention covers different forms of corruption, such as bribery, abuse of functions, trading in influence, and numerous acts of corruption in the private sector (UNODC, n.d.). However, with fast-growing economies, public institutions often lacking transparency and accountability, restricted civil society engagement, and a growing disparity between rich and poor, corruption is still a challenge for many countries in the region (Transparency International, 2015). In the most recent Corruption Perceptions Index of 2020, only Brunei, Malaysia and Singapore score above 50 points\(^\text{17}\), the Philippines scores 34 points, and Cambodia scores lowest (21) (see Figure 4) (Transparency International, 2021). Regarding the ranking of AMS on a global scale, out of 180 countries Singapore is ranked highest (Rank 3), Cambodia is ranked lowest (Rank 160), and the remaining AMS fall in-between.

17 Zero (0) points = highly corrupt, 100 points = very clean
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**Figure 4.** Corruption Perceptions Index in selected Southeast Asian countries and in the PRC (excluding Hong Kong, China, and Taiwan, China), 2020 (0 =highly corrupt, 100 = very clean). Source: Transparency International, 2020.
International Standards: Anti-money Laundering Laws

Another point of entry to prosecute wildlife offenders is through AML laws, as wildlife trafficking is considered a predicate offense to money laundering, meaning it forms part of organized crime, in the majority of Southeast Asian countries (FREELAND and ASEAN-WEN, 2016). With regard to AML crimes, the maximum imprisonment time (20 years) and the highest fine have been set by the government of Indonesia (FREELAND and ASEAN-WEN, 2016). The lowest imprisonment time (5 years) is imposed both in Cambodia and Malaysia, and the lowest fines are set in Thailand (FREELAND and ASEAN-WEN, 2016). A comprehensive overview of AML laws in SEA, and whether IWT is considered a predicate crime, is presented in the Report ASEAN Handbook on Legal Cooperation to Combat Wildlife Crime (FREELAND and ASEAN-WEN, 2016). All AMS ratified the International Standards on Combating Money Laundering and the Financing of Terrorism and Proliferation, issued by the Financial Action Task Force, which give recommendations on AML Policies and Coordination, Money Laundering and Confiscation, Terrorist Financing and Financing of Proliferation, Transparency and Beneficial Ownership of Legal Persons and Arrangements, Preventive Measures, Powers and Responsibilities of Competent Authorities and other Institutional Measures, and International Cooperation (FATF, 2012). The standards require close collaboration between law enforcers and the respective national Financial Intelligence Unit, to which banks and other financial institutions submit Suspicious Transaction Reports/Suspicious Activity Reports to investigate financial flows of wildlife crime (ACAMS and WWF, 2020). This data generated is not only essential for law enforcers, but also for the judiciary to apply fines and penalties. So far, public and private sectors have not yet prioritized combating the financial flows connected to IWT, because of a lack of knowledge, resources, and a legislative basis (FATF, 2020).

Collaboration: Mutual Legal Assistance and Extradition

Two other pivotal elements for successfully combating transboundary IWT are Mutual Legal Assistance (MLA), allowing actors of the criminal justice system to collaborate across countries, and extradition, which concerns surrendering a person to another State for prosecution. In addition to corresponding provisions under UNTOC and UNCAC, the countries in the region enacted the Treaty on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters (MLAT) in 2004, with national legislation supporting the Treaty currently present in seven AMS (UNODC and Freeland, 2015). Some States specifically mention for which kinds of crime the MLA can be evoked: Cambodia limits it to drug-related offenses whereas the Philippines sets its limitations to AML cases (UNODC and Freeland, 2015). In all other AMS, the MLA is valid for wildlife related crimes. UNTOC and UNCAC also provide the legal basis for extradition, however, there is no regional legal instrument in place as for the MLA under the MLAT (UNODC and Freeland, 2015). On the national legislative level, most countries in the region have provisions in place, which allow them to enter into bilateral agreements on extradition, but these can be quite lengthy, consuming time and resources (UNODC and Freeland, 2015).

---

18 ACAMS, the largest international membership organization for Anti-Financial Crime professionals, offers an online course on how to write more effective Suspicious Transaction Reports/Suspicious Activity Reports [here](#).
ASEAN Strategic Action Plans
To formalize environmental protection, including wildlife conservation, AMS have adopted several strategic action plans already, whereas others are still being drafted or updated. Action Plans can be passed at the Senior Officials level or at the Working Group level. Although the plans are interlinked, some may experience overlaps, depending on the mandates of the issuing bodies. The following plans and responsible bodies were identified:

- Regional Plan of Action on CITES and WE
  - Passed at AWG Level: AWG CITES and WE under ASOF
  - Currently revised, to be adopted in 2021
- ASEAN Strategic Plan of Action on the Environment (ASPEN)
  - Passed at Senior Official Level: ASEAN Senior Officials on the Environment (ASOEN)
  - Status: To be adopted
- Strategic Plan of Action for ASEAN Cooperation on Forestry (2016-2025)
  - Passed at Senior Official Level: ASOF
  - Adopted and in action
- Action Plan of the ASEAN Working Group on Nature Conservation and Biodiversity (AWGNCB)
  - Passed at AWG Level: AWGNCB under ASOEN
  - Adopted and in action

Among these plans, the only Plan of Action that specifically focuses on IWT is the Regional Plan of Action on CITES and WE, which is still revised at the time of writing and scheduled for adoption later in 2021. It will therefore function as an important road map for ASEAN and its efforts to combat IWT in the years to come. The ASPEN and the Action Plan of the AWGNCB are implemented under the ASOEN, and thus under the Socio-Cultural Pillar. Both plans are rather comprehensive in terms of environmental protection, and do not focus in-depth on IWT matters. The same holds true for the Strategic Plan of Action for ASEAN Cooperation on Forestry under ASOF.
3. The Philippines and IWT: A National Commitment

3.1. The Philippine IWT Context

The Philippines is one of 17 mega-diverse countries worldwide, which is reflected by its abundant biodiversity that includes 9,419 native vascular plant species ("Co’s Digital Flora of the Philippines," 2020) over 702 native bird species19 (Birdwatch PH, 2020), over 206 terrestrial mammal species and 27 marine mammal species (fieldmusuem.org, n.d.), 350 reptile species19 (Sy, n.d., Unpublished), including five out of seven marine turtle species, 112 amphibian species (Diesmos et al., 2015), and at least 205 species of sharks (DA-BFAR, 2017). Many of these species, 34-88% depending on the taxonomic group, are endemic, meaning they cannot be found anywhere else except in this archipelago. Adding to this breadth of life are the manifold habitats in this country, ranging from mossy forest ecosystems, over wetlands and lush tropical forests, to coastal and marine ecosystems that surround the entire country with a coastline of over 36,000km (index mundi, 2019). Located in midst the Coral Triangle, a geographical area covering six island nations known for their unique marine biodiversity dubbed the “underwater equivalent of the Amazon” (James Morgan, 2014), the Philippines is at its very center. It is home to most species of marine shore fish (Carpenter and Springer, 2005), 500 species of scleractinian coral (ADB, 2014), and 18 species of seagrass (Fortes, 2013). With such a variety of natural resources comes the responsibility to protect them. However, the Philippines is also one of the 36 identified biodiversity hotspots worldwide (Critical Ecosystem Partnership Fund, 2019). Threats, such as the overexploitation of natural resources, habitat destruction, pollution (waste, light, noise), increased population density, and conflicting policies (CEPF, n.d.) can quickly turn this paradise into turmoil.

As IWT source, transit, and destination country, the issue in the Philippines is complex and requires strategic and long-term investments and responses. The lead agency for combating IWT is the DENR. DENR’s mandate covers all terrestrial wildlife, including birds, as well as marine turtles and dugongs, as stipulated in Section 4 of the Wildlife Resources Conservation and Protection Act (RA 9147) of 2001. RA 9147 is the main legislative instrument in the Philippines regarding wildlife matters, and it is accompanied by DAO 2019-09, listing the native fauna protected in the Philippines, and by DAO 2017-11, listing the native flora protected in the country, categorizing all species according to their national conservation status. The Wildlife Act stipulates progressive penalties depending on this categorization. At a maximum, penalties can amount to 12 years in jail and/or a fine of PHP 1M (approx. $20,000)20 in the case of killing a species considered Critically Endangered. For identifying the correct conservation status of a species in the Philippines, it is crucial to know about the Red List categories used in the Philippines, which are compared to the IUCN Red List categories in Figure 5.

---

19 Excluding seven introduced species
20 Exchange rate: July 27, 2020
EX=Extinct; EW=Extinct in the Wild; CR=Critically Endangered; EN=Endangered; VU=Vulnerable; NT=Near Threatened; LC=Least Concern; DD=Data deficient; OTS=Other Threatened Species; OWS=Other Wildlife Species

Figure 5. A Comparison of IUCN Red List Categories and Philippine Red List Categories used to classify species, Source: Own creation based on IUCN, n.d. and RA 9147

It is equally important to be knowledgeable on the directives passed that establish whether the basis for categorization is the respective DAO or CITES. The decision paths to determine the correct listing are presented in Figure 6.

Figure 6. Directives for determination of a species’ conservation status based on its listing under CITES and in the relevant Philippine DAO, Source: Own creation based on DAO 2019-09 and DAO 2017-11
The jurisdiction for the remaining aquatic and marine wildlife that is not covered by the DENR remains with the Department of Agriculture (DA)-BFAR. For aquatic species falling under BFAR’s mandate, the key legislation to be consulted is the Fisheries Code of 1998 (RA 8550), as amended by RA 10654 of 2015.

The Province of Palawan takes a special position in the country, in that the environment and natural resources of Palawan are governed by the Strategic Environmental Plan for Palawan Act, or RA 7611, which is implemented by the Palawan Council for Sustainable Development (PCSD). Furthermore, the PCSD Resolution 19-682 provides “Guidelines for the Determination and Classification of the Categories of Terrestrial and Aquatic Wildlife Flora and Fauna found in the Province of Palawan”. Whenever species are confiscated in the Palawan Province, the classification and penalties of Resolution 19-682 apply.

The year of 2013 was a decisive one for the country’s fight against IWT in two regards: First, POGI was created by the DENR in 2013, in pursuit of the implementation of RA 9147 and of the Philippine commitments under CITES, addressing the longstanding active domestic market for elephant ivory in the country (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). The main mandate and tasks of the POGI Task Force are to investigate reports of ivory smuggling and other cross-border illegal collection and trade of wildlife resources; to file appropriate charges; and to collaborate diligently with the Department of Justice and Courts for the prosecution of the criminal cases, as stipulated in the DENR Special Order 2013-354. The Task Force comprises members from several Philippine Bureaus, such as the National Bureau of Investigation, the Forest Management Bureau and the Bureau of Customs (BOC), working together to detect and arrest individuals committing wildlife crimes. Second, in 2013 the Philippine government through the DENR destroyed about five tons of seized elephant ivory illegally smuggled into the Philippines by crime syndicates from African countries (Hranjski, 2013). According to the WildLEAP, this made the Philippines the first AMS and the first ivory consuming nation and non-elephant range state to take such an action (DENR-BMB, 2020b). Furthermore, this move sent a strong signal not only to the traffickers, but to everyone involved in the supply chain, including corrupt officials, which was crucial seeing that the remaining eight tons from a 13-ton ivory seizure disappeared in the years before – while in safekeeping (Agence France-Presse, 2013).

Since then, the POGI group has reported significant seizures and apprehensions (De Vera-Ruiz, 2020; DENR-BMB, 2020a; Tiburcio, 2020) and the Task Force was decorated with the 2021 Asia Environmental Enforcement Award. Based on records of DENR-BMB, PCSD, and other sources, the total number of seizures between 2010-2019 amounted to 511, with a maximum of 68 confiscations in 2018 and a minimum of 34 confiscations in 201021 (Sy, 2021, 2020a, personal conversation) (see Figure 7). Most of the species confiscated alive belonged to the group of reptiles (n=16,237), followed by birds (n=6,042), whereas pangolin scales were the most frequent and quantitatively largest derivative seized (>2,100 kg) (Sy, 2021).

---

21 Forest products and marine species, except for sea snakes and marine turtles, were not included.
Even though there have been a lot of efforts to curb IWT, enforcement activities were mainly concentrated in Palawan and in the National Capital Region (NCR). Enforcement activities in the Regions were rather few, with only 0-26 seizures per year from 2010-2019 (Sy, 2020a, personal conversation). This points to persisting challenges for enforcers, but – although key – enforcement also needs to be complemented by other instruments, such as an appropriate legal framework, available trainings, incentive schemes, integration and participation of communities, etc. in order to deliver an effective response to IWT.

3.2. Identified Challenges and Efforts in combating IWT in the Philippines

The challenges the Philippines is facing in combating IWT, but also the country’s strengths and opportunities, were recently assessed through three different instances: The Philippine government itself, TRAFFIC, and USAID.

The Philippine government, with assistance from UNODC, conducted the Indicator Framework Assessment in 2019 and identified several gaps in Philippine law enforcement. Opportunities for improvement were particularly identified under Outcome 3 - Wildlife crime is thoroughly investigated using an intelligence-led approach, Outcome 7 - Wildlife crime offenders are appropriately penalized, and Outcome 8 - A holistic approach is deployed to combat wildlife crime (ICCWC and UNODC, 2019, unpublished). Among the gaps identified were a lack of resources, in terms of personnel and equipment e.g. in Wildlife Rescue Centers (WRCs); irregular capacity building activities; a lack of specialized prosecutors; and shortcomings in evidence collection and case file preparation (ICCWC and UNODC, 2019, unpublished).
In its most recent report investigating IWT in SEA, TRAFFIC also identified capacity building as a shortcoming for the Philippines and stated that “Law enforcement trainings for government personnel conducted in the last few years are not translating into greater law enforcement actions in most regions of the country” (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). The authors suggest that a sufficient number of trainings are carried out, but this is not reflected in the actions taken in the regions. One reason may be a lack of political will to translate these trainings into action, another may be disconnectedness between theoretical trainings and on-the-job required procedures and techniques. Furthermore, Krishnasamy and Zavagli (2020) find that non-native species are owned, registered and traded in the Philippines, although legal importation records are not available, which “suggests loopholes in the implementation of national legislation”. The authors also mention frequent records of Indonesian wildlife entering the Philippines, which they state attributes to the pet trade and to the laundering of wildlife for international trade. Lastly, Krishnasamy and Zavagli (2020) observed that there is an “open and large trade of live animals on Facebook, with little being done to curb this problem”. From the assessment and analysis in Chapter 5.3, it was also apparent that, in contrast to most of the other AMS, there are no country offices of the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), Fauna and Flora International (FFI), or TRAFFIC in the Philippines, although the latter is active in the country. Collaborating with these NGOs may allow the Philippines to further strengthen its law enforcement efforts seeing their experience in implementing counter-IWT projects in the region. The three biggest environmental NGOs in the country, WWF, Conservation International, and RARE do currently not focus on IWT.

The USAID report *Wildlife from Forests to Cages* authored by Emerson Y. Sy (2021), mentioned the following areas for improvement: 1) Documentation: Seized wildlife should be properly identified by qualified personnel in order for the correct data to be recorded for subsequent analyses, with scientific names always included. Standard operating procedures need to be followed, which can prevent e.g. instances where confiscated wildlife that does not result in cases being filed against suspects is recorded as “voluntary surrendered” or “rescued” and is thus not reflected in seizure records (Sy, 2021). 2) Law enforcement: Cooperation among law enforcement agencies and the private sector should be encouraged, and Sy (2021) suggests that “additional resources and trained personnel should be allocated in the key source, transit, and destination locations”. As reflected also in the results of the ICCWC assessment, in-depth investigations and follow-up operations are recommended to increase the likelihood of intercepting illegal wildlife shipments and to prosecute not only key traffickers but also the financiers (Sy, 2021). According to Sy (2021), this should be complemented by in-depth physical and paper audits of registered wildlife facilities in order to detect wildlife laundering and fraudulent breeding reports and activities. 3) Further research: To encourage research on wildlife trade, an open-access national wildlife seizure database is encouraged to present trade dynamics and emerging trends, which may also incorporate seizure data from international wildlife law enforcement agencies (Sy, 2021). Moreover, Sy (2021) suggests to monitor regions in the country that are under-represented in IWT: Whereas this may point to only few illegal activities in these regions, it can also be indicative of a lack of enforcement or of a wrong categorization of seizures, with confiscations classified as “voluntary turnover” or “rescued”.

From these assessments, it is apparent that effective law enforcement needs to be supported by i) due diligence, especially in terms of wildlife permit and certificate issuance; ii) capacity building activities; iii) international collaboration for repatriation; iv) gathering and sharing of intelligence; v) innovative approaches to tackle IWT on social networks and e-commerce platforms; vi) a well-drafted legislative regulatory framework; vii) a judicial system that can effectively prosecute persons involved in wildlife crimes; and viii) by innovative financing mechanisms, which could be procured e.g. through restitution or debt-for-nature swaps. In the following, the main challenges to combating IWT are listed, with these narratives containing also the efforts the Philippines is undertaking to address these, including several examples of activities that were implemented under the DENR-ADB/GEF project.

**Ensuring due diligence in issuing permits** takes longer if permits and certificates are issued manually, which has been the case for the Philippines so far. The newly developed electronic CITES (e-CITES) permitting system will allow for permit approvals to be tracked in real time, leaving an audit trail, processing requests much quicker, and serving as an electronic storage for documents. However, e-CITES can only be effective to a certain degree as it cannot counteract fraudulent activities and corruption, should these occur. This is why the implementation of this system further requires morally steadfast staff supported by their supervisors with appropriate incentives in monitoring the e-CITES process diligently and reporting unlawful activities immediately in order to tackle the root of the problem. Due diligence is also essential in the monitoring of stakeholders, such as breeders, who might launder illegally caught wild animals into the legal trade, holders of Certificates of Wildlife Registration, who are not allowed to trade and may instead label the exchange of species as “donations”, and zoos, which might pass off commercial trade of threatened species as “loans”. Equally important is the monitoring of breeding facilities, which is carried out by regional DENR Offices, who then report their results to DENR-BMB. More frequent and regular on the ground monitoring by national staff would be recommended, as there have been reports of irregularities, where hatching and shipment time did not align and definite proof of hatching was missing (Bennett, 2014). Although these fraudulent practices were detected in some cases, and permits were indeed denied “due to the proponent’s inability to authenticate its captive breeding claims”, other instances of laundered wildlife may have been missed (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020; Sy et al., 2020).

**Capacity building** activities for wildlife law enforcers focused on conducting basic wildlife law enforcement trainings under the DENR-ADB/GEF project, as well as on the development of specific modules whose contents were identified by law enforcers during training needs assessments. The sustainability of trainings was ensured by involving participants of the DENR-BMB Training-of-the-Trainers program, by assessing trained participants again after a fixed time period has passed, and by translating contents into self-paced online learning modules available at ADB e-learn, which may counteract the high fluctuation of staff in public service and offer remote learning opportunities. These trainings were complemented by modules presented by guest lecturers, who have extensive experience in the field and passed on best practices to their fellow peers. It is aimed for capacity building on wildlife law enforcement to be institutionalized into the training structures and curricula of enforcers from various agencies, so it can be an integral part of the training and can be conducted in a participatory inter-agency manner.
Gathering and sharing of intelligence on wildlife-related crimes is an essential activity for all law enforcement agencies. The software IBM i2 Analyst's Notebook or the digital investigation platform Magnet Axiom are only two of countless tools that can facilitate the replication of existing networks to uncover connections not apparent on first sight. So far, there are no intelligence units in DENR-BMB and specific software to this regard is not being used. It is therefore recommended to set up a designated Wildlife Intelligence Unit in DENR-BMB closely collaborating with the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency and possibly with a new National Intelligence Unit, including representatives from all Philippine law enforcement agencies. This could be mirrored at sub-national levels, with intelligence units also in the DENR Regional Offices reporting regularly to the national level, facilitating effective collaboration.

Repatriation processes need to ensure that confiscated wildlife can be brought back into their country of origin once it has been seized in the Philippines. The repatriation of Indonesian wildlife in 2020 was an accomplishment, but also the first repatriation after several large-scale seizures in the past 10 years. In total, 91 animals, most of them birds, were repatriated in July 2020 (Firdausy, 2020). This is a promising start, but requires a continued exchange between the Philippines and particularly the countries seized wildlife most often originates from – to repeat this success story and to ensure that other species will also have a chance to be repatriated in the near future. It would also be recommended to follow up with the wildlife agencies involved in the repatriations on the performance of the operation by developing repatriation success indicators, e.g. to monitor whether the animals were returned to the wild and survived.

IWT on social networks and on e-commerce platforms has been on the rise during the last years (Siriwat and Nijman, 2018; The ASEAN Post, 2020b), which was even more aggravated by the Covid-19 pandemic (Standaert, 2020b). Innovative approaches, such as using artificial intelligence and machine learning, which is an activity under the DENR-ADB/GEF project and is equally promoted by the Coalition to End Wildlife Trafficking Online, are required to handle such vast amounts of data and to block user requests for putting illegal wildlife on sale (Bending, 2020; Fink and Minin, 2019). An efficient response to online trade does also rely on targeted investigations, on intelligence gathering and analysis via intelligence units specialized on online trade, and on the commitment of the platform in question to ban and delete advertisements for illegal wildlife products. Part of the solution would include the integration of a cybercrime unit investigating IWT in DENR-BMB, to hone the skills and employ the number of investigators that is required not only to search for criminals on social networks and e-commerce platforms, but also to infiltrate the darknet. Seeing that the RA 9147 is from 2001, online IWT is not yet included. The Philippines does have a Cybercrime Prevention Act, or RA 10175, of 2012, which stipulates content-related offenses cybercrime offenses under Section 4.c. However, so far these only include cybersex, child pornography, unsolicited commercial communications, and libel. As such, the Cybercrime Prevention Act can form an important basis for combating online IWT, but would need to be revised first to include this matter.

22 The Coalition to End Wildlife Trafficking Online states that, by March 2020, “Coalition companies working with WWF, TRAFFIC and the International Fund for Animal Welfare reported removing or blocking 3,335,381 endangered species listings from their platforms” (Coalition to End Wildlife Trafficking Online, 2020).
The legal framework to prosecute wildlife criminals in the Philippines consists of numerous pieces of legislation, the most important ones being RA 9147, RA 8550, as amended by RA 10654, RA 7611, RA 7586 as amended by RA 11038, DAO 2019-09, DAO 2017-11, PD 705, PSCD Resolution 19-682, and other related laws and legislation from the national to the local level. In addition, the Philippines drafted the WildLEAP in 2018, which is the Wildlife Law Enforcement Action Plan, laying the groundwork for wildlife law enforcement strategies in the country from 2018-2028. This legislation is rather advanced, but also has its shortcomings: The penalties of the Wildlife Act seem high, yet they pale when compared to the earnings that can be expected from IWT. Also, they are often stipulated in an "and/or" manner, meaning that even for the most serious violations a fine can be imposed without the need for the violator to serve time in jail. These are some of the reasons why the Act is currently under revision, with the introduction of the Draft Bill to the Philippine Senate supported by the DENR-ADB/GEF project. As stated in Chapter 2.1, the amended Wildlife Act, if passed, would further increase the fines and penalties, with jail terms raised to a maximum of 20 years for wildlife trafficking as defined in the amended Act. This would significantly increase the risk of conducting IWT for traffickers. Other benefits of the amended Act comprise granting law enforcers of selected agencies to carry firearms in the conduct of their duties, the imposition of the maximum penalty once a limit of a certain number of species confiscated is surpassed, and an introduction of the concepts of cost recovery, reparation and restoration of affected resources, which could form another basis for restitution. Nevertheless, laws and legislation, no matter how well they are written, always have to be applied with care, and potential sidesteps need to be anticipated. Below is a listing of scenarios that law enforcers, prosecutors and the judiciary may want to pay attention to:

1) Fines and penalties should be applied as stated in the Wildlife Act, thus leading to the intended consequences for violators. One of the issues encountered, however, is that convicted wildlife violators can apply for probation if the jail sentence is less than six years, meaning they do not have to serve a jail sentence (Cinco, 2019 in Sy and Krishnasamy, 2020). In addition, it may be more effective to have higher sentences for repeat offenders (see the USA Three Strikes law) and it should be common understanding to treat all criminals equally, irrespective of gender or age. In many cases, violators also receive significantly lower sentences than prescribed or simply administrative fines, a fact that was confirmed by the 2019 ICCWC Indicator Framework Assessment. Penalties are thus either close to the minimum penalties listed\(^\text{23}\), or even below, such as in the case of Administrative Adjudication, explained in detail hereafter.

2) Administrative Adjudication means that a department, via an Adjudication Committee, can impose a fine without going through the court, basically the administrator becomes the judge at the same time. Although this allows for a speedier handling of cases, which then do not need to go through the court hearings, this system may be more prone to corruption than compared to official court cases. An administrative adjudication provision was added for the amended Fisheries Code, which has stirred some concerning judgments: In 2020, two Chinese nationals were caught with 59kg of dried seahorses,\(^\text{23}\) This is addressed by the amended draft Wildlife Act, which utilizes the number of species confiscated to determine the number of individuals as of when the maximum penalty should be applied.
with an approximate value of PHP 1.7M ($35,258) (Sunstar, 2020), a violation of RA 8550, as amended by RA 10654. Section 102 of RA 10654, *Fishing or Taking of Rare, Threatened or Endangered Species*, applies, seeing that seahorses are considered Endangered with a listing in CITES Appendix II. According to RA 10654, in a case of administrative liability, as stated, the offenders should have been penalized with a fine equivalent to three times the value of the species or PHP 300,000 to PHP 3M, ($6,240 to $62,397), whichever is higher. With an estimated value of PHP 1.7M, the fine should thus have been PHP 5.1M ($106,074), but the criminals were only charged with an administrative fine of PHP 15,000 ($312) each by the responsible BFAR Office. This is in no relation to the possible profit, had the violators sold the seahorses, which is 57 times their combined fine. The provision would have even more clout if foreigners involved in these illicit activities were deported and blacklisted. Although there are clear benefits of Administrative Adjudication, there are also clear shortcomings, which requires a close monitoring of the process and of the decisions the Adjudication Committees takes.

3) The definition of specific quantities determining when a law applies can also open a door to corruption and thus equally needs to be monitored with vigilance. One case that became quite popular in 2017, was when two former Philippine Immigration deputy commissioners avoided non-bailable plunder charges, because PHP 1,000 ($21) went missing: RA 7659 states that, to qualify as plunder, the minimum amount of illegally acquired wealth is PHP 50M ($1.04M), but in the case in question, only PHP 49,999,000 were surrendered. One condition for IWT to qualify as wildlife trafficking in the amended Wildlife Act is that it is conducted “in large scale”, a term that is defined by the quantity seized: “involving one hundred (100) or more individual specimens of any threatened species; or two hundred or more individual specimens of non-threatened species” (DENR, n.d., Unpublished.). It is easy to see parallels to the stipulations under RA 7659 and which consequences this may entail, which is why a very closely monitored chain of evidence is required, as well as a monitoring of staff and a rigorous prosecution uncovering any schemes that may be at play.

Another aspect also pertaining to the legal framework is the categorization of species when there is a conflict between CITES and the DAOs in question. The current practice is to use the stipulations in the DAOs as a basis, even if the categorization in CITES would correspond to a higher protection category (see Figure 6). Taking a precautionary approach, however, would mean to use whichever categorization is higher, which is something that could be explored in subsequent DAOs and/or other legal instruments. The different categorization of species in the Province of Palawan and the rest of the country can also complicate law enforcement efforts: Whereas a Philippine pangolin confiscated in Palawan falls into the category of Critically Endangered, it is only categorized as Endangered if it is confiscated in the rest of the country. An alignment of the species’ categorizations on a countrywide scale would result in more efficient law enforcement efforts and in an improved criminal case development.

Lastly, even though the Philippines exited the NIAP process in 2018 (see Chapter 2.1), elephant ivory in raw form and finished products are still openly traded in the country, which suggests that the Philippines is still a country of concern (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020; Sy, 2020b,
The POGI Task Force, which was created to address this issue, is in a good position to follow up on these reports. This should be supported further by targeted legislation: In 2015, the Philippines drafted a DAO on the Registration of raw and worked Elephant Ivory, to implement the recommendation of CITES to “put in place comprehensive national legislative, regulatory, enforcement and other measures to regulate the domestic trade in raw and worked elephant ivory, and register raw or worked elephant ivory in the country” (DENR, n.d., Unpublished). This DAO would include a listing of all holders of pre-convention ivory, meaning ivory in possession before the year 1992, however, the DAO has not been signed and passed, yet. So far, elephant ivory is classified based on the respective species conservation level, e.g. for the African elephant a CITES Appendix listing I is translated to a Critically Endangered status in the Philippines, and penalties are applied accordingly. If the suspect claims that the ivory is pre-convention, an according certificate must be presented. Although this is the correct procedure, it relies on manual due diligence and the detection of fraudulent certificates, which could be further enhanced by another level of security in the form of a national registry where the law enforcer could search for a match between the name of the holder in question and the database entries. Also, there should be capacity to certify ivory products as antique and/or pre-convention, ideally to be conducted by DENR personnel.

On the judicial system, the ICCWC reported that 1) there is a lack of specialized prosecutors to manage wildlife crime cases; and 2) that the Philippines lack “general sentencing guidelines for judges, including specific ones for wildlife crime cases”, which leads to penalties that are often too lenient (ICCWC and UNODC, 2019, unpublished). In 2008, the Philippine Supreme Court issued the Administrative Order: Designation of Special Courts to Hear, Try and Decide Environmental Cases. This order created 117 environmental courts, where judges will have specialized knowledge of environmental law in addition to hearing cases also on other topics (Davide Jr. and Vinson, 2011). Moreover, the Philippine Judicial Academy has conducted specialized environmental law training programs and workshops, some in cooperation with regional law enforcement agencies like the former ASEAN-WEN (Davide Jr. and Vinson, 2011). The “Rules of Procedure for Environmental Cases” were put into effect in 2010, including the Writ of Kalikasan that protects people’s rights to a healthy environment and includes numerous mechanisms that facilitate it for petitioners to bring cases before the Court. The DENR-ADB/GEF project recognized the need for prosecutors to improve their knowledge on substantive laws pertinent to wildlife law enforcement and of implementing guidelines for the proper prosecution of wildlife cases. This was addressed by a 5-day Seminar on the Prosecution of Wildlife Cases, with participants from the DENR, the DA, and the Department of Justice (DOJ). The AML Act or RA 9271, the Quarantine Act of 2004, should be explored as additional legislative bases for prosecutions of wildlife crime.

Innovative Financing Mechanisms: Restitution and Debt-for-Nature Swaps
Restitution is currently high on the agenda and explores the concept of seizing and utilizing assets procured through illegal means from wildlife criminals to finance wildlife protection and efforts combating IWT. The Analytical Centre of Excellence on Trafficking (2020), under the FREELAND Foundation, published a report on this matter in 2020: Making Wildlife Traffickers Finance Wildlife Recovery. The report guides governments on how assets seized from criminals
can be used to finance wildlife protection and combat IWT, which would turn the illicit business into a "high risk, low reward" one instead, and could complement other funding for wildlife conservation. The report states that targeting the financial infrastructure of traffickers and using the illegal gains to finance wildlife conservation can “1) financially cripple wildlife trafficking operations; 2) Deter future offenses; and 3) Help targeted wildlife populations, habitats and affected communities recover” (Analytical Centre of Excellence on Trafficking, 2020). The Anti-Money Laundering Act in the Philippines, RA 9160, as amended by RA 9194, defines the functions of the Anti-Money Laundering Council (AMLC), among others, as follows in Sec.5 (6): “to apply before the Court of Appeals, ex parte, for the freezing of any monetary instrument or property alleged to be the proceeds of any unlawful activity as defined in Section 3(i) hereof” (Congress of the Philippines, 2003). Whereas this allows for the freezing of assets, there is no stipulation on how these assets will subsequently be used. It should also be noted that a Court Order is necessary for the authorities to access an account, which needs to be procured quickly after suspects know their operations are in jeopardy, so there will be no time for the offender or any accomplices to transfer or withdraw excessive amounts.

The 2020 report mentions the Philippines as one example for the application of restitution, citing its Penal Law, which contemplates Restitution, and the Fisheries Code, Republic Act (RA) 8550, as amended by RA 10654. In the case of illegal exploitation or exportation of coral, RA 10654 states that the offender “shall also be required to pay the cost of restoration of the damaged coral reefs based on available studies and as determined by the Department” (Congress of the Philippines, 2015). Based on personal conversations, it seems that this form of penalty has not been invoked so far in the country, but the entry points mentioned above could indeed form the basis for subsequent legal provisions to build on. In practice, the offender would be mandated to pay an amount equal to the gains he made through the exploitation of habitat, e.g. poaching or trafficking, to a designated authority that then in turn invests this money into wildlife conservation, the restoration or rehabilitation of wildlife habitat, wildlife law enforcement, or biodiversity conservation in general. Thus, restitution is a concept that should be internalized more deeply into national legislation, either by building on the Penal Law, using the Fisheries Code as a basis and tweaking it, or by passing additional legislation specific to this topic to be implemented by the agencies concerned and involved in law enforcement as well as in financial investigations. As mentioned above, the amended Wildlife Act, if passed, may also provide an entry point for restitution.

Another concept, which has already been used by the Philippines, is the utilization of Debt-for-Nature (DFN) swaps. DFN swaps reduce a country’s debt stock in exchange for a commitment from the debtor-government to protect the environment (UNDP, n.d.). In 2013, the U.S. government redirected $31.8M in debt payments owed by the Philippines into establishing a conservation fund to be used for conserving, maintaining, and restoring endangered rainforests across the Asian archipelago (Butler, 2013). This mechanism can equally be used to combat IWT, a connection that was made by Gockel and Gray (2011), who assessed DFN swaps in Peru and explored the range of programs financed through swaps via two case studies. Project interventions included recovery programs for threatened species overharvested by locals in the Pacaya Samiria National Reserve, as well as reducing illegal logging activities in and around the
Alto Purús National Park (Gockel and Gray, 2011). Although the swaps were perceived by locals to have positive effects on nature conservation and increased local capacity, the authors call for changing the methods of measuring success and direct impacts of the DFN swaps and for improving swap administration (Gockel and Gray, 2011). Carter (2015), who also analyzed the Peruvian case studies, adds that DFN swaps will be most effective in countries where

- Modest debt forgiveness will make the largest impact on the economy;
- Conservation organizations respect national sovereignty and law; and
- Both NGOs and government bodies provide financial and logistical support.

The Philippines may therefore want to explore the option of DFN swaps further, focusing on utilizing generated funds for wildlife conservation related projects.

### 3.3. Regional Agreements

The Philippines was one of the founding members of ASEAN in 1967 and the country strongly supports a regional order promoting international trade, good behavior, and adhering to internationally accepted rules and norms (Shead, 2017). The Philippines has constantly affirmed the promotion of ASEAN centrality, but naturally the country also has to maintain a diplomatic stance when it comes to pursuing national interests by simultaneously considering the conflicting interests other States might have, seeing the differences in economic progress, culture, and perspectives regarding territorial issues among the AMS (Shead, 2017). As AMS, the Philippines also regularly reports to the AWG CITES and WE on updates regarding wildlife law enforcement and legislation in the country and whether these are in line with the ASEAN Plan of Action; on the implementation of CITES; proposed listing of species in CITES COPs; and to discuss bilateral IWT issues with other AMS. The Philippines is a Party to the following regional agreements centering on wildlife conservation:

**The Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Marine Turtles and their Habitats of the Indian Ocean and Southeast Asia (IOSEA MT MOU)**

Administered by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)-Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), the Philippines has been a signatory to the IOSEA MT MOU since 2001. The MOU is regional in nature and “applies to the waters and coastal States of the Indian Ocean and South-East [sic!] Asia and adjacent sea”, covering 44 Range States, of which 35 have already signed to date (UNEP-CMS, n.d.). With the objective to “protect, conserve, replenish and recover marine turtles and their habitats”, the MOU includes a Conservation Management Plan, consisting of six Objectives and 24 Programs of Action (UNEP-CMS, n.d.). Specific provisions concerning IWT are discussed in

- Objective 1, Program 1.5, which prohibits the “direct harvest (capture or killing) of, and domestic trade in, marine turtles, their eggs, parts or products”;
- Objective 5, Program 5.1, which makes reference to CITES and encourages Parties to “[c]ollaborate with and assist signatory and non-signatory States to regulate and share information on trade, to combat illegal trade, and to cooperate in enforcement activities relating to marine turtle products”; and in
- Objective 5, Program 5.5, which calls for strengthening and improving enforcement of conservation legislation (UNEP-CMS, 2009).
All AMS, except Lao PDR, are Range States, and all, except Brunei Darussalam and Singapore, signed the MOU. The Philippines submits regular reports to the CMS Secretariat, which helps to monitor the status of marine turtles in the Philippines and thus has the potential to inform appropriate conservation actions. These should equally be guided by the *Marine Turtle Conservation Action Plan for the Philippines (2020-2030)* (DENR-BMB, 2020c, Unpublished).

**Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation and Management of Dugongs (Dugong dugon) and their Habitats throughout their Range (Dugong MOU)**

Equally administered by UNEP-CMS, the Philippines has been a member of the Dugong MOU since 2008. As one of the 46 Range States, the Philippines commits to protect dugong and seagrass areas by 1) replacing destructive fisheries practices with environmentally sustainable practices; 2) increasing the availability of critical knowledge for conservation action for dugongs and seagrass; 3) mainstreaming dugong and seagrass conservation priorities into national and regional policies and planning; and 4) enhancing community based stewardship in priority dugong habitats (UNEP-CMS, 2007a).

Although IWT is less common for dugongs than for marine turtles, the Conservation Management Plan addresses it in

- Objective 1, Action 1.4 “Reduce to the greatest extent practicable the illegal take of dugong”; and in
- Objective 6, Action 6.1 “Collaborate with, and assist Signatory and non-Signatory States to combat illegal international and domestic trade, and to cooperate in enforcement activities relating to dugong products” (UNEP-CMS, 2007b).

Although all AMS, except Lao PDR, are Range States, only few AMS have signed the MOU, including the Philippines. As for marine turtles, the Philippines submit regular reports to the CMS Secretariat, which helps in monitoring the current status of dugongs in the Philippines and has the potential to inform appropriate conservation actions. These should be equally guided by the *Dugong Conservation Action Plan for the Philippines (2020-2030)* (DENR-BMB, 2020d, Unpublished).

**Memorandum of Understanding on the Conservation of Migratory Sharks (Sharks MOU)**

The Sharks MOU is also located under the UNEP-CMS body and is the first global instrument that focuses on the conservation of sharks and rays. The MOU was signed by the Philippines in 2010 as one of the 11 original signatories. At the time of writing, 37 species of sharks and rays are listed in Annex 1 of the MOU. It is equally accompanied by a Conservation Plan, which addresses IWT in

- Objective B, Activity 4.3 “Prohibit the taking of species in accordance with paragraph 13 i of the MoU”;
- Objective B, Activity 7.2.1 “Develop and implement strategies that seek to ensure that sharks and shark products entering international trade are harvested and traded in accordance with existing conservation and management measures and applicable regulations including those of CITES and RFMOs”;
- Objective B, Activity 7.2.2 “Develop and implement additional measures to ensure legal and sustainable international trade in sharks and shark products”;
• Objective B, Activity 7.3.1 on Finning “Where not already in place, consider enacting legislation or regulations requiring sharks to be stored on board and landed with each fin naturally attached in line with applicable UN General Assembly Resolutions, including 62/177, and 66/68 and with applicable decisions from IUCN, including motion 4.114, and relevant RFMOs”; and

• Objective E, Activity 16.2 “Encourage Signatories that have not already done so to become Parties to (…) the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)” (UNEP-CMS, 2010).

Although all AMS, except Lao PDR, are Range States, only the Philippines has signed the MOU so far.

Coral Triangle Initiative – Regional Plan of Action
The Coral Triangle Initiative (CTI) – Regional Plan of Action is a 10-year\textsuperscript{24} guideline for countries located in the Coral Triangle on how to achieve poverty reduction and biodiversity conservation in the marine realm with “collective and parallel action at regional, national, and sub-national levels” (CTI-CFF, 2009). Several of its listed goals and targets may form an excellent basis for combating poaching of marine species, which is why it is considered an essential regional agreement for the design and implementation of counter-IWT activities under a regional mandate. Goal 2, Target 1 focuses on fisheries management and thereby deterring, preventing, and eliminating Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing. Goal 2, Target 4 calls for a more effective management and sustainable trade of live reef fish and reef-based ornamental fish. One of the recommendations is to establish a CTI Forum on the Management of International Trade in Coral Reef-Based Organisms. The most relevant goal, Goal 5: Threatened Species Status Improving, calls for the completion of regional action plans for certain taxonomic groups, such as marine turtles, and it calls for each country to recognize and enforce laws and regulations to combat Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated Fishing and trafficking of threatened marine species as transnational organized crime (CTI-CFF, 2009). In addition, Malaysia listed establishing a policy dialogue on marine turtle poaching issues as an indicative and prioritized action and the Philippines listed adopting and enforcing policies against poaching and destructive fishing (CTI-CFF, 2009).

Trilateral Co-operation between Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines
In 2017, a trilateral maritime patrol was launched in Tarakan, Indonesia, and a joint air patrol in Subang, Malaysia (Quilop, 2018). In addition, the set-up of three military command centers is foreseen, with one already inaugurated in Tarakan, North Kalimantan, and two more to be built in Tawau, Sabah, and Bongao, Tawi-Tawi, for intelligence exchange (Antara, 2017). This represents a concerted response to counteract violent extremism, terrorism, kidnapping, and piracy in the region (Quilop, 2018), but the agreement could also form a viable basis for apprehending wildlife criminals. For now, the three countries signed a joint declaration only, with an MOU on the horizon (Quilop, 2018), which could further strengthen the framework of action and the trilateral partnership, and allow for additional focal areas, such as IWT, to be explored.

\textsuperscript{24} The CTI – Regional Plan of Action came into effect in 2009 and is currently updated (CTI, 2019).
Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Philippines – East ASEAN Growth Area (BIMP-EAGA)

The four countries of Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines launched the BIMP-EAGA in 1994, with the objective to accelerate economic development, specifically in the designated focal areas of their countries (Shead, 2017). The sub-region covers a total land area of 1.6 million km² with an estimated population of 73 million people (ADB, 2020). ADB assisted in preparing the BIMP-EAGA Vision 2025, and whereas the vast majority of infrastructure projects focus on air, land, and sea connectivity and on power interconnection projects, other key pillars include agri-business, tourism, the environment, and socio-cultural education (ADB, 2019a; BIMP-EAGA, 2017). The Vision recognizes sustainability to be key to the development of the agriculture and fisheries, manufacturing, and tourism sectors of these countries, and assumes that the environment will most probably be the sector that benefits most from transnational cooperation (BIMP-EAGA, 2017). The Vision therefore calls for increased private sector investments into and local community support for the protection of natural resources, as well as a mainstreaming of the environmental sector into its other strategic pillars (BIMP-EAGA, 2017). Strategic Priority 3 of the Environment Sector Strategy is most relevant for the protection of wildlife: Sustainable management of natural resources and ecosystems. Although there is no direct mentioning of IWT, the BIMP-EAGA is a crucial platform for member countries to collaborate and to commit to biodiversity conservation. Networks, working groups, institutional and physical structures required for combating IWT may have already been built in the context of agri-business, tourism, and infrastructure development, thus enabling the member states to fall back on existing structures and arrangements instead of building these from scratch.
4. The Philippine-Southeast Asian Nexus: Legal and Illegal Wildlife Trade

In order to fully understand IWT, it is equally essential to understand the legal wildlife trade flows and supply chains, which is the objective of this data analysis that was based on the data in the CITES Trade Database. Legal wildlife trade is closely connected to IWT, in that the cloak of legality can be used to 1) hide illegal specimens within legal shipments; 2) launder wild-caught species into the legal trade; and 3) to declare a false purpose, source, or even species, e.g. in cases where look-alike species have not yet been included in Appendix II of CITES.

These implications can be drawn indirectly only. It is important to note that there is a letter code, letter “I”, for a CITES Source Category denoting “Confiscated or seized specimens”, however, none of the recorded trade entries assessed in this report fell into this category. As CITES states in its trade database handbook, “Information on seized or confiscated specimens is often absent or provided in insufficient detail” (CITES and UNEP-WCMC, 2013). This was confirmed by D’Cruze and Macdonald (2016), who found that 70% of countries that are Parties to CITES did not provide any information on live seizures.

Legal cross-border wildlife trade in CITES-listed species is registered in the CITES Trade Database by all Parties to the Convention and is publicly accessible. The following data was extracted from that database in the form of comparative tabulations and covers the years 2015-2018. The comparative tabulation files were utilized as this is the only form of data presentation, where information on the purpose and source of the trade is included. In terms of legal wildlife trade, the flows from the Philippines to other selected AMS and vice versa were assessed, as well as the flows from the Philippines to the PRC, including Taiwan, China, and Hong Kong, China, and vice versa. The PRC was included as it is considered the largest market for illegal wildlife products (Kirschke-Schwartz, 2016), and is also a major actor for legally traded wildlife species. Line items in the database were referred to as “entries” instead of “shipments”, as each row may or may not represent a shipment. The CITES Database Guidelines state that “(…) quantities traded are added together for all records where all details, such as taxon, term, importer, purpose etc. are the same, except for quantity” (CITES and UNEP-WCMC, 2013). In this case, several shipments are aggregated and reported as one entry. In cases where one of the attributes differs, the entries are counted separately.

The results have implications for proper Non-detriment Findings to be issued by the Scientific Authorities (SAs) for specimens listed under CITES Appendix I (from exporting and importing country) and Appendix II (from exporting country), e.g. when the source is indicated as Specimens taken from the wild. Plants artificially propagated and Animals bred/born in captivity require a close monitoring of breeding facilities to prevent the laundering of wild-caught animals into the legal trade and, in the latter case, has implications for animal welfare and human health. Moreover, the manifold origins, sources, and purposes of these species may render their protection more challenging, which requires a well-functioning international collaboration between CITES Management Authorities (MAs) and national wildlife law enforcement teams.
4.1. Legal Wildlife Trade between the Philippines and selected ASEAN Member States

Legal Wildlife Trade\textsuperscript{25} from the Philippines to selected ASEAN Member States

First, the records of legal wildlife shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS were assessed per country (see Figure 8). From 2015-2018, most entries indicated legal wildlife destined for Singapore (372), followed by Thailand (241), and by Indonesia (146). Shipments to Malaysia and Viet Nam were relatively few, and there were no entries for Brunei, Cambodia, and Lao PDR. This amounts to a total of 799 entries from the Philippines to the AMS presented in Figure 8 from 2015-2018, with 43 entries classified as Appendix I, and 756 entries classified as Appendix II listed species. Of these 799 records, 47 entries for wildlife did not originate in the Philippines. With the country acting as a transshipment point only, there are implications for ports and customs. Of these 47 entries, 23 originated from other AMS, led by Viet Nam (10), and followed by the Indonesia (7), Lao PDR (3), Malaysia (2), and Thailand (1), and beyond the region, the USA was the most prominent country of origin (6) for these 47 entries.

\textbf{Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018 - per country}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected ASEAN Member States</th>
<th>No. of database entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Figure 8. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018 - per country, Source: CITES, n.d.}

\textsuperscript{25} The term “legal wildlife trade” in the analysis presented pertains only to species listed under CITES, which are included in the CITES database.
Most wildlife species belonged to the taxonomic group of plants (638), with almost all the species being part of the Orchidaceae family, or orchids. This group was followed by traded birds (102), and traded reptiles (53) (see Figure 9).

![Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018 - per taxonomic group](image)

**Figure 9.** Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018 - per taxonomic group, Source: CITES, n.d.

Most of these wildlife species were shipped in 2015 (with 307 entries) and the number continually declined until 2018 (with 109 entries) (see Figure 10).26 The CITES description of specimens traded refers to the state of wildlife. Figure 11 shows that the dominant state specimens were traded in is live (737), and several entries were recorded as leather products (43). Regarding the purpose these specimens were traded for, the highest number was recorded for Commercial trade (634), followed by Circus or travelling exhibitions (72), Personal (61), and Breeding in captivity or artificial propagation (26) (see Figure 12). The source of wildlife, either referring to the Philippines or to the country of origin in case the Philippines only acts as transshipment point, is mainly from Plants that are artificially propagated (638), followed by Animals bred in captivity (120), Specimens taken from the wild (21), and Appendix-I animals bred in captivity for commercial purposes (21) (see Figure 13). The Specimens taken from the wild entry referred in majority to the trade of leather products and one entry concerned monkeys traded for scientific purposes. The Appendix-I animals bred in captivity included saltwater crocodiles (Crocodylus porosus) in the form of skins/skin pieces, live golden parakeets (Guarouba guarouba), and a live grey parrot (Psittacus erithacus).

---

26 One of the reasons may have been due to the role of the Philippines as a major exporter of African lovebirds: When the bird flu was confirmed in 2018, importing countries imposed an importing ban (Arcalas, 2017).
Figure 10. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018 - per year, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 11. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018 - per category, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 12. Purpose of wildlife legally traded from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 13. Source of wildlife legally traded from the Philippines to selected AMS between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.
Legal wildlife Trade from selected ASEAN Member States to the Philippines

From 2015-2018, there were in total 233 entries of wildlife legally shipped to the Philippines, which originated in four AMS: Singapore (131), Indonesia (54), Malaysia (45), and Viet Nam (3) (see Figure 14). All four countries mainly acted only as transshipment points for these species, with many species originating from Indonesia, the United States of America (USA), Viet Nam, Lao PDR, Australia, and Bolivia. Of these 233 entries, 30 entries were classified as Appendix I, 198 entries as Appendix II, and five entries as Appendix III listed species.

![Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per country](image)

Figure 14. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per country, Source: CITES, n.d.

Most species imported belonged to the taxonomic group of reptiles (165), followed by plants (29), and fish (*actinopteri*) (20) (see Figure 15).
Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per taxonomic group

There was no significant fluctuation of the number of entries over the time period 2015-2018 (see Figure 16). Two CITES categories for the imported wildlife species stood out: live (107) and leather products (95) (see Figure 17). With 185 entries, most of the trade was of a Commercial nature, followed by Breeding in captivity or artificial propagation (29), and Personal (8) (see Figure 18). The sources of wildlife traded varied, with most species/products stemming from Animals bred in captivity (83) (see Figure 19). The second highest category was Specimens taken from the wild (57), which concerned almost exclusively reptiles, followed by Appendix I animals bred in captivity for commercial purposes (25). The species listed under this source were live Asian arowanas (Scleropages formosus), one of the world’s most expensive ornamental fish, and saltwater crocodile (Crocodylus porosus) products, such as skins, leather, and two bodies. Entries of specimens listed as taken from the wild mostly referred to leather products and skins, but also to wood chips and products, as well as live reptile species. Other source categories were Plants that are artificially propagated (22), Animals born in captivity (22), Pre-convention specimens (13), and Ranched specimens (11). The pre-convention specimen traded were mostly wood products, but also included ivory carvings, marine turtle shells, corals, and stingrays.
Figure 16. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per year, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 17. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per category, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 18. Purpose of wildlife legally traded from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 19. Source of wildlife legally traded from selected AMS to the Philippines between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.
4.2. Legal Wildlife Trade between the Philippines and the People’s Republic of China

Legal wildlife Trade from the Philippines to the People’s Republic of China

Between 2015 and 2018, there were 522 entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to the PRC, with 12 entries classified as Appendix I, and 510 entries classified as Appendix II listed species. Most of these were destined for Taiwan, China (436), some for Hong Kong, China (57), and only few for the PRC\(^27\) (29) (see Figure 20). It seems that the species shipped to Taiwan, China, remained in the Province, and were not re-exported to another destination, as the exports from Taiwan, China, with the Philippines indicated as the country of origin, only amounted to five in total from 2015-2018. Most of the species shipped to Taiwan, China, were orchids, a major industry in the Province, and some were parrot species.\(^28\)

![Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018 - per Region/Province](image)

**Figure 20.** Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018 - per Region/Province, Source: CITES, n.d.

Most entries comprised flora (426), with the majority belonging to the *Orchidaceae* family. Birds were the second highest taxonomic group traded (90), followed by small numbers of mammals (5) and reptiles (1) (see Figure 21).

\(^{27}\) Here referring to Mainland, China.

\(^{28}\) Taiwan, China, is not recognized as a Party under CITES, and as such does not submit separate trade reports. The CITES Trade Database nevertheless allows for an independent search of “Taiwan, Province of China”.
Figure 21. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018 - per taxonomic group, Source: CITES, n.d.

Whereas the number of database entries slightly increased from 2015 to 2016, it decreased in the following years from 159 to 92 entries per year (see Figure 22). With 516 entries, almost all entries (99%) were recorded as containing live species (see Figure 23), referring here to the trade of orchids. The purpose of the traded species was equally unambiguous, with 488 entries stating commercial reasons. The sources of wildlife traded were mainly Plants that are artificially propagated (426) and Animals bred in captivity (90). The four Appendix-I animals bred in captivity for commercial purposes were orchids\textsuperscript{29}, and the three Pre-convention specimens referred to ivory carvings.

\textsuperscript{29} One of these three shipments was declared as Robiquetia pantherina under Taxon, but Crocodylus under Genus, with skins being exported. It is assumed that this is a recording error.
Figure 22. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018 - per year, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 23. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018 - per category, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 24. Purpose of wildlife legally traded from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 25. Source of wildlife legally traded from the Philippines to the PRC between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.
Legal wildlife Trade from the PRC to the Philippines

There were in total 136 database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the PRC; Hong Kong, China; Macau, China; and Taiwan, China, to the Philippines between 2015 and 2018. Of these, five entries were classified as Appendix I, 129 entries were classified as Appendix II, and two entries were classified as Appendix III listed species. Most of these traded specimens were exported to Hong Kong, China (99), followed by Taiwan, China (21), the PRC (15), and Macau, China (1) (see Figure 26). The origin of the wildlife species varied widely, with 30 different countries of origin given. Whereas the origin of wildlife was unknown for 15 entries, most wildlife/wildlife products originated from the USA (19), followed by the Seychelles (12), and Indonesia (10). Products from Zambia (8), Peru (8), and Viet Nam (7) were also recorded.

![Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the PRC to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per Region/Province](image)

Figure 26. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the PRC to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per Province/Region, Source: CITES, n.d.

Most entries were recorded for the taxonomic group of reptiles (118), followed by flora (14), mammals (2), and fish (2) (see Figure 27).
When assessed by year, Figure 28 shows that the number of database entries of wildlife legally shipped did remain relatively stable over the time period from 2015 to 2018. The CITES category traded most was live specimens (95), followed by leather products (26), and wood products (9) (see Figure 29). The three purposes of wildlife traded from the PRC to the Philippines were recorded as Commercial (77), Breeding in captivity or artificial propagation (56), and Personal (3) (see Figure 30). The sources of wildlife varied, with a majority of species being Animals bred in captivity (85), Animals born in captivity (17), and Specimens taken from the wild (14) (see Figure 31). Twelve of the specimens taken from the wild were reptiles, traded in the form of leather products and skin pieces, and two were plants, traded in the form of wood products. Other sources of wildlife were recorded as Pre-convention specimens (9), Plants that are artificially propagated (5), Ranched specimens (4), and Appendix-I animals bred in captivity for commercial purposes (2). The pre-convention specimens included wood products, an ivory carving, and piano keys made out of ivory. Both shipments of Appendix-I bred animals contained Asian arowanas (Scleropages formosus), an ornamental fish.
Figure 28. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the PRC to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per year, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 29. Database entries of wildlife legally shipped from the PRC to the Philippines between 2015-2018 - per category, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 30. Purpose of wildlife legally traded from the PRC to the Philippines between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.

Figure 31. Source of wildlife legally traded from the PRC to the Philippines between 2015-2018, Source: CITES, n.d.
4.3. IWT between the Philippines and selected AMS

The legal wildlife trade forms part of a sustainable use regime that can function well as long as the regulations are enforced, implementation is closely monitored, and species are harvested sustainably – meaning the national and global population numbers are known, the recruitment rate is understood, and the species’ stock is stable and thus resilient to threats and extraction/harvest. IWT is the complete opposite and undermines the sustainable use approach, as it eludes regulations and exploits wildlife without limitations, which threatens the survival of species, the livelihoods of people, and the security of countries.

Due to its clandestine nature, analyzing trade flows, particularly transboundary ones, requires time and means that would be outside of the scope of this report. The procurement of national confiscation data of other AMS would have required lengthy procedures, as this concerns sensitive and confidential data of several countries. Even an analysis of secondary data proved to be challenging, as the confiscation database of DENR-BMB, although comprehensive, does not contain information of the origin and destination of intercepted IWT shipments. Trade flows, whether domestic or international, can therefore not be derived from the data at hand. Therefore, other paths that were explored to showcase the flows of IWT: the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal, the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) Global Environmental Crime Tracker, and the Reducing Opportunities for Unlawful Transport of Endangered Species (ROUTES) country profiles.

The TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal was created and launched by the NGO TRAFFIC in April 2020 to share non-sensitive data on IWT incidences worldwide. However, the information included in the portal are mostly based on published data from news articles, brochures, reports etc., which can lead to discrepancies in incidence reporting, if there is no agreement between a country and the Portal to share confiscation data. There are, however, also datasets that come directly from the responsible government agencies, which greatly enriches the database.

Differences in seizure records occur due to differences in methodologies: Whereas the number of wildlife seizures in the Philippines between 2010 and 2019 amounts to 511 as reported in Chapter 3.1, the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal only reports 236 incidents in the same time period.30 “Philippines” was used as search criterion for “country” and the time period was selected from 01 Jan 2010 – 31 Dec 2019. Of these entries, the Philippines is “Country of Incident” in 196 cases and “Country Involved” in the remaining 40 cases. In cases where the Philippines was a Country of Incident, other countries involved were France (1); Indonesia (4); Japan (1); Macau, China; Mozambique (1); the Netherlands (1); Norway (1); Papua New Guinea (1); Poland (2); the PRC (2); Taiwan, China (1); United Arab Emirates (1); USA (2); and Viet Nam (1) (TRAFFIC, 2020c). For most incidents, however, the field “country involved” was blank. In cases where the Philippines was only Country Involved, the Countries of Incident were Austria (via Qatar in transit to Germany) (1); Belgium (via Burundi); Hong Kong, China (2); India

---

30 The TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal was accessed on 10 February 2020.
(2); Indonesia (5); Malaysia (2); Mexico (1); Poland (7); the PRC (once via Hong Kong, China) (8); Singapore (2); Slovenia (1); Sweden (3); Tanzania (1); Thailand (1); and the USA (3) (TRAFFIC, 2020c) (see Figure 32). The transport mode was only indicated for 109 incidences, of which 42 were by air, 19 by land (vehicle), and 48 by sea.

With regard to the “Countries Involved” label in the portal, it should be highlighted that it is not applied upon the mere mentioning of the nationality of a violator in publications, meaning if a Vietnamese national is caught smuggling wildlife in the Philippines, Viet Nam is not automatically mentioned as Country Involved. The nationality is not considered to be an accurate attribute to determine whether that country was involved in the trade route, and thus it cannot be indisputably ascertained that this specimen came from or was about to be shipped to Viet Nam (TRAFFIC, 2020d, personal conversation).

The results from the Portal nevertheless present essential information for combating IWT and can give excellent indications for potential entry points: Those comprise, but are not limited to, informing customs officers by flagging routes that carry a higher risk to be used as smuggling routes for wildlife, and by unveiling the countries involved in recorded incidences, which the Philippines may want to intensify its international collaboration with.

![Figure 32. Countries of incidence and countries involved in illegal wildlife trade from 2015-2019 based on the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal, Source: TRAFFIC, 2020c](image-url)
The **Global Environmental Crime Tracker** is equally based on data collected from publicly available information, and allows for assessing incidents via an interactive dashboard in a detailed manner due to the ability to use a wide variety of filters. To date, the information collected focuses on a selected number of species. If the Philippines is selected as “Country of Incident”, a total of 53 incidents were recorded between 01 Jan 2010 and 31 Dec 2019, with an arrest rate of 50.9% and a conviction rate of 1.9% (EIA, 2021). The numbers of incidents per species category point to major seizures of timber and pangolins.

** ROUTES** is a USAID partnership that tackles IWT in the transport sector, and thus brings together transport and logistics companies, law enforcement, government agencies, development groups, donors, and conservation organizations to disrupt wildlife trafficking by reducing the use of legal transportation supply chains (ROUTES, n.d.). The partnership developed an interactive country profile map that reports on wildlife seizures in airports. For the Philippines, 51 incidents were reported between 2009 and 2020, with a country enforcement index of 65% and the four top smuggling routes being Manila – Taipei; Manila – Japan; Philippines – Jakarta; and Philippines – USA (ROUTES, n.d.). Other routes recorded within SEA were Indonesia – Singapore; Malaysia – Indonesia; Malaysia – Thailand; Philippines – Indonesia; Singapore – Lao PDR; Thailand – Cambodia; Thailand – Lao PDR; and Thailand – Viet Nam. The top cities in the Philippines where seizures were reported were Manila, Cebu City, Puerto Princesa, and Bacolod. Annex 2 shows the ROUTES data for selected AMS between 2009 and 2020, however, it should be noted that these wildlife seizures only concern incidents at airports. The table shows that the number of trafficking instances recorded was highest for Thailand (218), and the country enforcement index was best for Viet Nam (71%). Checked luggage is the transport method used most for wildlife trafficking at airports, followed by air freight. Most of the products/taxonomic groups that were recorded as part of trafficking instances were ivory and reptiles. Countries that were recorded to be involved in wildlife trafficking outside of SEA were South Korea; Hong Kong, China; Netherlands; Kenya; the PRC; India; Taiwan, China; Japan; USA; Ethiopia; and France.

In addition to the Wildlife Trade Portal, the Global Environmental Crime Tracker and ROUTES, the following sources present information on trade routes involving the Philippines:

One major IWT route that was recognized by Krishnasamy and Zavagli (2020) is the illegal inflow of species into the Philippines from Indonesia, with at least at least four seizures of 462 parrots endemic to Indonesia between 2013 and 2017 (TRAFFIC, 2018). Balut Island, Davao Occidental, was identified by DENR-BMB as the main entry point of wildlife into the country (ADB, 2018; DENR-BMB, 2020e), mainly concerning birds to be sold as pets (see Chapter 3.2).

---

31 The Global Environmental Crime Tracker was accessed on 15 June 2021.
32 The Country Enforcement Index gives an approximation of enforcement success rates and “(...) is a quantitative representation of each country’s ability to detect and seize illicit wildlife products traveling through its airports (Utermohlen and Baine, 2016). A lower number indicates that the country is not able to detect the majority of illicit products that are smuggled through its airports, whereas a higher index number indicates a more effective enforcement. The Index is calculated by dividing the number of total seizures by the successfully attempted trafficking instances (Utermohlen and Baine, 2016). The latter can e.g. be derived from IWT shipments intercepted in the destination country, counting as a “miss” in the country of origin.
33 The ROUTES Database was accessed on 20 December 2020.
Many of the smuggled species are also believed to originate from Papua New Guinea, such as the 345 birds that were detected in a Mati warehouse in 2019 (TRAFFIC, 2019). These trade flows are the response to a thriving pet trade as well as a means to launder the animals for international trade (Krishnasamy and Zavagli, 2020). Recent updates on significant wildlife seizures and prosecutions worldwide are presented in the TRAFFIC Bulletin: Seizures and Prosecutions, which has been published from 1997 onwards. For Philippine forest turtles \textit{(Siebenrockiella leytensis)} the PRC; Hong Kong, China; Japan; Malaysia; the EU; and the USA were reported as consumer countries (Sy et al., 2020). Another species smuggled from the Philippines is the Philippine pangolin \textit{(Manis culionensis)}. Huangpu, Guangdong, PRC was the destination of one major confiscation of 854.1kg of pangolin scales in Cagayan de Oro City in 2017 (Sy and Krishnasamy, 2020), as well as among the destinations of smuggled tokay geckos, which were included in CITES Appendix II in 2019 (Sy and Shepherd, 2020). Although destinations of illegal wildlife shipments vary, a majority of confiscations points to the PRC as a major destination for smuggled wildlife, which is confirmed by recent studies and reports and required increased vigilance on the part of the Philippines concerning shipments to the PRC (C4ADS, 2018; Kirschke-Schwartz, 2016; Wong, 2019).

To give an overview over IWT hotspots and flows, two maps were developed: One by the DENR-ADB/GEF Project Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines, based on DENR-BMB confiscation data (Figure 33), and the one by the USAID Wildlife Protect Project (Figure 34). Figure 33 is a point symbol map and presents the wildlife crime hotspots in the Philippines (2010-2018) including 16 major poaching sites, 11 transshipment points of wild fauna, and four primary transshipment and confiscation points of wild animals from Indonesia, with Balut Island presented as the main entry point for the latter. Trade routes to other AMS are not visualized. In contrast, Figure 34 is a flow map and shows the IWT routes within the Philippines as well as to and from the country (Vinluan et al., 2019). Data was gathered by USAID from national government reports (e.g. DENR, PCSD), open-source data (e.g. media reports), assessment workshops on violations, and key informant interviews (Vinluan et al., 2019). The map clearly shows some of the links between the Philippines and specific AMS implicated in IWT, such as: Thailand, as transit country for products originating from African countries being shipped to the Philippines; Malaysia, mainly as destination for marine turtles and derivatives, such as eggs; and Indonesia, as a source country for wildlife being shipped to the Philippines, thereby confirming the connection established also in Figure 33. Other illegal shipments of wildlife are exported to Hong Kong, China; Hainan, China; to the USA; to Europe, to Oceania; and illegal wildlife shipments are shown to be imported from Poland.

It should be noted, however, that recorded confiscations are only the tip of the iceberg, as only a small percentage of illegal shipments are detected (WWF Germany, 2017) and official data on confiscations is often absent (CITES and UNEP-WCMC, 2013; D’Cruze and Macdonald, 2016). Van Uhm (2016) gives an estimation that no more than 10% of smuggled wildlife is confiscated. This signifies the need and the urgency to collect, report, and share more information and data on confiscations, to continue the development and usage of red flags for high-risk shipping routes (by air, land and sea) and for often used shipping companies, as well as more efficient cross-country collaboration, including the private sector.
Figure 33. Wildlife crime hotspots based on DENR-BMB confiscation data from 2010-2018, Source: ADB, 2018; DENR-BMB, 2020e
Figure 34. Illegal wildlife trade routes within, from, and to the Philippines, Source: Vinluan et al., 2019
5. Stocktaking of Projects combating IWT in selected AMS I: An Assessment of counter-IWT Projects

To combat IWT in ASEAN, governments of AMS have collaborated with various international organizations, multilateral and bilateral donors, NGOs, development banks etc. for many years, implementing counter-IWT projects to protect flagship species or to safeguard wildlife in general (see Table 4). This focus on wildlife and on addressing IWT directly has developed from a project design originally geared towards broader biodiversity conservation activities, or having IWT as only one component among many. With increasing trade volumes, more international pressure through new campaigns, agreements, and declarations, and the Covid-19 pandemic, combating IWT gained even more prominence, which will most certainly be reflected in the number as well as in the design of future counter-IWT projects. In the spirit of South-South cooperation, best practices provide an excellent basis for the replication of successful activities and to promote learning partnerships on methodologies and tools used, and expertise acquired.

5.1. Objective

The Philippines has increased its efforts in combating IWT over the last years, such as with the passing of the WildLEAP and through its commitments during the DENR-ADB/GEF project. However, there are still significant gaps that are exploited by criminals and that require focused attention to halt IWT in the long-term. To analyze the counter-IWT project landscape in SEA and to inspire similar actions in the Philippines, the activities of counter-IWT projects in selected AMS and beyond were assessed and judged by their relevance for potential replication. If applicable, these activities were adjusted to the Philippine context and were taken up as recommendations in Chapter 5.5. **The first objective of this report is to assess past and present counter-IWT projects in Southeast Asia and to present recommendations for a potential replication of these counter-IWT activities in the Philippines.**

5.2. Methodology

Counter-IWT projects in selected AMS were assessed with regard to their project activities. Whenever these activities convinced through their innovativeness or responded to a gap in combating IWT that is equally encountered in the Philippines, they were summarized in a narrative and adjusted to the Philippine context. Based on these narratives, recommendations were formulated to inform potential future interventions combating IWT in the country.

This process is explained in further detail below.

**Project Identification:** To identify organizations involved in counter-IWT projects in the Southeast Asian region, purposive sampling was conducted to arrive at the final data sets for processing and analysis. Therefore, multiple sources were utilized to gather information: Subject matter experts, literature research, participation in webinars, and counter-IWT experience from previous projects. Once the main funding and implementing organizations were identified, they
were screened for potential project databases, which were identified to be present mostly for multilateral and bilateral donors. From these databases, project information, e.g. in the form of projects documents, was procured and analyzed. These results were further expanded by adding information from organizational websites, factsheets, projects reports, and personal conversations, whenever project databases were not available. Campaigns, trainings, workshops, meetings, and courses were not considered as standalone projects. All identified projects were assessed based on their relevance to and potential replicability in the Philippines. If considered relevant, a brief project narrative summarizing the most innovative, inspiring, promising, and/or successful activities was prepared and, based on these narratives, recommendations were formulated. For selected projects under the Global Wildlife Program (GWP) in AMS and beyond, online interviews were conducted in order to include in-depth best practice case studies in the report for activities that were considered particularly important. It should be noted, however, that the projects featured here only present a small selection of the efforts taking place to combat IWT in each country. The IWT Project Map and Database introduced in Chapter 1 can give a more comprehensive overview when it comes to the number of projects and organizations involved.

**Time Period of Research:** The research focused on projects whose implementation was completed in 2015 or after. The main project time span covers the years 2015-2021, which is considered a valid time frame to provide a good overview of counter-IWT projects in the region, also seeing that counter-IWT projects gained momentum during the last decade.

**National vs. Regional Level:** Projects in this Chapter are listed according to their project range, starting with implementation at the national level: First by country for selected AMS, then by country for other regions. Subsequently, projects implemented at the regional level are listed, however, these are not analyzed for potential replication in the Philippines, but rather give an overview over the regional project landscape in SEA.

**Project Partners:** Each country section opens with a paragraph listing the main organizations working on counter-IWT projects in the country. These listings were based on the partners mentioned in donor databases, which is why it is recommended to use the IWT Project Map and Database (introduced in Chapter 1) as well to obtain a more comprehensive and updated list of project partners. Project partners do not include country-specific government agencies, as it is mostly one Ministry or Department only that is responsible for the implementation of biodiversity conservation related projects. Instead, Annex 5 gives an overview of the CITES MAs, SAs, and Enforcement Focal Points (EFPs) in selected AMS, with the MAs often corresponding to the government partners and/or Executing Agencies for counter-IWT projects in the countries.

**Best Practice Boxes:** Requests for in-depth interviews were sent out to selected countries implementing projects under the GWP, whose activities were perceived to be of high interest for a potential replication in the Philippines. A questionnaire was prepared in advance for those countries that responded and three interviews were conducted with focal persons of GWP projects in South Africa, Thailand, and Viet Nam. Based on the interviews, which focused on specific activities that are or will be implemented under the projects, a best practice box write up
was prepared for each country and sent to the interview partners for review and verification. These boxes are included under the respective country sections.

**Recommendations:** Based on the challenges and potential solutions explored in Chapter 3.2 and based on the activities analyzed in Chapter 5.3, recommendations for potential counter-IWT activities in the Philippines are given in Chapter 5.5. Only project activities implemented at the national level were used as a basis for deriving recommendations, with regional projects often not providing sufficient country-specific details in implementation. All recommendations were allocated to the six strategies of the Philippine WildLEAP. Italics in the strategy titles indicate that this wording was added to the original strategy heading. The abbreviations in the brackets behind each recommendation indicate the countries that recommendation was based on. For ADB Member Countries, the ADB country codes were used, whereas the ISO 3166 international standard (Alpha-3) country codes were used for the remaining countries (see Annex 6).

The Databases and websites used and the methodologies applied are listed in the following:

**GEF/World Bank GWP Website**[^34]: The GWP is a World Bank-led, GEF-funded global partnership, combating illicit trafficking in wildlife by promoting wildlife conservation and sustainable development. Phase I was approved in 2015 with a $131M grant, which was increased by a $82M grant for Phase II in 2019 (The World Bank, n.d.). By approaching the poaching crisis holistically through 37 projects across 32 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America, the GWP seeks to reduce both the supply and demand that drives IWT to protect species and habitats. GWP Projects of AMS (Chapter 5.3.1) and of non-AMS (Chapter 1.1.1) were analyzed and relevant findings presented. The project factsheets were used to extract initial information on the projects of those countries that had participated in the GWP Phase I. Six AMS were identified (Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam) (see Annex 3). In addition, the Project Document and/or Project Appraisal Document for each GWP project was acquired, and the project Outcomes and Outputs were searched for activities that could be relevant for replication in the Philippines. Projects under the GWP from non-AMS were only included whenever activities provided good entry points for Philippine-specific recommendations. This led to the inclusion of five African States (Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Republic of Congo, and South Africa) and one South Asian State (Afghanistan). A table providing summaries of the projects is presented in Annex 4.

**GEF Project Database**[^35]: The full GEF project data was downloaded as an Excel file and the projects were sorted by GEF funding cycle and country. A selection was made to include all projects from AMS for GEF funding cycles-6 (2014-2018) and -7 (2018-2022), which yielded 82 results. As only projects were assessed that were completed in 2015 or after, the GEF-5 funding cycle (2010-2014) and earlier funding cycles were excluded, except if the implementation had been continued past 2015. These 82 results were then filtered for only the GEF focal area “Biodiversity” to be included, which yielded 38 results. Of these projects, many were excluded based on their project titles, e.g. a framework development for the Nagoya protocol, which were

[^35]: https://www.thegef.org/projects
not related to IWT. Whenever this was not clearly visible, the Project Document of the project in question, particularly the project framework, was consulted. The four projects that remained in the end of the filtering and selection process had already been included, as they were part of the GWP, thus, no other projects from the GEF-6 and GEF-7 funding cycle were added. However, a GEF-4 project implemented in Viet Nam was identified that offered several insightful activities, and it was included on the basis of its strong focus on wildlife consumption and Traditional Chinese Medicine (TCM).

**USAID Project Database**: Project information was gathered for all selected AMS from the USAID Foreign Aid Explorer and from the ForeignAssistance.gov website. An Excel file was created based on information from the database for all identified counter-IWT projects to assess their relevance for replication in the Philippines. Whenever a project was extended by another phase, earlier project phases were highlighted in grey and all rows were considered as one project only.

**Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs – UK IWT Challenge Fund**: Counter-IWT projects in AMS funded by IWT Challenge Fund rounds 1 (2015) to round 6 (2020) were assessed based on the list of projects provided by the UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs. Since only brief summaries of the projects were given and more detailed information was difficult to procure, it was decided not to include these projects in this chapter, but rather to record them in the IWT Project Map and Database as described in Chapter 1.

**ADB Project Database**: The Project database of ADB was searched for projects on combating IWT, which yielded three results: One project implemented at the national level in Indonesia (IWT only one component), one project implemented at the national level in the Philippines (DENR-ADB/GEF project), and one project implemented at the regional level.

**UNDP Project Database**: The project database of UNDP was searched by country for counter-IWT projects. In total, one budget revision and six counter-IWT projects were identified in AMS, three of which were included under the GWP and thus had already been analyzed and included. One project located in Thailand was included in the analysis, and the remaining two, in Indonesia and in the Philippines, both included IWT as only one component and had both not yet started their implementation phase.

**ACB**: Counter-IWT related activities of ACB were mentioned during a presentation of a draft version of this report and through follow up questions that were responded to by staff from the organization via email. Although interventions take place at the national level in AMS, only summary statements were available, which is why these activities were attributed to the regional level instead.

---

38 [https://www.adb.org/projects](https://www.adb.org/projects)
39 [https://open.undp.org/projects](https://open.undp.org/projects)
Various NGOs: The homepages of various NGOs active in selected AMS were searched for counter-IWT projects, including but not limited to WWF, TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society, Wildlife Alliance, Fauna and Flora International, WildAid, the Zoological Society of London, and the FREELAND Foundation. Most NGO projects were, however, already included under the analysis of the USAID database, since they often acted as implementing organizations for USAID. In the narrative below, NGO projects were only separately mentioned if they did not fall under any of the databases mentioned above.

Limitations
For the GEF database, the Project Documents were used as a basis for project activity extraction, as these documents contain detailed information on project activities and were publicly accessible. It should be noted, however, that the Project Document is drafted before the implementation and does therefore include activities still to be implemented. However, since the success of the project is measured based on the performance indicators set in the project framework of the Project Document, it was assumed that the actual activities do not differ much from the identified ones. Projects in other databases varied in their implementation status, from on-going to completed.

Information provided online was often either outdated or presented in aggregated form, e.g. no information on which countries were included in regional projects, whether certain projects and initiatives were still on-going or had been completed, or which emphasis was placed on counter-IWT activities in projects that had a wider conservation scope. This was mostly the case for NGO websites, which often displayed only a summary section for all on-going activities in the field of IWT, which did not provide more detailed project information, such as partners, funding, or project sites. In one case, the project database of an international NGO had been archived and had not been replaced by an updated version, which further complicated a review of these projects. Missing information was followed up upon with experts, but in several cases the information at hand remained limited and was therefore excluded.

5.3. Analysis of Projects at the National Level

5.3.1. Selected ASEAN Member States

1) Brunei Darussalam (BRU)

Although Brunei Darussalam has been part of several ASEAN Agreements, such as the Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Illegal Wildlife Trade in March 2019, no counter-IWT projects have been launched in the country so far by the government or by international organizations. Workshops on IWT have taken place in the context of workshops and trainings conducted in the entire region, such as the 1st Wildlife Trade Regulation Training Workshop in 2008. It seems that the NGO “1StopBrunei” was quite active in addressing IWT until 2015 (Fletcher, 2016), with a focus on pangolin poaching, however, since then there have been no news about on-going activities and the homepage seems to be offline.
2) Cambodia (CAM)

The main implementing organization in Cambodia is the Wildlife Alliance. Other organizations combating IWT are WCS, FFI, FREELAND, Conservation International, and the Zoological Society of San Diego.

GEF: Global Wildlife Program
Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project
IDA and WB/GEF Project (Additional Financing in GEF-7 funding cycle)

The project supports the development of a national law enforcement strategy and of a toolkit to combat wildlife crime and encroachment in the target protected areas. Detailed activities focus on the use of and training in innovative technologies, with the toolkit to be developed to include guidance for: ranger patrolling; use of SMART approaches (technology to be purchased and rangers to be trained in the SMART Patrolling App); data gathering linked to the Information Systems and Decision Support; using drones, satellites, remote sensing imagery, and telecommunications in forest monitoring; and collaborating with law enforcement, including the judicial system. Data and information concerning the protected area planning and enforcement will be integrated through a cloud-based geospatial platform, also to be developed under the project. The platform will inform protected area management, enhance zoning processes and help in coordinating enforcement operations, by systematically organizing information collected, e.g. by rangers and communities, on patrolling reports, observations, and illegal activities. With 334 protected areas under the National Integrated Protected Areas System (NIPAS) of 1992 and the Expanded NIPAS as of 2018, as well as countless locally managed protected areas and sanctuaries, the efficient management of these is also one of the priorities of the Philippines. A cloud-based geospatial platform would greatly enhance the coordination and monitoring of these areas. In addition, it might be beneficial for the country to compile, document and review biodiversity conservation related interventions in protected areas via a respective database. This could provide a good basis for feedback-related adjustments and would facilitate the design of future projects. This could include the creation and publication of factsheets for each NIPAS site, including GPS points, species protected, interventions done, project partners, and a brief description of the area. The greatest impact would be achieved if these were to be publicly accessible online. Based on this wealth of information gathered, wildlife crime prevention strategies tailored to each protected area could then be devised. For a discussion on innovative technologies, including SMART, and their use in the Philippines, please refer to the Indonesian GWP project below.

USAID

The USAID database lists 27 counter-IWT projects implemented at the national level in Cambodia. Whereas most projects were implemented nationwide, other geographical key locations were the Cardamom Mountains National Park and the Keo Seima Wildlife Sanctuary. The main species protected by the projects were Asian elephants, marine turtles, and yellow-cheeked crested gibbons, but projects also focused on pileated gibbons, Asiatic black bears, sun bears, the Cantor’s giant softshell turtle, and Siamese crocodiles. Several projects for the protection of Asian elephants and pileated gibbons were part of the Kouprey Express, which is the mobile environmental education program of the NGO Wildlife Alliance. The Mobile
Environmental Education Unit travels by bus to remote areas and engages and educates students and communities about their country’s wildlife to raise awareness and also to cultivate a culture of conservation throughout Cambodia (Andrew Ball, 2019; Knierim, 2017). This would equally have benefits for replication in the Philippines, where remote municipalities do have only limited access to information from the outside, often with weak mobile signals, no internet, and only a few hours of electricity. Projects in Cambodia also focused on the implementation of the NIAP, creating better linkages between remote villages and ranger stations to address poaching and land encroachment, and training forest rangers in order to increase their effectiveness in cases involving high-ranking officials and middlemen involved in wildlife trafficking. This could be of interest to the Philippines as e.g. dependencies on other agencies lead may lead to misplaced sentiments of loyalty, thus sparing officials involved in IWT from being reported to the police. Another activity for replication would be the installation of matching signs and hotline stickers on 10 tuk-tuks (taxis) in Phnom Penh for one year, which could be applied in Philippine jeepneys and/or tricycles, especially in the National Capital Region and in cities, like Cebu City.

3) Indonesia (INO)

In Indonesia, key implementing organizations comprise the International Rhino Foundation, WCS, and WWF. Other organizations combating IWT are the Orangutan Tropical Peatland Project (now Borneo Nature Foundation), the Community for Sumatra Nature Conservation, Planet Indonesia, Health in Harmony, FFI, the Frankfurt Zoological Society, the U.S. Government – Department of Justice, INTERPOL, the Alliance of Religions and Conservation, Panthera, Inc., and the Turtle Foundation.

FLIGHT

FLIGHT is an NGO that was formed in 2018 and is managed by Indonesian people for the benefit of wildlife, especially birds and their habitat (FLIGHT, n.d.). The NGO’s activities are a direct response to the massive scale of songbird trade in Indonesia, which often involves the illegal trapping of wild birds in order to supply the demand (FLIGHT, n.d.). Birds often die either during capture or while being transported to markets. Also, many of the buyers are not experienced in bird-keeping, which leads to birds being neglected until they die (FLIGHT, n.d.). These demand reduction and awareness raising activities of FLIGHT could act as a template for the Philippines, seeing that the illegal bird trade from and via Indonesia to the Philippines is quite extensive and the birds are also sold as pets in the Philippines, where bird-keepers most probably face the same challenges with regard to ensuring animal welfare (see Chapter 4.3).

GEF: Global Wildlife Program

Combating Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Species in Indonesia

UNDP/GEF Project (GEF-6)  

Several aspects of this project have been addressed by the DENR-ADB/GEF project, such as a revision of RA 9147, the introduction of e-CITES, and the piloting of PortMATE. One very
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40 A UNDP/GEF project is in the pipeline for Indonesia at the time of writing: Catalyzing Optimum Management of Natural Heritage for Sustainability of Ecosystem, Resources and Viability of Endangered Wildlife Species (CONSERVE) (UNEP, 2020).
relevant activity for potential replication in the Philippines is the aim of this project to conduct an economic assessment in order to quantify the value of legal and IWT, and the loss to the national economy. In terms of the quantification of IWT in the Philippines, there have been several attempts to disclose an overall figure, however, these should be used with caution as long as there are no detailed calculations accompanying these numbers, and should not be taken for face value. Reliable economic valuations have taken place under the DENR-ADB/GEF project, however, these only focused on the value of marine turtles and blue-naped parrots, for both excluding the illegal trade value. Consequently, a comprehensive economic valuation of IWT in the Philippines still needs to be conducted, which will allow to better gauge the scope of the trade and the losses incurred by the national government. Once the costs have been quantified, the Indonesian GWP project will review cost recovery mechanisms from IWT, e.g. by using AML legislation, and review the legal trade, e.g. by assessing whether fiscal regulations ensure that the legal trade is taxed at a level that is commensurate with the actual cost of regulating it, and to ensure that wildlife traded legally is not undervalued if exported. The Philippines could likewise explore options for cost recovery mechanisms from IWT seizures, using AML legislation. This also includes looking into the earlier introduced concept of restitution, where the offender is mandated to financially support biodiversity conservation and/or wildlife law enforcement activities, either by freezing and transferring part of their financial assets to a designated institution, confiscation of commodities, or fines to be paid that will be re-invested into habitat restoration, law enforcement or wildlife conservation. The valuation of IWT should likewise be accompanied by a valuation of legal wildlife trade.

Furthermore, Indonesia showcases a very structured and tech-savvy approach to intelligence gathering, by using the IBM i2 Analyst’s Notebook software, which significantly facilitates criminal network mapping and analyses. Even though there are several agencies with intelligence units, such as the Philippine National Police (PNP), National Bureau of Investigation (NBI), and BOC, there is no intelligence unit in DENR-BMB. POGI may want to explore the usage of this software, which would, in the long-term, also require the set-up of a designated intelligence unit first (see suggestions below under the Botswana GWP project). Moreover, to improve staff motivation and performance, Indonesia plans to introduce incentive structures, such as accreditation or career points. It might equally be of interest to the Philippines, especially to the DENR, to motivate its staff at all governance levels in order to keep a high morale, which could lead, among others, in an increased number of reports on irregularities detected with regard to IWT handling. This could include the provision of insurance, also to contractual workers (see below under Thailand’s GEF-5 project). Moreover, Indonesia holds international collaboration on IWT high, which translated into an MOU with Viet Nam, to eliminate the illicit trafficking of wildlife between the two countries. The Philippines signed a Joint Declaration on Trilateral Cooperation with Malaysia and Indonesia (Chapter 3.3), but so far this one focuses rather on security matters than on combating wildlife crime. It is therefore recommended to add the wildlife crime aspect to the tasks under this declaration, to formalize it as an MOU, and develop additional agreements with the law enforcement agencies of other countries to efficiently share information and to foster collaboration.
Building on the Philippine PortMATE assessment, the Philippines could strive to join the World Port Sustainability Program of the International Association of Port and Harbors, which rewards ports striving to achieve certain standards and the Sustainable Development Goals. The 2020 PortMATE assessment results should also be used to design interventions that can close identified gaps in the seaports, by differentiating between domestic and international ports. Even though major sea ports often possess x-ray machines and more advanced equipment, vehicles and passengers on smaller Roll On, Roll Off ferries in the Philippines are often not checked thoroughly. This results in easy conditions for smugglers, who are known to transport illegally caught wildlife from Indonesia via Mindanao to Luzon in rented vehicles, using ferries in-between the islands (Sy, 2020b, personal conversation).

The Indonesian project also disseminates and trains wildlife law enforcers on the anti-poaching monitoring technology SMART, which stands for Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool, and is a powerful software application that improves the ability of rangers and protected area managers to combat poaching and other illegal activities (SMART, n.d.). Using SMART allows accurate and timely gathering of information on illegal activities and enables rapid communication between enforcement officials and protected area staff. The monitoring and enforcement tool used in the Philippines is called LAWIN, which integrates SMART, and is a protection system devised to monitor forest and biodiversity threats to address forest degradation and achieve conservation objectives. LAWIN was developed by the USAID funded “Biodiversity and Watersheds Improved for Stronger Economy and Ecosystem Resilience (B+WISER)” Program in 2015 and has been piloted since in seven protected areas in the Philippines (STI Forum, 2016). The different components of the system include the a) monitoring technology (CyberTracker), b) analysis of the observation records to prepare actionable reports (SMART), and c) the implementation of responses such as law enforcement operations (STI Forum, 2016). The system starts by identifying focus areas for monitoring and protection, and formulates measurable conservation objectives for these areas by analyzing forest cover data and biodiversity information through a geographic information system (GIS). Then, patrol plans consisting of patrol routes, sectors, and schedules are formulated for the identified focus areas to ensure a systematic monitoring of the forest. During patrolling, an app (CyberTracker), which has been installed on a smartphone or tablet, is used to record geo-referenced observations of wildlife, threats, and forest condition. These records are uploaded to a computer and analyzed and visualized with the SMART software, which automatically creates reports that can be presented to resource managers such as community leaders. Based on this information, these managers can then identify and implement appropriate actions to address threats and conserve biodiversity, actions that are validated through continuous monitoring. In 2016, the Philippine Government adopted LAWIN as the national strategy for forest and biodiversity protection. The feedback from users has been mixed so far. It may be useful to assess which components work well and which ones may need to go back to the developers to be improved. Even though the purpose of LAWIN is not only to monitor but also to detect illegal activities, most enforcement activities take place based on leads or reports submitted by the public.
USAID Project Database
With 43 national-level projects, Indonesia has the largest number of USAID projects combating IWT. Most of the projects are implemented in designated project sites, as opposed to the national level, with the most prominent ones being the Gunung Leuser National Park, Bukit Barisan Selatan National Park, Ujung Kulon National Park, Way Kambas National Park, and the Ulu Masen Landscape. Geographically, the projects are spread out from the north of Sumatra to the east of the Maluku islands, with a clear focus on Sumatra. Only six USAID projects were recorded on the island of Borneo, Indonesian side (seven in total). Most projects are species specific. The main species protected are Sumatran tigers, Sumatran and Bornean orangutans, Sumatran elephants, and Javan rhinos. One focus area is habitat destruction and human encroachment, such as the impact of road development into pristine habitat. With annual deforestation rates of up to 3.6% (Sodhi, 2010 in ADB, 2019b), infrastructure expansion is also one of the key drivers of deforestation in the Philippines (GIZ, 2012). This is closely connected to IWT, as studies have shown that infrastructure cutting into wildlife habitats, such as roads, and good accessibility to major towns lead to an increase in wildlife hunting pressure (Benítez-López et al., 2017). The country might thus be interested to explore green infrastructure design, which was assessed in ADB’s report Green Infrastructure Design for Transport Projects: A Road Map to Protecting Asia’s Wildlife Biodiversity, as one additional tool to combat IWT. Another crucial element that projects emphasized is the need to establish additional sustainable income options for community patrol team members, which can help to ensure that team members feel valued, more effectively engage in patrolling activities, and are less susceptible to corruption. This would also be an important approach in the Philippines, where voluntary environmental guards, such as Bantay Dagat and Bantay Gubat, are too often ill-equipped and receive no honorarium. Incentives do not necessarily have to be of a financial nature, but could also comprise in-kind payments, health insurances etc. Along the same lines, another project pushes for collecting socio-economic data in areas prone to IWT to identify human poverty hotspots linked to poaching and to implement economic development activities there. Attention is also directed towards tourism, when it comes to combating IWT, with one project e.g. discouraging the trade of hawksbill shells. The project investigated manufacturing centers and trading points, created an outreach campaign for tourists, using the motto “Cool without Scales”, and established a certification approach in order to reward shop owners who discontinue selling turtle shell products. Even though there has been an outreach campaign under the DENR-ADB/GEF project to curb the demand for marine turtle eggs and meat, this should be continued and expanded beyond the project sites, seeing that particularly marine turtle egg consumption and the use of scutes for ornaments is still an issue in some remote islands in the Philippines. Moreover, as it was established that TCM that may contain illegal ingredients is sold in shops in the country (see GEF-4 project Viet Nam), a certification program for shops refraining from these practices could be a viable option to curb IWT further.

Lastly, a very interesting approach was taken by the Alliance of Religions and Conservation: Indonesia’s religious leadership passed an unprecedented Muslim edict (fatwa) in 2014, which prohibits IWT and calls on Indonesia’s Muslim population to oppose IWT. The project developed a fatwa comic book and bulletin meant for distribution to young people in schools in rural areas, developed of a video on the fatwa to spread awareness at the local and national levels, and
monitored the impact near a wildlife reserve. Addressing illegal practices by appealing to the faith of people can be very effective, as projects in other areas of work have shown that used the same idea.\textsuperscript{41} If religious leaders in the Philippines would follow the Indonesian example of passing a \textit{fatwa}, this could have a profound impact, as about 11\% of Filipinos identify as Muslims. This is particularly the case for the country’s south, the island Mindanao, where an equal number of wildlife hotspots is located as in Luzon: General Santos, Mati, Surigao City, Agusan del Norte, Balut Island, Zamboanga City, Turtle Islands, and Mapun Island (ADB, 2018; DENR-BMB, 2020e). An important stakeholder for negotiations to this effect would be the Bangsamoro Autonomous Region in Muslim Mindanao (BARMM) government, which was established in 2019.

4) Lao PDR (LAO)

\textit{The main implementing organization combating IWT in Lao PDR is WCS, followed by WWF.}

\textbf{USAID Project Database}

Eight national-level projects in the USAID database focus on combating IWT in Lao PDR. Most of the projects are implemented nationwide, with other project sites in the Nam Kading National Biodiversity Conservation Area, Phou Si Thone Endangered Species Conservation Area, Nam Et-Phou Louey National Protected Area, and in the Nam Pouy National Protected Area. Project activities rather comprise general actions to combat IWT, including the enforcement of CITES, and the disruption of African elephant ivory markets. The protection of native species focuses mostly on white-cheeked gibbons. Other activities focus strongly on enforcement responses, such as trainings on the SMART software, the introduction of community-led patrolling, and the development of a wildlife crime prevention strategy for the Nam Pouy National Protected Area, which could be an activity for potential replication in the Philippines.

5) Malaysia (MAL)

\textit{The main implementing organization in Malaysia is WCS. Other organizations combating IWT comprise WWF, Alliance of Religions and Conservation, Raleigh International Trust, Panthera, Inc., the Woodland Park Zoological Society, the Malaysian Nature Society and TRAFFIC.}

\textbf{GEF: Global Wildlife Program}

\textit{Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and enhance protection of iconic wildlife in Malaysia}\textsuperscript{42}

\textbf{UNDP/GEF Project (GEF-7)}

In its first project component, Malaysia focuses on the design and implementation of a national wildlife crime intelligence system to enable the real-time sharing of intelligence between regional and federal wildlife agencies. Although intelligence is shared among various Philippine agencies, a more structured system that is updated in real time would facilitate the conduct of

\textsuperscript{41} See TARGET’s campaign against female genital mutilation \text{here}.

\textsuperscript{42} The Malaysian GEF/UNDP project is in its Project Preparation Grant-Phase at the time of writing.
operations, and could be headed by a National Intelligence Unit (see also below under the GWP project in Thailand). Malaysia further plans to develop a set of accredited basic and advanced wildlife crime investigation and prosecution training modules, which is similar to the self-paced online wildlife law enforcement modules developed under the DENR-ADB/GEF project. Malaysia will further strengthen the capabilities of the federal wildlife crime forensics unit to manage and conduct online investigations and undertake forensic analysis of cell phone communications. The Philippines may want to explore additional tools to monitor mobile phone communications, and to extract and share phone data from persons involved in and suspected to be involved in wildlife crime. This could be achieved by gaining access to and being trained in the usage of digital investigation platforms, such as Magnet Axiom. Moreover, specialized (ethical-legal-tactical-procedural) field training of rangers will be conducted, and poaching detection technologies are piloted, with the following to be deployed: perimeter-based technologies (e.g. lasers, sensors, optical fibers); ground-based technologies (e.g. cables, sensors, heat-mapping, black-flash cellular cameras, closed-circuit television, camera traps, shot-detection, etc.); aerial-based technologies (e.g. drones, satellites); and animal-tagging technologies (motion/global positioning system (GPS) sensors). The Philippines would benefit from an assessment of which anti-poaching technologies have been deployed where with which results to detect possible gaps and to determine which additional tools might be needed. The project will also contribute to securing national park boundaries (beacons, signage, fencing, channels, etc.), and explore merging parks to a park complex. It will then support the establishment and management of a small community-conservation area within the complex, generating income from a nature-based tourism enterprise. In the Philippines, protected area boundaries are not always present, which is why an according demarcation could help in deterring poachers from these areas and to have a proper basis of evidence in the filing of cases in court. The nature-based tourism enterprise is a concept that DENR takes up through its biodiversity-friendly enterprise (BDFE) program, even though this is yet confined per decree to marine protected areas, and should be expanded to terrestrial ones.

USAID Project Database

The USAID database lists 10 counter-IWT projects at the national level. The geographical focal areas in Peninsular Malaysia were in the Taman Negara National Park and the Endau Rompin National Park, and in Sarawak in the Batang Ai National Park. Only one USAID project is registered in Sabah (two projects overall). The key species protected by the projects are tigers, orangutans, and Asian elephants. One project established the first Conservation K9 Unit to Combat Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade of Malayan Tigers and Rhinos. The Unit is available for use to the Malaysian Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Royal Malaysian Customs Department, global transport and logistics companies, and local conservation NGOs. In 2020, the K9 Unit recently acquired sniffer dogs to assist them in detecting wildlife and wildlife parts (Leoi Leoi, 2020). Sniffer dogs would also significantly improve the Philippines’ efforts to detect IWT in sea and airports, which would require funding for a similar unit to be allocated accordingly. As for Indonesia, the Alliance of Religions and Conservation reaches out to the Muslim communities, here near the core area of the Taman Negara National Park. In 2015, a fatwa prohibiting IWT was signed in the state of Terengganu in northeastern Malaysia (Dasgupta, 2015). Building on that, the Alliance tries to reach an agreement with Muslim leaders
to issue a national level *fatwa* on IWT and, to reach that goal, has so far empowered at least 20 Muslim clerics in 24 villages. The implications of a *fatwa* prohibiting IWT in the Philippine have been listed above under USAID Indonesia. Another USAID project conducted a nationwide market survey on traditional medicine outlets and pet shops to determine the scale of IWT. In the Philippines similar efforts are on-going on a small scale, but should be scaled up, particularly for TCM-shops selling products including illegal ingredients like pangolin scales under the counter. In 2019, incidental observations of these stores in Manila documented three stores that sold pills claimed to contain pangolin derivatives (Sy and Krishnasamy, 2020). In one of the stores, a pangolin taxidermy was even on display in the store window (Sy and Krishnasamy, 2020), which 1) requires a permit, and 2) sends quite an unambiguous signal to potential buyers. These market surveys should be expanded to include African elephant ivory and rhino horn, and followed up by a regular monitoring scheme of the vendors.

6) **Philippines (PHI)**


**GEF: Global Wildlife Program**

*Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines*

ADB/GEF Project (GEF-6)

This project is placed under the regional TA 9461: *Protecting and Investing in Natural Capital in Asia and the Pacific* and focuses on combating IWT in the Philippines via three components: 1) Strengthening legal and institutional frameworks and increasing knowledge exchange, (2) Conducting capacity building activities for wildlife law enforcers, and, (3) Implementing public awareness and demand reduction measures. The project is implemented in three project sites, with marine turtles and parrots as the key taxonomic groups assessed and to be protected. Under the policy component, the current Wildlife Act is revised and a draft Bill on the amended Act was submitted to the Philippine Congress. The Implementing Rules and Regulations of the current Wildlife Act were also revised, and local government units (LGUs) in the project sites are encouraged to pass Ordinances on the implementation of RA 9147 and/or of the revised Act, if passed, at the local level. Furthermore, an e-CITES Master Plan is being developed under collaboration of all CITES Management Authorities, and an e-CITES permitting system is introduced. Under the capacity building component, a training needs assessment was done with law enforcement agencies, trainings were conducted, and self-paced online learning modules for law enforcers were developed. In addition, a PortMATE assessment took place in national and international ports in the project sites. Under the demand reduction component falls a communication, education, and public awareness campaign, as well as an economic valuation study that assessed the value of blue-naped parrots and marine turtles in the Philippines.

---

43 The Philippines was included in this assessment to present on-going activities in the country that might in turn act as best practices for other countries in their efforts to combat IWT.
Katala Foundation
The Katala Foundation is an NGO that has been active in protecting threatened endemic wildlife, particularly the Palawan forest turtle, Philippine cockatoo, Palawan pangolin, Calamian deer and Balabac mouse-deer. Various research and conservation programs are complemented by the Southern Palawan Anti-Poaching Initiative, which focuses on one of the most crucial source areas for IWT in Palawan, through addressing poachers, traders and buyers, law enforcers, youth and other relevant stakeholders, to conserve and sustainably manage wildlife and their critical habitats in Culasian, Rizal (Katala Foundation, n.d.). Conservation outcomes were 1) stable or increasing populations of selected species threatened by poaching, such as the blue-naped parrot and Palawan hornbill; 2) 80% of threatened individual host trees that serve as nest trees for poached wildlife are left intact; and (3) the Culasian Managed Resource Protected Area is established and managed locally (Katala Foundation, n.d.).

TRAFFIC
TRAFFIC has conducted research on IWT in the Philippines since 2016, which has resulted in publications on the trade of native species, and in trainings, focusing on strengthening government action against illegal ivory trade and on capacity building for law enforcement.

USAID Project Database
Four counter-IWT projects at the national level were recorded in the USAID database. Most projects had a nationwide scope and addressed rather general IWT matters. One project focused on the protection of flying foxes and one on strengthening government action against the illegal trade of elephant ivory in the Philippines.

Zoological Society of London
The Zoological Society of London (ZSL) is active in combating IWT on a species-specific basis in the Philippines. In the context of Project Seahorse, based at the University of British Columbia, ZSL has conducted research and trade surveys on seahorses, assessed population distribution, supported citizen science, done CITES policy work, and engaged in site conservation by establishing marine protected areas where seahorse habitats were identified since 1996 (Labrado, 2020, personal conversation). The main project sites can be found in Danajon Bank, Bohol. In addition, ZSL was catalytic in the development of the Palawan pangolin (Manis culionensis) Conservation Strategy 2018-2043 along with the PCSD, IUCN – Species Survival Commission Pangolin Specialist Group, and the Katala Foundation. ZSL undertook the first range-wide surveys on perceived pangolin abundance and population trends, which paved way for the implementation of a pangolin protection program in Palawan, developing Local Conservation Areas, setting up camera traps for bio monitoring, conducting capacity building, and engaging in social marketing for demand reduction in order to reduce poaching and to build financial resilience in communities. The initial project site is in Taytay, Palawan, with El Nido and Busuanga municipalities in the pipeline (Labrado, 2020, personal conversation). Since 2014, ZSL is also involved in researching the trade of the freshwater eels Anguilla marmorata, A. bicolor pacifica and A. luzonensis in the Cagayan River system in northern Luzon. This supported the establishment of 12 freshwater sanctuaries and riparian rehabilitation to restore the habitats of these species (Labrado, 2020, personal conversation).
7) Singapore (SIN)

The main organizations combating IWT in Singapore is the Animal Concerns Research and Education Society.

Animal Concerns Research and Education Society (ACRES)
ACRES was founded in 2001 with the ambition to drive forward a sustainable and collaborative animal protection movement in Asia. Tackling IWT is one of the NGO’s focus areas and ACRES operates a 24h Wildlife Crime Hotline, conducts regular undercover investigations, works with the TCM industry, collaborates with other NGOs and government bodies, and initiates public awareness programs to halt IWT in Singapore, which has led e.g. to improved national wildlife protection laws (ACRES, n.d.). Even though the DENR-BMB disseminated a telephone number to be called in the case of observed wildlife crime during the DENR-ADB/GEF project, this number cannot be considered a hotline and is not operated by personnel specifically employed for this task. Also, the number is a landline telephone number, which is not suited to receive text or messenger notes, including pictures, a feature that would most probably lead to a surge in reporting in a country where, with 10h and two minutes, people spend more time online daily than anywhere else in the world (Dumlao-Abadilla, 2019). This would also require designating staff specifically for attending the hotline, best at a 24/7 basis. It should be noted that DENR-BMB encourages reporting also via Facebook, however, a dedicated around-the-clock mobile phone hotline and opportunities to report e.g. via Viber might resonate with more people as it may provide more privacy and would possibly yield faster responses from Bureau staff.

8) Thailand (THA)

The main implementing organizations in Thailand are WCS and FREELAND. Other organizations combating IWT are ZSL, the U.S. Government - Department of Interior, Loma Linda University, and Panthera, Inc.

GEF: Global Wildlife Program
Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade, Focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand

UNDP/GEF Project (GEF-6)
Thailand focuses on improving the coordination effectiveness and functioning of the Thailand Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) (see Best Practice Box 1). The Philippine WEN is the POGI Task Force, which may experience similar challenges as the ones listed for the Thailand WEN: A loose organizational structure; inadequate annual budget; lack of a systematic approach to planning, implementing and reviewing collective actions; lack of a formalized information and intelligence exchange system; and lack of specific training courses. It would therefore be recommended to strengthen the mandate, membership, and inter-agency cooperation of the POGI task force, including connecting it with regional efforts under the ASEAN CITES & WE WG, and to develop and implement a strategic action plan, encompassing budget requirements and allocation, and to procure equipment needed to carry out the operations most efficiently (e.g. hidden cameras). Complementary would be the set-up of a
national wildlife crime information and intelligence exchange network, including a computer-based intelligence and case management system, to efficiently exchange information and intelligence between the POGI Task Force members and other relevant stakeholders, e.g. the DOJ (see also GWP projects in Indonesia and Malaysia). This would allow for a coordinated and intelligence-led implementation of the WildLEAP. Another weakness that was identified by the Thai project was weak enforcement at key cross-border trading points, which the project tackles by introducing provincial WENs. Illegal wildlife trading points should also be clearly identified for the Philippines, e.g. Balut Island, and mechanisms should be introduced for communities to better cooperate with law enforcement agencies in these high-risk places. These mechanisms could take on the form of community agreements on wildlife protection with the local/provincial authorities, e.g. facilitating the provision of incentives and trainings for local community volunteers engaged in surveillance and wildlife protection activities (e.g. Bantay Dagat, Bantay Gubat), and offering possibilities for local development co-benefits in the form of alternative livelihoods. Another focus area of the project is forensic analysis, where the Philippines may benefit from an ISO-accredited Wildlife Forensic Science Unit and Laboratory at the DENR-BMB, or it could possibly be housed in the future Environmental Protection and Enforcement Bureau (EPEB). So far, the DENR-BMB depends on the UP Diliman DNA laboratory for molecular analyses. In addition, a comprehensive assessment of capacity and technology available for forensic analysis, considering the needs of the law enforcement agencies, is recommended, as well as the development of a DNA sequence database for key CITES-listed species implicated in IWT in the Philippines. Best practices to that regard could be exchanged through an active participation of the Philippines in regional Wildlife Forensic Working Groups established by the TRACE Wildlife Forensic Network.

**Best Practice Box – Thailand**

**Project information:** In order to address the challenges of IWT, the country is currently implementing the project *Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade, Focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand*, which is a 5-year project (2018-2023) that is funded under the GEF-6 funding cycle with a Total Project Cost of US$32M. It is one of the projects under the Global Wildlife Program administered by the World Bank. Although the project is implemented at the national level, there are demonstration sites in Pengjan Village, Nongkhai Province; and at the Sadao Border Checkpoint, Songkhla Province, both being part of the trafficking route for pangolins. The Implementing Agency is UNDP, and the Executing Agency is the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation (DNP), with support from the Royal Thai Police, the Thai Customs Department, and other law enforcement agencies from the Thailand-Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) Committee. The project has three main responsible parties for implementation: TRAFFIC, for the demand reduction component and IWT monitoring; IUCN, for knowledge exchange management, and TRACE, for the capacity building on wildlife forensics. WCS, which was already involved in capacity building of the DNP during the GEF-5 funded project *Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex Project*, provides training on investigations and digital programs, and offers advice on the development of potential training modules for the Thailand-WEN. The country is considered predominantly a transit and destination country for IWT, with wildlife originating most often from outside of Thailand, such as from African countries. Species most frequently traded are tigers, pangolins, elephants, and rhinos.
Thailand-WEN: One of Thailand's success stories that is further developed under the project is the Thailand WEN. The Thailand WEN was created in 2004 by the DNP, the Thai Customs Department and the Royal National Police, even before the ASEAN-WEN was created in 2005, to fill a perceived gap in law enforcement that rendered collaboration between various agencies difficult. After the ASEAN-WEN was created, some of its funding was allocated to the Thailand-WEN and it was an opportunity for the Thai government to accelerate this process of establishing effective wildlife law enforcement and to encourage other countries to form their own WENs in order to build a close-knit network. Once the ASEAN-WEN merged into the AWG-CITES & WE, the continued development and funding slowed down, which is why it was decided to include strengthening of the Thailand-WEN under this project. In 2019, Thailand conducted the ICCWC Indicator Framework Assessment, which identified gaps in wildlife law enforcement and in the Thailand WEN to be addressed.

One of the identified limitations pointed to the restricted membership of the Thailand-WEN National Committee, which is chaired by the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE). In 2020, several agencies were added to the existing Committee, such as the Anti-Money Laundering Office, the Attorney General, the Court of Justice, the Thailand Post Company, and the Zoological Park Organization of Thailand. This increased the number of representatives from 17 to 28: the Chair (MONRE), 10 representatives from MONRE, and 17 representatives from other agencies. The obligations and authorities for the Thailand-WEN include the establishment and support of policies and guidelines, such as guidelines on inter-agency cooperation, the support of activities of the Senior Officials Meeting on Transnational Crime (SOMTC), and the deliberation of approvals for action plans and yearly budget plans for the Thailand-WEN, among others. One of the next steps to be implemented will be the establishment of three Sub-Committees on 1) Enforcement, 2) Technical matters, and 3) Public Relations, and to set up respective Working Groups under each Sub-Committee to handle the operations. In addition, the project explores setting up additional Working Groups outside of Thailand-WEN, e.g. focusing on species, such as a Pangolin Working Group, as well as for other urgent technical matters. The National Committee is scheduled to meet twice a year.

Once the strengthening of the Thailand-WEN will have been completed at the national level, the project plans to establish Provincial WENs – in the two demonstration sites first, with a potential for up-scaling. The DNP, as well as several other Departments, have offices on the sub-national level that will form the basis for this endeavor: The DNP has 21 Regional Offices in Thailand, as well as Provincial Offices for each of its 77 Provinces. With the establishment of the Provincial WEN, it is planned for the representatives of each Department part of the National Committee to work together on the Provincial level. Activities to this effect already take place in two of Thailand’s Provinces today, as there are several bilateral agreements in place with the neighboring countries of Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Malaysia to collaborate on IWT matters. Originally formalized at the national level, these agreements were translated into transboundary collaboration at the Provincial level for some Provinces located at the Thai-Lao PDR border. An example is the cooperation between the Mukdahan Province (Thailand) and the Savannakhet Province (Lao PDR), and between Nakhon Phanom Province (Thailand) and Khammouane Province (Lao PDR), where law enforcement groups from both countries work closely together. Another enabling factor for the planned Provincial WENs is the existing presence of a platform at the Provincial level, in that the Governors, who are the heads of the Provinces, call for monthly meetings to discuss natural resources in more general terms. This platform for exchange could then be used to highlight counter-wildlife crime activities during these meetings, and to discuss matters of the newly established Provincial WENs. In order to ensure sustainable financing for the Thailand-WEN beyond the project, it is planned to ask the Thai
Strengthening Capacity and Incentives for Wildlife Conservation in the Western Forest Complex
UNDP/GEF Project (GEF-5)

One project activity of this GEF-5 project was to rationalize and upgrade SMART Patrol Data Centers across several wildlife sanctuaries in Thailand. For large Protected Areas in the Philippines, using LAWIN, it would facilitate enforcement patrols and reports if Patrol Data Centers, equipped with computers, solar panels for electricity, etc., were to be set up within protected areas to more efficiently and systematically address threats. In areas with high poaching intensity, a security surveillance system linked to a network attached storage device could be added. Furthermore, the usage of state-of-the-art radio communication equipment, such as VHF/FM hand-held and vehicle radios, complete with solar battery chargers would be beneficial. The GEF-5 project further seeks to strengthen the enforcers’ insurance schemes, which, in the Philippines, could be addressed by providing a free Philippine Health insurance coverage (including death and disability insurance) for all wildlife law enforcers, including contractual workers. In addition, the project supports an effort to register the genetic coding of every wild and captive-bred tiger in Thailand in order to control the illegal trade in tigers and tiger products. This applies to all captive-bred species that are considered threatened and where thus is a high risk of illegally wild-caught species to be laundered into the legal trade. It would thus be an insightful initiative for the Philippines to register the genetic codes of native threatened species and of captive-bred ones, and to compile these in a DNA database.

Another important Output of this project is the provision of community livelihood assistance. Communities are the front line defenders – without their support the fight against IWT cannot be won. Often, the most important communities are located right at the boundaries or in the buffer zone of a national park. The project negotiates Conservation Agreements with buffer zone villages, facilitates access to financial and technical assistance for agreed on livelihood development opportunities and for community-based forestry initiatives in the buffer zone villages. This would likewise be an option for Philippine communities located in or near protected areas, which would allow them to stabilize the tenure of the inhabitants and their land use practices, ask them to enter into agreements with jointly agreed responsibilities of the villages, such as putting a stop to poaching activities, and provide sustainable livelihood options that are in accordance with the legislation protecting the protected area.

Finally, the project also invested in developing nature-based tourism for the project site, by preparing a medium-term Financial Plan providing the strategic framework for mobilizing financial resources, and undertaking a feasibility assessment of all opportunities for potential tourism and recreational development in and around the protected area. In the Philippines, there are several areas, where a similar module could be driven, and where the thoughtful introduction of eco-tourism may wean people away from on-going poaching activities. One example are the Turtle Islands in Tawi-Tawi, where the poaching of marine turtle eggs is still
practiced, caused by a combination of weak enforcement, a shortage of basic socio-economic services, and a lack of alternative livelihoods. The introduction of sensible eco-tourism based on an abundance of wildlife and natural resources in these islands, is only one example of the potential that exists in the Philippines to better manage its natural resources and at the same time ensure the well-being of its population. However, external pressures such as the Covid pandemic also highlight the drawbacks of an overreliance on tourism. Therefore, the Philippines should at the same time explore other sustainable livelihood options focusing e.g. on the trade and sale of local natural resources, in plain or value-added form.

**Panthera, Inc.**
The NGO implements tiger conservation in addition to the above-mentioned project sites in the Sri Nakarin National Park with ZSL Thailand and in the Thap Lan National Park with FREELAND. Panthera, Inc. is protecting corridors connecting several sanctuaries, strengthens law enforcement efforts, and monitors tigers and their prey (Panthera, Inc., n.d.). Moreover, Panthera is monitoring an isolated population of melanistic leopards in the Khlong Saeng-Khao Sok Complex, which is done in partnership with ZSL. The NGO is also providing law enforcement data on illegal human activities (USAID, 2017). The establishment and protection of corridors connecting several protected areas would also be an option for the Philippines, where landscapes are becoming more and more fragmented. For marine protected areas, GIZ (2017) published a knowledge brief on creating marine protected area clusters in the Philippines, acting as stepping stones for the distribution and protection of species, which could be replicated also in the terrestrial realm (see also the GWP project in Botswana below).

**USAID Project Database**
There are 11 counter-IWT national-level projects recorded in the USAID database. The geographical locations are spread out, with most projects implemented in the Huai Kha Khaeng Wildlife Sanctuary and in the Dong Phayayen-Khao Yai Forest Complex. Key species protected are tigers, but also Asian elephants, marine turtles, lar gibbons, and pangolins. Activities include capacity building of law enforcement officers, e.g. in the SMART technology, reducing human-elephant conflicts, conducting conservation education in communities, and building conservation volunteer networks at the local level. One activity at the national level, that, however, had extensive regional implications is the *Activating a Permanent Law Enforcement Extension Office for the ASEAN-WEN* project. With Thailand hosting the headquarters of the ASEAN-WEN, Thailand took on the responsibility for ensuring its functioning and operationalization. The project aimed at promoting police-led cross-border intelligence sharing between AMS on wildlife trafficking, with a focus on tigers and rhinos, which led to arrests of high-level traders. In order to operationalize that endeavor, Thailand initiated a dedicated law enforcement and intelligence analysis unit, with analysts working with seconded Royal Thai Police officers. This intelligence-driven approach is also visible in the Western Forest Complex, where one project identified the need to better aggregate, analyze, and manage multiple information streams on IWT by using a single intelligence platform across the area. That USAID project further sought to formalize action plans for combating IWT within each protected area, build cross-protected area relationships, and to promote information-sharing outside of the protected area network. Seeing the aforementioned potential in the Philippines to improve intelligence sharing and the
protection of the country’s protected areas, it may be beneficial to explore the creation of a single intelligence platform for key protected areas (NIPAS and local), where IWT has been reported to better aggregate, analyze, and manage multiple information streams on IWT. Cross-protected area relationships would certainly facilitate that initiative. Another USAID project focused on protecting hawksbill nests and nesting females from poaching: All nesting records of the past five years were synthesized, threats were validated with communities on the ground, and four Thai representatives were supported to participate in regional training workshops on marine turtle biology and conservation methods. Seeing the significance of the Philippines as marine turtle developmental habitat, including part of the only major green turtle nesting ground in ASEAN (UNESCO World Heritage Centre, 2015), the synthesis of data, identification of threats, and regular attendance of trainings would equally be beneficial for Philippine marine turtle specialists.

**Zoological Society of London (ZSL)**

*Pangolin Conservation Initiative (with Fondation Segré and IUCN – Save Our Species)*

The project is implemented by ZSL in Cameroon, the PRC, and in Thailand. In Thailand, the ZSL pangolin team is supporting the Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation in implementing SMART in two key sites: in the Khlong Naka Wildlife Sanctuary and in the Salak Phra Conservation Landscape. ZSL is also trialing different survey methods, aiming to develop the first standardized monitoring protocols for the Sunda pangolin. The protocols will be utilized to track changes in the pangolin population over time and determine if the conservation interventions were successful (Waterman, 2016). Once these monitoring protocols have proven to be successful, ZSL and the PCSD may be interested to utilize them also for population monitoring of pangolins in Palawan.

9) **Viet Nam (VIE)**


**Education for Nature-Viet Nam**

Education for Nature-Viet Nam is an NGO focused on wildlife conservation by ending IWT through reducing consumer demand for wildlife and wildlife products, strengthening Vietnamese law enforcement, and working with lawmakers, judges, and prosecutors to update wildlife legislation in the country (ENV, n.d.). The NGO has its own Wildlife Crime Unit since 2005 working directly with law enforcement, and offers a wildlife crime hotline that receives eight new cases per day – with 18,000 wildlife crime cases reported from 2005 until 2020 (ENV, n.d.). Its Wildlife Crime Unit works with a national network of more than 6,778 volunteers located in 59 provinces (2017), who assist the NGO staff with monitoring wildlife trade hotspots of wildlife consumers in urban centers throughout Viet Nam (USAID, 2017). Even though there is currently no NGO that is leading the fight against IWT in the Philippines, a future organization committed to taking up this challenge might use this best practice and engage a certain number of
volunteers per Province to monitor wildlife trade hotspots. DENR-BMB could initiate such a national volunteer network, as well, offering citizen reporting awards to the most successful volunteers engaged. Education for Nature-Viet Nam also hosts its own Outstanding Achievement Awards for Wildlife Protection to recognize the hard work done by Viet Nam’s law enforcement agencies. The NGO also publishes crime statistics (2005-2019), such as confiscations on its homepage, with the successful confiscation or transfer of 321 live animals in 2019 (ENV, n.d.). If aggregated and anonymized information on confiscations was published on the DENR-BMB Website or Facebook Page, e.g. on an annual basis, it could help mobilize volunteers (see above) and raise awareness on IWT (see also GEF-6 GWP project below).

**GEF: Global Wildlife Program**

*Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Viet Nam*

*World Bank/GEF Project (GEF-6)*

Whereas Viet Nam sets course to develop a legal framework for wildlife conservation facilities to effectively protect and conserve wildlife ex-situ, the Philippines already includes the ex-situ aspect in RA 9147, Section 17 “Commercial Breeding or Propagation of Wildlife Resources”. Nonetheless, this should be complemented by guidelines for breeding facilities in the Philippines, to close loopholes and prevent fraudulent activities. These guidelines should, among others, 1) define the roles of conservation breeding centers; 2) clearly delineate allowed and disallowed activities; 3) introduce reporting requirements and require the submission of acceptable evidence of captive breeding; 4) put forth monitoring schedules and auditing schemes for facilities; and 5) encourage international cooperation with other similar facilities (Sy, 2020c, personal conversation). This would allow for the detection of suspicious activities, such as offspring numbers that are too high for natural fertility, animals bred in captivity for the first time worldwide without proof, and commercial trade fraudulently declared as “donations” etc. (see Chapter 3.2). The DENR-ADB/GEF project further conducted a study on WRCs in the project sites and gave recommendations on how to address challenges encountered. With regard to suggested improvements in monitoring these facilities, please see the recommendations below (GWP project of Ethiopia). For the protection of threatened species in tourism activities, the DENR, DA, Department of Transport, and the Department of the Interior and Local Government signed the Joint Memorandum Circular 2020-01 on *Rules and Regulations governing the Conduct of Marine Wildlife Tourism Interactions in the Philippines* in 2020, which will now require an efficient implementation, and complements the *Birding Guidelines* issued in Technical Bulletin 2017-02. However, counter-IWT messages could play a stronger role in the tourism sector, including continuous advertisement in airports and seaports and also in transportation vehicles, such as airplanes, public busses, public taxis, and jeepneys. This should be affected in different languages (e.g. English, Tagalog, Visayan, Ilocano, and Chinese). Working together with local tourism champions, e.g. RA 9147 compliant communities and resorts, would be recommended. Leading LGUs successfully advertising these messages and enforcing them could be awarded a Seal of Good Governance, issued by the Department of the Interior and Local Government.
Another interesting motion is the introduction of a public information sharing mechanism at the national level, where trafficking data is entered to the system by enforcement agencies and the data is integrated and publicly accessible. If published via the DENR-BMB website, this would lead to tremendous data transparency, would promote inter-agency coordination, increase public interest in IWT, and stimulate research. This sharing mechanism could be extended to other platforms, such as the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal. In addition, the Vietnamese GWP project develops conservation programs for Critically Endangered species (see Best Practice Box 2). Conservation programs should be designed and launched for selected Endangered and Critically Endangered species as per RA 9147, DAO 2019-09, and DAO 2017-11, in the Philippines, accompanied by technical assistance from experts, conservation agencies, and law enforcers. These programs may be formalized through conservation action plans, such as the Philippine Marine Turtle Conservation Action Plan and Dugong Conservation Action Plan (DENR-BMB, 2020c, 2020d).

Best Practice Box – Viet Nam

Project information: The project Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Viet Nam (WLP Project) is a 4-year project implemented from 2019-2022 and is funded under the GEF-6 cycle with a Total Project Cost of $10.2M. The project is implemented at the national level with the World Bank as the Implementing Agency, and the Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment (MONRE) as the Executing Agency. Its three project components are: 1) Strengthening the legal and regulatory framework, 2) Enhancing capacity to effectively implement and enforce policies and regulations related to wildlife protection, and 3) Promoting knowledge sharing and awareness raising. Combating IWT is one of its objectives. Foremost, the project aims to set up partnerships with different stakeholders for biodiversity conservation, such as NGOs, civil society organizations, and government partners. This includes working closely with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MARD); the Central Committee for Communication and Education; and the Environmental Police under the Ministry of Public Security. Viet Nam entered into MOUs on combating IWT/biodiversity conservation at the provincial level with Cambodia, Lao PDR, and the PRC, and at the national level, MOUs on biodiversity conservation exist with the Czech Republic, South Africa and with Indonesia. Viet Nam is considered a transit and destination country for IWT.

Introduction of a public information sharing mechanism at the national level: The public information sharing mechanism will include information on prioritized threatened species. These are covered by two legal documents: 1) Decree 160/2013/ND-CP, promulgating lists of “endangered, precious and rare species prioritized protection”, administered by the MONRE, and 2) Decree 06/2019/ND-CP, managing trade related matters and CITES-listed species, administered by the MARD. In a previous project, Wildlife Consumption in Viet Nam: Reforming Policies and Practices to strengthen Biodiversity Conservation (GEF-4, 2012-15, WB/GEF), a database and information sharing system on wildlife crime cases was set up under MONRE. Although in the pilot phase, some wildlife law enforcement agencies, such as the Environmental Police, the Forest Protection Department, and Customs, use it in and around Hanoi to share and update information on wildlife trade cases. The project aims to make it more efficient and to focus on prioritized species. Under the WLP project, Viet Nam also plans to build an information sharing mechanism at the national and local levels on the protection and conservation of prioritized endangered species. This activity aims to promote scientifically sound conservation of endangered species prioritized under Decree 160 across agencies. This will also be useful for the national reporting to e.g. CBD and CITES, and further improve the legal framework for the protection of threatened species.

Legal Framework for Wildlife Conservation Facilities: Under the law of biodiversity, Biodiversity Conservation Facilities (BCFs) are defined to include three types of facilities: (i) Facilities rearing or planting species on the list of endangered precious and rare species prioritized for protection; (ii)
Wildlife rescue centers; (iii) Facilities storing endemic, endangered precious and rare crop plant varieties, domestic animal breeds, microorganisms and fungi which have special scientific, medical, economic, ecological, landscape, environmental or cultural and historical values; and facilities storing and preserving genetic resources and genetic specimens. They may receive e.g. injured or confiscated animals, which are not restricted to only the animals categorized as protected. The key goal of the BCFs is to support the conservation of these species. Any commercial wildlife farms or sales are not included under the BCFs’ mandate and objective, but are instead managed under the MARD. So far, mostly breeding facilities have not been officially registered as BCFs, including many of rescue centers. The project is conducting survey on the status of these facilities to create a legal corridor and incentives for the registration as official BCFs, which will require them to adhere to certain wildlife management criteria in order to receive a BCF permit from MONRE. For this purpose, the project will develop a Decree, to complement the Law of Biodiversity, which will stipulate in more detail how the operations of a BCF should be managed and regulated, which criteria need to be fulfilled to become a BCF, the kind of government support that will be provided, and which are potential funding mechanisms.

**Awareness raising among civil servants on the consumption of threatened wildlife products:**
Even though there have been many activities targeting stakeholders on the consumption of threatened wildlife products, civil servants have usually been excluded from these awareness raising campaigns, even though previous surveys showed that policy and decision makers are involved in wildlife consumption. The project will therefore work closely with the Central Committee for Communication and Education to target civil servants at the national level and in the provinces to raise awareness and advocate for their support to not consume threatened wildlife species. Close collaboration will take place with WWF under its “Voices for Diversity - Safeguarding ecosystems for Nature and People” project.

**Conservation Program for selected Critically Endangered (CR) species:** MONRE is responsible for developing conservation programs for the species listed under Decree 160/2013/ND-CP, which is revised by Decree 64/2019/ND-CP. So far, several conservation programs have been approved by the government for selected Critically Endangered species. These programs are drafted per taxonomic group, such as for tigers, bears, turtles, tigers, etc., and include objectives for conservation, tasks and solutions, stipulations on program funding, and a list of the organizations that are part of the plans’ implementation. Governmental conservation agencies submit funding requests for the implementation of these programs in their annual budgeting plans to the Ministry of Finance and, whereas some conservation program are funded by the state budget resources for some others are also mobilized from other sources. The project will support the implementation of the activities under the selected programs among five already approved conservation programs for CR species. In addition, the project is planning to design a framework conservation program for the remaining species under Decree 64. This will serve as the legal basis to guide the conservation activities prepared and conducted by NGOs or other stakeholders, and save time and effort as compared to submitting individual conservation programs to the Government for approval. Program activities include, among others, reviewing and improving legal regulations and technical guidelines, developing and implementing population restoration projects, protecting and restoring habitats, enhancing the effectiveness of law enforcement, carrying out capacity building programs, and conducting awareness raising activities.

**GEF: Project Database**

*Wildlife Consumption: Reforming Policies and Practices to Strengthen Biodiversity Conservation World Bank/GEF Project (GEF-4)*

This project aims to conserve biodiversity through a significant reduction of wildlife consumption in Viet Nam. The component on policy reform and capacity building aimed for a regulatory environment adequate for effective protection of wildlife and biodiversity and strengthened institutional capacity in government regulatory bodies and non-traditional enforcement agencies.
To achieve this, the project planned to develop decrees and implementing regulations on management and protection of wildlife, revise guidelines on pharmacopoeia and training curricula, and to draft a National Tiger Recovery Plan. Although there is no national pharmacopeia in the Philippines, there are stores selling TCM most probably including illegal wildlife products. One example are pangolin scales used in TCM: Sometimes these are rather clumsily covered, e.g. by product packaging advertising “armadillo” pills depicting a pangolin, but in some instances violations are displayed rather openly, e.g. by placing a taxidermied pangolin in the shop window (see USAID Malaysia) – both of which require more in-depth investigations by the DENR and by the Food and Drug Administration (Sy and Krishnasamy, 2020). The project concentrated on changing attitudes to minimize wildlife consumption, targeting not just common consumers, but also medical and pharmacological communities, and zoo/wildlife farm owners. Another objective was to enhance the role of the private sector in supporting biodiversity conservation, by targeting businesses and sealing public-corporate commitments to halt illegal wildlife consumption. The Philippines should include and engage the private sector more in counter-IWT activities, e.g. postal service companies like LBC, and raise awareness on how their services may be utilized by traffickers and how this could affect their business. The third component improved knowledge management and outreach, especially by informing and training media to develop pro-conservation attitudes and reporting. Seeing that journalists might not be familiar with the intricacies of IWT, which may lead to distorted reporting, it would be a valid undertaking for the Philippines to organize workshops for reporters from the largest newspapers and radio/TV news channels to sensitize them for these topics.

Save Vietnam’s Wildlife
Save Vietnam’s Wildlife is an NGO founded in 2014 with the aim to save animals from IWT, protect Viet Nam’s recognized wildlife strongholds, and continue to monitor released individual and wild populations. The six main fields the NGO is working on are: Wildlife rescue and Rehabilitation, Education Outreach, Species Conservation, Site protection, Conservation Breeding, and Advocacy (SVW, n.d.). The NGO has its own rescue center and their Wildlife Rescue Team has already rescued 1,745 animals from IWT. Of these animals, 60% were rehabilitated and released back into the wild, 10% were transferred or were unfit for release, and 30% died (SVW, n.d.). Save Vietnam’s Wildlife closely works with the government and collaborates with Pu Mat National Park. Whereas the NGO does not support the commercial farming of wildlife, they do support conservation breeding programs (SVW, n.d.). The DENR-ADB/GEF project conducted an assessment of WRCs in the Philippines. The recommendations in the report should be used to guide future interventions to improve animal welfare, human safety, and WRC design.

USAID Project Database
The USAID database lists 25 counter-IWT projects at the national level. Whereas most of the projects have a nationwide focus, the main project sites listed were in the Pu Mat National Park and in Ho Chi Minh City. With nine projects, most projects focused on the protection of gibbons, namely the yellow-cheeked crested gibbon, the black crested gibbon, and the Northern white-cheeked crested gibbon. Other species protected by the projects were rhinos, tigers, pangolins, tortoises and freshwater turtles, and Tonkin snub-nosed monkeys. Some of the activities that
are shared by many projects concern conducting surveys, capacity building, SMART refresher trainings, communication development, and the reduction of consumer demand specifically with regard to wildlife consumption. Data is collected not only on the training needs of wildlife law enforcers, but also on equipment needed to be able to carry out their duties. In order to curtail illegal hunting, one project strengthened enforcement of the national firearm decree. In the Philippines, poachers usually use air guns with lead pellets or glass marbles. Unfortunately, these are not classified as firearms under RA 10591, the Comprehensive Firearms and Ammunition Regulation Act. One way to address this problem would be to prohibit or regulate the use of air guns under RA 9147.

Education is one of the major tools Viet Nam uses to address IWT issues already at an early age at all education levels, from primary schools to universities. Although in RA 9512, or the Philippine National Environmental Awareness and Education Act of 2008, it states that several agencies, including the DENR, “shall integrate environmental education in its school curricula at all levels”, this is not implemented in practice. As the legal basis is already established in a joint commitment among several Philippine agencies, the integration of environmental education, including threats to wildlife, into school curricula would be a low-hanging fruit that could start-off a tremendous positive ripple effect for generations to come. In addition, students in Viet Nam are invited to submit their rhino horn demand reduction campaign ideas to the CITES Management Authority that judges the ideas and awards prizes. Following the same train of thought in the Philippines, USAID and the U.S. Embassy to the Philippines, partnering with DENR and the telecommunication company SMART, announced the first zoohackathon in 2019, a competition to come up with innovative digital tools and solutions in order to contribute to the fight against IWT (U.S. Embassy to the Philippines and USAID, n.d.). This competition should be continued in the years to come.

Another project strengthened the Vietnamese criminal justice system, generating more detailed profiles on known traders and their networks for law enforcement action, which would also be beneficial for the Philippines, and is connected to IBM i2 as well as the National Intelligence Unit mentioned above. Also, a roundtable meeting with Vietnamese prosecutors was carried out to review the current legal framework, and identify loopholes in processing illegal rhino horn trade related cases. Most projects are complemented with a media strategy, increasing local media coverage on IWT issues to make sure that achievements, seizures etc. are covered by the media to spread the message. Although arrests and seizures are well-covered by Philippine media, there are only few follow-up reports on whether successful cases were filed, criminals were convicted, which sentences were passed, whether money flows were investigated, and what happened to the confiscated assets, including the wildlife, of the violators.
5.3.2. Non-ASEAN Member States

Six projects under the GWP in non-AMS were equally analyzed, as their project focus areas and components were considered relevant to the Philippine context. Recommendations for the Philippines based on these project activities are likewise listed in Chapter 1.

GEF: Global Wildlife Program
Conservation of Snow Leopards and Their Critical Ecosystem in Afghanistan (AFG)
UNDP/GEF Project

This project was selected due to its references to the periodic monitoring of wildlife trade markets, human-wildlife conflicts, and land-use planning. The continuous monitoring of both, legal and illegal wildlife trade markets is essential: For legal markets, to determine whether animal welfare laws are adhered to, to prevent zoonotic diseases, and to prevent the illegal sale of species ensuring that all sellers have the required permits. The monitoring of clandestine illegal wildlife markets is important to identify the IWT networks and collect information on the higher-ups involved to arrest them, to monitor the price changes of the products, which could indicate changes in supply and/or demand, and to close down any illegal avenues that may still be open for vendors to sell their products. Human-wildlife conflict, which is also part of the project, is rare in the Philippines due to the absence of large terrestrial mammals and no major conflicts between humans and marine wildlife either. The only apparent threat that Filipinos are exposed to is the Saltwater crocodile (*Crocodylus porosus*) with sightings most frequently reported in the town of Balabac (Almendral, 2019), in the south of Palawan, and in the municipality of Tawi-Tawi (Alipala, 2020). The Philippines might benefit from assessing the levels of risk and reasons for conflict to develop mitigation measures to ensure a peaceful coexistence. This may be complemented with community awareness raising of the ecological role this species has to avoid retaliatory actions, which can be bolstered by appealing to religious beliefs, seeing that crocodiles are sacred to some Muslim tribes in the area. Moreover, this will help the Philippines to adhere to their commitments under CITES, as the *Crocodylus porosus* is listed under CITES Appendix I. If captured and housed in WRCs, crocodiles are in need of large fenced areas simulating their natural habitat and should be separated from other crocodiles as individuals may show aggression to each other, which may lead to injuries and death.

Another essential component to combating IWT is research: Data should be collected on wildlife population sizes, distribution and habitat use, hotspots and threats, and migration pathways, complemented by health assessments of the viability of populations through on the ground patrolling surveys, camera-trapping and, where applicable, non-invasive genetic sampling using fecal DNA. This information is equally important to inform land use planning, and to prevent domestic animal wildlife diseases. Only strict monitoring of wildlife movements and access to relevant data can prevent domestic animal wildlife diseases, which is some cases, can also be transferred to humans. This includes detecting smuggled agricultural products and livestock. The latest African swine fever outbreak in the Philippines in February 2020 may be traced back to pork smuggled from the PRC into the country, infecting animals in the Philippines (Reuters, 2020). Best practices should be shared and scaled up, and not be dependent on specific projects, but instead continue beyond the project timeline.
GEF: Global Wildlife Program

Managing the Human-Wildlife Interface to Sustain the Flow of Agro-Ecosystem Services and Prevent Illegal Wildlife Trafficking and in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands (Botswana) (BWA)

UNDP/GEF Project

This project sports several interesting ideas with regard to combating IWT, including another perspective on the set-up of institutional structures. To support the implementation of Botswana’s National Anti-Poaching Strategy, the project aims to improve nationwide intelligence gathering by all relevant law enforcement agencies. Therefore, it plans to establish a national Joint Operations Centre (JOC) and six District Intelligence Diffusion Centers. The Philippine National Anti-Poaching Strategy, the WildLEAP, was adopted in 2020 and, although adopted, still awaits its implementation, and the Philippine JOC would be mirrored in the endeavor to create a national intelligence unit. Possibly housed in the EPEB, this could then serve as Headquarters to Regional Intelligence Diffusion Units (RIDUs) that may be integrated into the DENR Regional Offices, and would facilitate effective collaboration and cooperation on the ground with regard to intelligence gathering and active enforcement operations. To operationalize these RIDUs, equipment, vehicles and technology would have to be procured and personnel seconded or hired. Institutions providing information and/or representatives to the RIDUs could be the POGI Task Force, NBI, BOC, PNP and PNP-Maritime, Philippine Coast Guard (PCG), Armed Forces of the Philippines, DOJ-Bureau of Corrections, Office of the Ombudsman (anti-corruption), AMLC, WEOs, regional and local level enforcers, etc.

The project in Botswana also provides incentives and systems for communities to embrace wildlife conservation and to participate fully in monitoring and reporting wildlife crimes, by increasing community benefits from non-consumption based natural resource management strategies. This is equally important in the Philippines, especially for areas where wildlife is sourced, such as in Balabac, Palawan, in the Sulu archipelago, and in Mapun, Tawi-Tawi for the direct take of turtles; in the Turtle Islands, Tawi-Tawi, for turtle eggs; in Northern Palawan for pangolins, freshwater turtles, and birds, such as parrots and the Palawan hill myna; and in Central Luzon, for birds and reptiles, such as the rufous hornbill and the Philippine marbled water monitor lizard. Gaps in access to and availability of socio-economic and natural assets have to be assessed and closed in order for livelihood interventions to be sustainable, as identified by Trono and Fischer in the Livelihood Feasibility Study for the Turtle Islands (2020-2030) (DENR-BMB, 2020f, unpublished). A suitable methodology to be used for these assessments is the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework developed by the Department for International Development. Special attention should be given to the needs of women, the elderly, and indigenous people. The main target group should be former poachers and their families to turn them into advocates for wildlife protection. Other criteria for long-term livelihood solutions include skills development, market access, and access to investment capital. Possible interventions can focus on ecotourism ventures or the set-up of supply chains (supply chain diagnosis, planning and implementation) to sustainably and equitably generate benefits for community members. The livelihood strategies should also identify climate smart agricultural practices as well as disaster risk reduction approaches, seeing that the poorest households are often the ones hit hardest by the typhoons and floods. Lastly, Botswana secures wildlife
migratory corridors, which would also be a viable endeavor for the protection of Philippine wildlife, especially concerning migratory marine animals and flyways for birds.

**GEF: Global Wildlife Program**

*Enhanced Management and Enforcement of Ethiopia’s Protected Areas Estate (ETH)*

**UNDP/GEF Project**

Instead of establishing a new institution on law enforcement, Ethiopia opts for creating a National IWT Steering Committee. This could also be an option for the Philippines, which would institutionalize the POGI Task Force further, by having a Steering Committee comprising all relevant law enforcement agencies and stakeholders meet bi-annually to discuss IWT challenges and solutions. Additional detection capacity may be needed in airports and seaports, building on the USAID Wildlife PROTECT airport initiatives and the DENR-ADB/GEF PortMATE assessments. Another important aspect addressed by this project that may be relevant for the Philippines, is to have bi-annual audits for seized/confiscated animals, which concerns WRCs. The [WRC Manual of Operations](#) lists all the laws and DAOs relevant for WRCs, but whereas the legislation focuses mostly on WRC establishment, protocols on collection and seizure of wildlife, and its disposition, there is not much information regarding monitoring and reporting mechanisms. It is therefore recommended to set up a functional reporting and auditing mechanism, wherein WRCs submit quarterly reports to the DENR Regional Offices, who in turn report to the national office of DENR-BMB, with DENR-BMB national staff conducting an annual audit of WRCs. All WRCs and Regional Offices should be compliant with this requirement and submitted reports should be thoroughly reviewed to identify suspicious activities. The same mechanisms may be replicated for breeding facilities (see GWP Project Viet Nam).

**GEF: Global Wildlife Program**

*Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach (KEN)*

**UNDP/GEF Project**

With the Mombasa Port being one of the demonstration ports of the UNDP/GEF project “Reducing Maritime Trafficking of Wildlife between Africa and Asia”, Kenya makes IWT detection at ports a priority. Seeing that the Philippines is a source, transit, and destination country for illicit wildlife products, ports should likewise be strengthened to detect and handle IWT efficiently. Kenya introduced a Multi-Agency Port Control Unit, consisting of 12 officers from different agencies, sharing common office space and planning and successfully implementing joint inspections of containers. The Philippines has Wildlife Traffic Monitoring Units in sea and airports that may need to collaborate more closely with other agencies. This inter-agency approach can be complemented with repetitive training on container control, wildlife detection and identification for customs and border posts, and on CITES regulations. The PortMATE assessments of the DENR-ADB/GEF project, e.g. in Lipata Port, Nasugbu Port, Cebu Port and Manila Port, should form the basis for these deliberations. However, it should be assessed whether there are other ports, not yet included in the assessments that may be an equally significant hub for IWT, e.g. Lucena Port, Liloan Port, etc. (ADB, 2018; DENR-BMB, 2020e).
Moreover, the Kenyan project increased the capacity of judges and prosecutors to effectively deter wildlife crime, addressing gaps that were identified in the country. Such capacity building exercises will most probably also be required for judges and prosecutors in the Philippines in the near future, especially considering the results of the Philippine ICCWC assessments, stating that: 1) the capacity of prosecutors to manage wildlife crime cases is limited, with very few of them ever having handled a wildlife crime case before, 2) there is a lack of specialized prosecutors for environmental or wildlife crime cases, 3) judges tend to take a lenient view on wildlife offenders, often handing down either administrative fines, or very low sentences, 4) there is a lack of general sentencing guidelines on wildlife crime cases for judges, and 5) that wildlife crime is barely prosecuted as predicate offense to money laundering or corruption, resulting in no offender assets forfeited (ICCWC and UNODC, 2019). This is why the Philippines would certainly benefit from an in-depth training of prosecutors, such as the 5-day Seminar under the DENR-ADB/GEF project, as well as a judiciary sensitization for the issues and consequences of IWT for the country, its environment, and its people. In addition, manuals should be devised for judges to provide them with necessary guidance on wildlife and forest crime legislation, penalties, and the usage of wildlife crime as predicate offense to be prosecuted under the Anti-Money Laundering Act and the Anti-Corruption Act. A comprehensive Rapid Reference Guide on the most important Philippine laws to combat IWT was developed under the IWT project together with UNODC, and is available – after approved registration – at the EliTusk platform. Another idea put forward by Kenya is to establish a Wildlife Conservation Trust Fund, which could be governed in the form of trusteeship and would operate both as a grant facility and micro-loan facility open to wildlife conservation efforts of communities. Means of financing could stem from private investments, diverse income generating activities, government budgetary allocations, payments for ecosystem services etc. The Trust Fund may also help communities to market sustainable wildlife eco-tourism, link communities with the private sector for investments and corporate social responsibility programs, and defend pro-wildlife development interests in courts. This idea may also be of interest to the Philippines.

**GEF: Global Wildlife Program**

*Integrated and Transboundary Conservation of Biodiversity in the Basins of the Republic of Congo (COG)*

**UNDP/GEF Project**

The Republic of the Congo is establishing a detection dog unit to detect and apprehend poachers before they can kill wildlife. As the Philippine context is different without having these vast wildlife reserves, dogs may not be used for this purpose, but could still significantly enhance detection of illegal wildlife products in seaports and airports. For the former, dogs could be used to search containers arriving or leaving the ports. As customs officials often have only a limited period of time they can hold these containers for, using a detection dog unit could very much fast-track this process and increase the success rate. For airports, dogs could be trained to assist border officials in detecting wildlife in carry-on and check-in luggage, as well as in larger deliveries in the cargo hold of the airplane. In terms of livelihood development to wean people away from poaching, the Republic of the Congo suggests establishing small grant programs and micro-loan facilities for local communities, particularly former poachers, women, and indigenous people, to support sustainable natural resource management. A committee
would be established to select eligible micro-projects. As access to financial capital and the
development of alternative livelihoods is equally a challenge for the Philippines, these options
could be explored for IWT hotspots. Micro-loans and/or grants could be co-financed by private
sector companies operating in nearby areas.

**GEF: Global Wildlife Program**

*Strengthening institutions, information management and monitoring to reduce the rate of illegal
wildlife trade in South Africa (ZA)*

**UNEP/GEF Project**

One of the project activities concerns the capacity development of the Scientific Authority of
South Africa (SAoSA) by establishing a cohort of young wildlife professionals to support the
provincial conservation authorities (see Best Practice Box 3). Acquainting young minds with the
tasks and responsibilities of the Scientific Authority would also be a worthwhile undertaking for
the Philippine CITES Scientific Authorities, such as the Ecosystems Research and Development
Bureau (ERDB)\(^{44}\), which is situated inside the University of the Philippines (UP)-Los Baños
Campus, and could thus easily recruit students, preferably graduates from biology/forestry/human ecology. South Africa further proposes the set-up of a national monitoring system for priority species under the Scientific Authority, with the system expected to compile valuable data and information in order to inform the CITES permitting process, provide information on the current status of the distribution and abundance of these species, and give information on the levels of trade in these species. This database is complementary to the e-CITES permitting system and would be a repository of much needed information in order to devise Non-detriment Findings. Set up under the ERDB, it could be utilized by the Philippines to facilitate reporting at future CITES meetings. Community livelihoods are also addressed by this project through the identification of community projects, assessing most appropriate points of entry and interrelationships between relevant structures, such as protected areas, traditional authorities etc., and the development of governance guidelines for stakeholder engagement. These guidelines include members’ bill of rights, definitions of roles, village constitutions, governance systems and procedures, financial systems and procedures, and mechanisms for financial and procedural compliance, developed by community facilitators. An MOU and capacity building will ensure a successful implementation. Key communities identified in Philippine IWT hotspots could benefit from similar approaches regarding community project identification and institutionalization of stakeholder engagement, e.g. via the First Line of Defense methodology. Conservation measures can yield more powerful results when there are formal guidelines indicating responsibilities and accountability of relevant and involved stakeholders. This could be further strengthened by the recruitment of community governance champions, at the interface between the community and regional/national agencies.

---

\(^{44}\) Next to the ERDB, the Philippine CITES Scientific Authorities include the National Museum, UP, UP-Marine Science Institute, UP-Visayas, Silliman University, Philippines Aquatic Red List Committee and the National Fisheries Research and Development Institute (NFRDI).
Best Practice Box – South Africa

Project information: The project Strengthening Institutions, Information Management and Monitoring to Reduce the Rate of Illegal Wildlife Trade in South Africa is implemented from 2019-2024 and is funded under the GEF-6 cycle with a Total Project Cost of $12.3M. The project is both implemented at the national level and in designated project sites, where rural communities border the western boundary of the Kruger National Park (KNP): the Makuya Complex; the Matsulu/Stolznek Cluster, and the Sabie Sands Wildtuin and Sabie River Cluster. The Implementing Agency is UNEP, working closely together with the South African Department of Forestry, Fisheries and Environment (DFFE), which is the Executing Agency. The main project partners for implementation are: For Project Component 1, Strengthening Institutional Capacity and Information Systems for Effective Management of Wildlife Trade Monitoring – South African National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI); for Project Component 2, Development of a Ready-to-use e-permitting System for CITES-listed Species – DFFE; and for Project Component 3, Strengthening Community Capacity to Reduce the Rate of Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) – a multi-stakeholder approach is driven, including DFFE, the Peace Parks Foundation (PPF), South African National Parks (SANParks), and the South African Wildlife College. The project is co-financed by WWF under the Ketha Program and through contributions from all the Sub-Executing Agencies. South Africa is considered predominantly a source country for wildlife crime, with IWT encompassing the illegal harvesting/poaching of high value species such as rhinos, lions, and elephants from the KNP and Greater Kruger reserves, and the IWT of animal parts (e.g. rhino horn) to external markets. Locals also use/trade wildlife, e.g. vulture parts, for traditional purposes.

Governance Guidelines and Community Livelihoods: This Component is implemented in three communities living on the western boundary of the KNP (which is part of the Greater Limpopo Transfrontier Conservation Area), with plans for upscaling in the entire region. It aims to engage community members in the wildlife law enforcers’ efforts to oppose and halt IWT. This will be achieved through 1) the drafting, validation and implementation of governance guidelines, specifically targeting community-based wildlife management, and 2) by the provision of livelihood opportunities.

1) The aim of implementing governance guidelines is to provide a regulatory baseline for actions and interventions at the community level in combating IWT. It is important to note that the project does not seek to establish new structures, but rather to strengthen existing community governance structures at different tiers. Close partners are SANParks and the PPF, who developed a community ranger/village scout model for the prevention of illegal activities in the areas bordering the national park. Even though the project implementation will focus on South Africa, both organizations work and have close ties with neighboring countries, such as Mozambique. SANParks is also part of the constituted Joint Management Board of the Great Limpopo Transfrontier Park Treaty that was signed in 2002 among Mozambique, South Africa, and Zimbabwe. This is a crucial testimony for the recognition of the transboundary nature of wildlife conservation and facilitates the cooperation on IWT matters. Communities were already identified and programs launched through the Greater Kruger Steering Committee. This project will contribute through the existing programs and enhance their governance processes and community structures (Community Forums, Traditional Authorities, etc.). Governance guidelines will be co-developed, tiered at the National, Provincial, Community forum, Traditional Authority and Project level. The guidelines will be formally adopted for use by community-based organizations such as People & Parks (P&P), which are government-supported structures, with a national office and provincial chapters in each of the nine provinces. The organization represents the voices and interests of communities who are impacted, positively or negatively, by conservation. The incentives that will be offered to community members, who adhere to the guidelines in support of collective action accountability, range from livelihood support projects, employment of rangers and workplace development, over innovative financing options and honorariums, to knowledge sharing and the participation in and access to knowledge/incubator hubs.

2) The main objectives in identifying and implementing community livelihoods under the project are to achieve a reduction in poaching and associated wildlife mortality, as well as to develop environmental awareness and custodianship within communities. Some of these livelihoods may also be essential to target the lack of basic services that some communities experience, as well as to reduce their high
dependence on natural resources. In identifying potential livelihoods, a key focus is on the sustainability of existing initiatives, whilst gaps will be identified through an iterative engagement process, and be endorsed by the Greater Kruger Steering Committee and Cluster Task teams. To identify opportunities on a continuous basis, a range of different complementary tools are being used. One of these is a synthesis report, which was based on a stratification framework reviewing strategic, socio-economic, environmental, risk, opportunity, and management considerations, and layered through further filters/criteria of existing institutional mandates, community readiness/willingness, champions, sustainability etc. Livelihood priorities were further narrowed down by several recent programs, such as the Greater Kruger Strategic Development program (2020), recent community consultation processes, and the institutional wildlife and socio-economic priority program of the GEF-6 reporting entities in the implementation clusters. With regard to specific livelihoods, a key focus of communities is to have better access to information/knowledge management on upcoming opportunities, especially for youth; access to funding; and entrepreneurial development opportunities and associated support to access value chain opportunities linked to the Greater Kruger protected area network. Most community members are interested in being taught on trade-related matters, e.g. orange farming and how to sell their produce, but also in waste management (recycling, clean environment, entrepreneurial development); and in value chains linked to the Greater Kruger Protected Area networks, such as crafts, food, and tourism enterprises. Since the project builds on existing programs implemented by well-established institutions, the livelihood initiatives have a high probability to be sustained beyond the project. This will also be ensured by offering capacity building to the participants, and by identifying NGOs to take over these initiatives after the project completion.

A cohort of young wildlife professionals for the South African Scientific Authority: The Scientific Authority of South Africa (SAoSA) was established under the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (NEMBA). The Purpose of the SAoSA is to assist in regulating and restricting trade in specimens of Threatened or Protected Species/CITES-listed species through a scientific and professional review of available information and consultation with stakeholders. The SAoSA has representatives from nine provincial conservation authorities, one per province. These are legal entities in their own right with provincial jurisdiction. SAoSA further includes representatives from the national Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment, SANParks, and SANBI, which provides scientific support to the SAoSA and coordinates the secretariat functions. Seeing the importance of the Scientific Authority, well-qualified and committed individuals are essential for the assessment of wildlife species and the reporting to the national level. Once SAoSA members have served their mandated 4-year terms of office, they need to be replaced or can be re-appointed by the Minister. Replacement has been problematic in the past, as young graduates are often inexperienced in wildlife trade. In addition, some of the experienced provincial scientists are close to retirement, whereas some of the new provincial SAoSA members may be less able to provide expert advice. Due to the shortage of expertise that was observed, especially in the Provincial Offices, the project plans to establish a cohort of young wildlife professionals to shadow SAoSA members and to build capacity amongst existing SAoSA members. The project initiated this process by undertaking a survey with past and present SAoSA members to enquire about their capacity needs, in order to develop a capacity building strategy. Moreover, provincial agencies are encouraged to host young professionals, who, once selected for these paid positions, will acquire much needed work experience to shape the future cadre of the SAoSA for their time of deployment. The main objective is to offer these professionals permanent placements in the provincial agencies after their training has come to an end. However, this will be entirely dependent on budget availability and whether prevalent budget constraints can be addressed.

Best Practice Box 3. South Africa

Species listed as threatened or protected in terms of section 56 of the National Environmental Management: Biodiversity Act (NEMBA) of 2004.
5.4. Listing of Projects at the Regional Level

The following overview concerns projects that were implemented at the regional level in SEA. Due to their broader scope and less detailed information, these projects were not used to extract recommendations for the Philippines. Nevertheless, this listing was considered an essential piece of knowledge to put the projects implemented at the national level into the regional context and to present which initiatives shape the broader project landscape in SEA.

**ASEAN Center for Biodiversity**

*Various Projects*

As an inter-governmental organization tasked with supporting AMS in implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and promoting biodiversity conservation in the region, ACB’s programs also include initiatives on species conservation and combating wildlife crime through activities imbedded in various projects throughout the region. Pilot projects are taking place in Indonesia, and projects are initiated in Viet Nam, working on law enforcement and community livelihoods in ASEAN Heritage Parks, financed by the KfW Small Grants Program. The ACB is also the main partner of the EU-ASEAN BCAMP Project (see below) and was asked to contribute to combating wildlife trafficking during the 36th ASEAN Summit in June 2020.

**Asian Development Bank**

*Support to Combat Transnational Organized Environmental Crime and Promote Environmental Law Reform and Enforcement*

The TA was implemented from October 2013 until August 2016. Under the TA, comprehensive needs assessment analyses were conducted and reports on Legal Enforcement Frameworks to Control Wildlife Trade were produced. One example of legislation supported under this TA is the revised Penal Code on Environmental Crimes in Viet Nam, which was adopted and approved by the National Assembly.

**European Union**

*Law enforcement and demand management of wildlife in Asia*

The €5.15M project funded by the EU’s Global Public Goods and Challenges Program is implemented by UNODC and CITES in more than 10 Asian countries, with the objective to address the growing problem of international trade and demand for some key African wildlife species in Asia, and to reduce the illegal killing of key Asian wildlife species that are impacted by international trade (UNODC, n.d.). The project implementation period is from 2016-2020.

*EU-ASEAN Biodiversity Conservation and Management of Protected Areas in ASEAN (BCAMP) project*

This project is implemented jointly by the EU and ACB with the aim to “contribute to global sustainability by ensuring ASEAN’s rich biological diversity is conserved and sustainably managed toward enhancing social, economic, and environmental well-being” (EEAS, 2018). As part of this project, the protected area management is improved in 10 pilot sites in five AMS: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand through capacity building on the use of technology for surveillance and wildlife monitoring, improvement of enforcement
strategies, and purchase of equipment to support these trainings (Ravichandran, 2020). An EU-ASEAN Partners Dialogue on Protected Areas and Wildlife was held in conjunction with the 6th ASEAN Heritage Parks Conference in Lao PDR in October 2019 (Ravichandran, 2020). Under the BCAMP project, the ACB also collaborates with the IUCN Asian Species Action Partnership, to conduct a baseline analysis of Critically Endangered species in ASEAN for the purpose of developing a species conservation action plan for the region (Ravichandran, 2020).

FREELAND

ASEAN Legal Studies and Support Program to Fight Transnational Organized Wildlife Crime (LEGAL)

The LEGAL program offers ASEAN-wide research support and capacity building for prosecutors and the judiciary, “to promote strategic legal remedies in prosecuting transnational wildlife trafficking in Southeast Asia” (FREELAND, n.d.). The program includes toolkit development, legal analyses, research support, and in-country missions. It is supported by USAID and the USFWS, and it is implemented by FREELAND, UNODC, and by the Asia Pacific Centre for Environmental Law, National University of Singapore.

Detection of Environmental Crime Training (DETECT)

The DETECT program is a capacity building program for wildlife crime investigators, prosecutors, and other law enforcement officials, facilitating transnational collaboration between regional WENs and government agencies (FREELAND, 2014a). Therefore, FREELAND facilitates Special Investigation Groups, provides on-the-job training, and conducts trainings on wildlife identification, border procedures, investigations, and for law enforcement investigation managers (FREELAND, 2014a).

Asia’s Regional Response to Endangered Species Trafficking Program (ARREST)

The ARREST program was initiated by USAID in 2011 and implemented by FREELAND in the AMS and the PRC, with the goal to fight IWT in Asia in three ways: 1) Reduce consumer demand; 2) Strengthen law enforcement; and 3) Strengthen regional cooperation and anti-trafficking networks (USAID, 2011). In detail, consumption reduction campaigns took place in the PRC, Viet Nam, and Thailand, the program mainstreamed wildlife crime into law enforcement, and supported cross-border wildlife law enforcement cooperation. Law enforcement trainers and institutions in the region were trained on prevention, detection, and prosecution, and law enforcement managers were trained to lead front line staff in reducing wildlife crime. Moreover, ARREST monitored the former ASEAN-WEN Program Coordination Unit staff to connect better with national law enforcement agencies, and promoted regional events for countries to exchange information, intelligence, and best practices (USAID, 2011). As part of the program, FREELAND launched the training “Wildlife Friendly Skies”, in which flight attendants, cargo and baggage handlers, airport security and Customs officials from Royal Thai Customs, Airports of Thailand, Kenya Airlines and Delta Airlines participated (FREELAND, 2014b). Other international NGOs and inter-governmental organizations, such as ACB, were also program partners. The ARREST program concluded in 2016.
**Operation Laser and Operation Laser 2**
The operations increased cross-border cooperation to decrease the illegal trade of rhinos and tigers throughout the Mekong Region. This was done by: 1) Increasing information sharing between the governments of Cambodia, Thailand, Lao PDR, the PRC, and Viet Nam with regard to rhino horn and tiger trade routes, suspect profiles, and specific smuggling methods used at border-crossings; and 2) by improving the performance of law enforcement officers in these countries in identifying and arresting high-level tiger and rhino horn traffickers. The project also aimed at facilitating bilateral and multilateral Special Investigation Group meetings that would enable joint training, planning, and information sharing among key rhino and tiger source, transit and consumer countries in the Mekong region.

**GIZ**
*Partnership against Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trade (in Africa and Asia)*
This project is implemented from 2017-2021 by the German Development Cooperation (GIZ) in selected African and Southeast Asian countries, as well as in the PRC, with a total commitment of €14.9M (GIZ, n.d.). The AMS covered by the project are Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, and Viet Nam. GIZ states that the objective of the project is to improve the “inter-sectoral, cross-border and trans-continental fight against poaching and illegal trade in ivory and rhino-horn” by operating along the entire illegal trade chain (GIZ, n.d.). The four areas of work 1) enable actors involved in combating poaching and illicit trade in elephant and rhino range states to adopt and implement innovative measures through provision of lessons learnt; 2) improve organizational and institutional capacities for effective transnational law enforcement to curtail international illegal trade; 3) identify and implement approaches to reduce demand among mainly Asian consumers, for example through target group specific campaigns; and 4) promote exchange and coordination of German governmental and non-governmental actors involved in combating wildlife crime.

**INTERPOL**
During the last decade, INTERPOL has launched over 50 regional and global wildlife crime operations. One large initiative was *Operation Thunderball* in 2019, which led to the arrest of 582 suspects and 1,828 seizures of wildlife and wildlife products in 109 countries worldwide (INTERPOL, 2019). This was a follow up to *Operation Thunderstorm* (2018) and *Operation Thunderbird* (2017), which both also targeted the people behind the illegal trade in wildlife and timber and together saw over 3,000 seizures of wildlife and identified over 2,000 suspects (INTERPOL, n.d.). *Project Predator* was launched in 2011, with a strong focus on AMS, enhancing the capacity of law enforcement to conserve Asian big cats and also other wildlife in the 13 tiger range countries, including Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam (SDG Knowledge Hub, 2011). Based on this project, *Project PAWS II* took place in 2015, investigating the trade of tigers and other Asian big cats, pangolins and timber in Asian countries, which this time also included Cambodia and Singapore, leading to a total of 305 arrests (INTERPOL, 2015). *Project Wisdom* was launched in 2008, to support member countries in targeting criminal networks hunting rhinos and elephants, with over 50,000 carved ivory items confiscated so far (INTERPOL, n.d.). In 2013 and in 2017, INTERPOL partnered
with the International Fund for Animal Welfare to investigate the sale of illegal wildlife products online. INTERPOL also published an [ASEAN Cyberthreat Assessment Report](#) in 2021.

**TRACE**

Established as an NGO in 2006, TRACE – The Wildlife Forensics Network is dedicated to promoting forensic science in wildlife conservation and law enforcement (TRACE, n.d.). Under one of its administered projects, the ASEAN-WEN Wildlife Forensics Project - A Darwin Initiative implemented by TRAFFIC from 2009-2012, the ASEAN Wildlife Forensics Network was created. Its purpose is to “provide the ability for members of the ASEAN WEN to undertake coordinated wildlife forensic analysis for CITES enforcement operations and to deter further wildlife crime in the ASEAN region” (ASEAN Wildlife Forensics Network, n.d.). It seems, however, that the network has not been very active in the last years.

**USAID Wildlife Asia**

USAID Wildlife Asia works to end IWT in SEA and has the following four objectives: Reducing consumer demand, strengthening regional law enforcement, enhancing political commitment and support, and supporting regional cooperation (USAID, n.d.). Moreover, USAID Wildlife Asia campaign systematically to change the behavior of consumers, with campaign titles such as “A Good Life Is Free of Killing”, “Beautiful without Ivory”, and “No Ivory No Tiger Amulets”, targeting spiritual beliefs perceived by the buyers, such as power or good luck (USAID, n.d.). In order to do that, USAID works with law enforcement, lawmakers and regional and local partners, and coordinates closely with ASEAN to reduce demand and IWT. To this effect, USAID Wildlife Asia has leveraged $11.5M from private sector partnerships (USAID, 2020).

**WWF**

*Ivory High Impact Initiative (Ivory HII)*

Under this initiative, the WWF network is focusing on “Closing down Asia’s ivory markets” as a High Impact Initiative (HII). This places great emphasis on the Greater Mekong region, seeing that the legal ivory markets in the PRC were closed on December 31, 2017, which led to a shift of ivory sales to neighboring countries of the Greater Mekong region (Cambodia, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, and Viet Nam). The ivory trade is persisting and thriving in the Greater Mekong region, either in the form of regulated domestic ivory markets, such as in Thailand, or being sold underground. The HII plans to drive a two-pronged approach: 1) to build an effective policy engagement capacity in the region to persuade governments to close domestic ivory markets, and 2) to focus on demand reduction for ivory, working with a wide variety of partners.

*Asia-Pacific Counter-IWT Hub*

WWF’s Asia-Pacific Counter-IWT Hub was launched in 2021 with the objectives to build and complement synergies amongst existing WWF programs and partners combating IWT. The IWT Hub is based in Hong-Kong and partners with government agencies, shipping and airline industries, e-commerce and financial institutions, and other NGOs in order to achieve impact through networking, catalyzing, innovating, and amplifying counter-IWT actions (WWF, 2021).
5.5. Recommendations for the Philippines

In the following, adjusted recommendations based on the projects assessed in Chapter 5.3 are given for the Philippines. Country abbreviations were added to each recommendation and allow for tracing each recommendation back to the more comprehensive narrative. This approach will facilitate the search for the respective project documents, detailed activities, target species, and project partners, who may then be contacted to discuss about activities of interest in more detail, thereby strongly benefitting international collaboration as well as south-south learning. It should be noted that this activity-to-country-connection does not imply that the assistance of these countries is indispensable to put the recommendations below into action, but should rather be considered as an opportunity to initiate a fruitful exchange on lessons learned. For taking these recommendations below forward, it is further suggested that these are discussed among the Philippine CITES MAs, DENR, DA, PCSD, and BARMM, as well as by other wildlife law enforcement agencies in the Philippines, such as NBI, AMLC, PNP, PCG, etc. to allocate the Agencies responsible for the implementation of each recommendation. Complementary elements that may be added in subsequent discussions may be a prioritization of projects (high, medium, low) and a time line (short-, medium-, long-term). It is further suggested that this list is consulted during the planned review of the WildLEAP in 2022/23.

Strategy 1. Policy and System Development

1. **Conduct a feasibility study on cost-recovery mechanisms from IWT using AML legislation and restitution through asset seizures/freezing, penalties and fines, and on re-investing these into wildlife conservation/wildlife law enforcement (INÓ)** *(best with an economic valuation of legal wildlife trade and IWT – see Strategy 6.1)*

2. **Develop guidelines for breeding facilities in the Philippines**, to
   a. Define the roles of conservation breeding centers;
   b. Clearly delineate allowed and disallowed activities;
   c. Introduce reporting requirements and require the submission of acceptable evidence of captive breeding;
   d. Put forth monitoring schedules and auditing schemes for facilities; and
   e. Encourage international cooperation with other similar facilities (VIE, Sy, 2020c, personal conversation)

3. **Ask breeding facilities to submit quarterly reports** to the DENR Regional Offices that in turn submit these reports to DENR-BMB and conduct an annual audit of these facilities, done by DENR-BMB staff (ETH)

---

46 At the time of report writing, BARMM is not yet a CITES Management Authority, but an according provision to this effect is included in the recently proposed revision of RA 9147, currently discussed as a Bill in the Philippine Senate.
4. Develop a wildlife crime prevention strategy and/or action plans for combating IWT in protected areas and in other IWT hotspots, and build cross-protected area relationships to promote information-sharing (LAO and THA)

5. Develop and implement a strategic action plan for the POGI Task Force, encompassing budget requirements and allocation (THA)

6. Develop a conservation program for selected Critically Endangered species as per RA 9147, DAO 2019-09, and DAO 2017-11, accompanied by technical assistance from species experts, conservation agencies, and law enforcers (VIE)

7. Amend Section 4.c of the Philippine Cybercrime Prevention Act, or RA 10175, of 2012, to include IWT as a cybercrime offense covered by the Act under its content-related offenses (Chapter 3.2)

8. In order to curtail poaching, prohibit and/or regulate the use of air guns under RA 9147 (VIE)

9. Require that fines and penalties are applied as stated in the Wildlife Act, with consequences for the violators
   a. Explore introducing higher sentences for repeat offenders;
   b. Apply professional consequences for judges handing down significantly lower sentences than prescribed minimum sentences;
   c. Develop sentencing guidelines for judges, including specific ones for wildlife crime cases; and
   d. Ensure that the created environmental courts are functional (Chapter 3.2)

10. In cases of Administrative Adjudication, indicate cases that qualify to be heard administratively in the IRR of the Wildlife Act to avoid indiscriminate non-filing of criminal cases, and require the fines to correspond to the ones listed under the Wildlife Act (Chapter 3.2)

11. Monitor the chain of evidence very closely in cases where minimum quantities of species are required for certain penalties to apply, and ensure a rigorous prosecution whenever suspicious activities occur and/or evidence disappears (Chapter 3.2)

12. In case there is a conflict in the categorization of species between the CITES listing or the relevant DAO, explore using whichever classification is higher instead of always giving the prerogative to the DAO, to ensure a precautionary approach is taken (Chapter 3.2)

13. Align the conservation status of species in the Philippines on a countrywide scale, harmonizing the species listings between Palawan and the remaining country (Chapter 3.2)
14. Review and pass the DAO on the Registration of Raw and Worked Elephant Ivory to establish a national registry and to prevent fraudulent statements of pre-convention ivory ownership, and build capacity of DENR personnel to certify ivory products as antique and/or pre-convention (Chapter 3.2)

15. Internalize the concept of restitution into national legislation, building on the entry points already identified in the Penal Law and the Fisheries Code (Chapter 3.2)

16. Explore IWT prosecutions under the AML Act or under RA 9271, the Quarantine Act of 2004, as additional legislative bases (Chapter 3.2)

Strategy 2. Networking, Coordination, and Partnerships

**Networking and Coordination**

1. Explore adding a wildlife crime aspect to the tasks under the Trilateral Cooperation Declaration by Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines, formalizing it as an MOU, and developing additional agreements with the law enforcement agencies of other countries, to efficiently share information, cooperate and collaborate (INO)

2. Strengthen mandate, membership, and inter-agency cooperation on IWT through the POGi Task Force as a national task force to implement the ASEAN CITES & WE stipulations, including to
   a. Forge bilateral agreements on cooperation;
   b. Strengthen the engagement of anti-money laundering and anti-corruption agencies in the national response to IWT through the POGi Task Force; and
   c. Strengthen the permitting and inspection of licensed breeding facilities (THA)

3. Identify key cross-border IWT trading points and actively promote police-led cross-border intelligence sharing among AMS to arrest high-level criminals (THA)

4. Support and participate in existing ASEAN wildlife forensic networks (THA)

5. Ensure a close collaboration among agencies gathering intelligence on wildlife crime (see Strategies 6.19 and 6.20) (THA)

6. Explore the possibility of passing a fatwa prohibiting IWT by working together with Muslim religious leaders in the Philippines (INO)

7. Introduce mechanisms for local communities, law enforcers and protected area officials to share perspectives and discuss in order to develop a common understanding and foster collaboration in responding to IWT (THA)

8. In cases of human-wildlife conflicts, assess the levels of risk and reasons for conflict and develop co-management actions with communities to develop
mitigation measures, and help community members understand the ecological role of the species, using science but also appealing to religious beliefs (AFG)

9. Secure wildlife migratory corridors, especially for marine animals and birds (BWA)

10. Facilitate dialogues and build collaboration and cooperation among wildlife management and law enforcement agencies, including enhanced intelligence sharing, to implement the WildLEAP (BWA)

Partnerships

11. Include and engage the private sector in counter-IWT activities and raise awareness on how their services may be utilized by traffickers and how this could affect their business (VIE)

12. Explore collaborating with international conservation NGOs with regional expertise in combating IWT to further strengthen Philippine law enforcement efforts (Chapter 3.2)

13. The CITES MAs of the Philippines may want to explore drafting and entering into an agreement with the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade Portal to share data on confiscation incidents in the Philippines with the Portal, thus enabling better collaboration through publicly shared knowledge and assisting research on IWT (VIE)

14. Establish a national volunteer network with volunteers in each Province, monitoring IWT hotspots and reporting to DENR-BMB and/or a designated NGO, and give out citizen reporting awards to the most successful volunteers (VIE)

15. Identify and recruit local community governance champions leading local actions against IWT (ZAF)

Strategy 3. Capacity Building

1. Train WEOs and law enforcers of various agencies on how to file cases involving high-ranking officials and officials from partnering agencies involved in wildlife crime (CAM)

2. Further disseminate LAWIN and train law enforcers on its usage, regularly update the system according to the needs of patrollers, data managers, and resource managers47, and utilize the information provided to devise and implement informed action plans (INO)

47 “Patrollers are community members including indigenous people, forest rangers of the national government, and forest guards of the local governments. Data managers are forest technicians of the national government and GIS experts from the LGUs. Resource managers are forest managers from the national government, as well as environment and natural resource officer of the local government” (STI Forum, 2016).
3. Allocate additional resources and trained personnel in key domestic source, transit, and destination locations (Chapter 3.2)

4. Establish detection dog units for the use in confiscation operations and in airports and seaports to detect illegal wildlife and derivatives, and allocate funding for these units accordingly (COG and MAL)

5. Build detection capacity in key points of entry and exit by strengthening the detection, handling, and inter-agency collaboration at airports and seaports, e.g. by developing a close inter-agency approach for Wildlife Traffic Monitoring Units in air and seaports, complemented with repetitive training (ETH and KEN)

6. Assess the expansion of the PortMATE assessment to additional ports serving as IWT hubs in the Philippines and use the 2020 PortMATE assessment results to design interventions closing the gaps identified during the assessments in the respective ports (INO, KEN)

7. Conduct a comprehensive assessment of capacity and technology available for forensic analysis, and improve hardware, software and training to undertake wildlife forensic sciences as required (THA)

8. Introduce the IBM i2 Analyst's Notebook software in DENR-BMB and train POGI members in its usage to facilitate criminal network mapping and analyses (INO)

9. Ensure that relevant Philippine government staff have the possibility to regularly participate in regional or international trainings on combating IWT and on wildlife conservation (THA)

10. Design and facilitate exchange visits and study tours for relevant government technical staff and community representatives at the national and local level to observe best practices on combating IWT for successful initiatives in IWT hotspots to be replicated (AFG)

11. Assess and close gaps in communities' access to and availability of basic socio-economic and natural assets via a Livelihood Feasibility Study, e.g. using the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework by the Department for International Development, in order for livelihood interventions to be sustainable (BWA)

12. Identify community livelihoods and projects through the First Line of Defense methodology (ZAF)

13. Formalize community assistance through Conservation Agreements with jointly agreed responsibilities of e.g. buffer zone villages, and facilitate access to financial and technical assistance for agreed livelihood development opportunities (THA)

14. Develop nature-based tourism by conducting feasibility assessments of opportunities for potential tourism and recreational development, particularly in areas where a sensible introduction of eco-tourism may wean people away from on-
15. Explore livelihoods independent of tourism, such as trade/sale of local natural resources, in plain or value-added form, to counteract external pressures (THA)

16. Expand the concept of BDFEs to terrestrial protected areas (MAL)

17. Explore establishing small grant programs and micro-loan facilities for local communities, particularly former poachers, women, and indigenous people, to support sustainable natural resource management (COG)

18. Build community resilience by investing into climate smart agricultural practices and disaster risk reduction approaches (BWA)

19. Build the capacity of the judiciary branch, especially prosecutors and judges, on matters of IWT through in-depth trainings using the results of the ICCWC Indicator Framework as a basis for addressing the gaps (Chapter 3.2 and KEN)

20. Devise manuals for judges to provide them with necessary guidance on wildlife and forest crime legislation, penalties, and the usage of wildlife crime as predicate offense (KEN)

21. Establish a young professionals training program in selected Philippine Scientific Authorities, such as ERDB or NFRDI, to prepare the next generation of scientists for the responsibilities the Philippines has committed to under CITES (ZAF)

22. Ensure that capacity building on law enforcement is translated into actions on the ground in the regions, by advancing political will and relevant training contents, if possible combined with practice exercises (Chapter 3.2)

23. Institutionalize capacity building on IWT into law enforcement trainings and curricula, e.g. at the PNP Academy (Chapter 3.2)

24. Establish a multidisciplinary Masters course on combating IWT (VIE)

Strategy 4. Communication, Education and Public Awareness

1. Collaborate with the Department of Education and other relevant agencies to implement the provisions of the National Environmental Awareness and Education Act, or RA 9512, in order to integrate environmental education into the curricula of primary schools and high schools (VIE)

2. Develop an information sharing mechanism at the national level, where IWT data is entered into the system by enforcement agencies and the data is published via the DENR-BMB website, including a/an

   a. Up-to-date threatened species list;
b. Database on population of most trafficked species;

c. Appropriate methodologies for conservation and management;

d. Threats to these species;

e. Aggregated and anonymized information on confiscations etc. (VIE)

3. **Explore setting up a mobile education project for local communities by sending out a Mobile Environmental Education Unit by van/bus** to cultivate a culture of conservation, focusing on remote areas where school attendance rates and mobile/internet signals are weak (CAM)

4. **Sponsor a contest at Philippine universities**, inviting students to submit proposals/campaigns to the DENR-BMB **on how to combat IWT best in the country**, award prizes for the best ideas, and **continue the zoohackaton** in frequent intervals (VIE)

5. **Increase local media coverage on follow-up events after the arrests/seizures have taken place**, e.g. covering court proceedings and sentences, financial investigations, the freezing of the criminals’ assets, WRCs, etc. (VIE)

6. **Inform and train key media in the country in biodiversity/wildlife conservation/IWT reporting** for them to develop pro-conservation attitudes and to report accurately on these topics (VIE)

7. **Integrate more counter-IWT messages in the tourism sector on a regular basis**, including continuous advertisement in different languages, and **work together with local tourism champions** (VIE)

8. **Use continuous counter-IWT advertisement in airports and seaports and in transportation vehicles**, such as airplanes, public busses, public taxis, and jeepneys in different languages (e.g. English, Tagalog, and Chinese) (VIE)

9. **Distribute stickers to jeepney and/or tricycle drivers that inform passengers about the illegality of IWT** and display DENR-BMB’s telephone number to report wildlife related incidences, and ask the drivers to **display the stickers in their vehicles for a minimum of one year** (CAM)

10. **Set up a well-functioning 24/7 mobile phone hotline to report IWT and other wildlife-related incidences and assign designated staff attending to the hotline** (CAM, SIN)

11. **Target not just consumers, but also zoos, medical and pharmacological communities, and restaurants/eateries serving wildlife** in demand reduction campaigns (VIE)

12. **Encourage the GWP to serve as a platform even after the projects will end** for a continued best practice exchange and for the replication of interventions (AFG)
### Strategy 5. Improving Governance, Curbing Corruption, and Establishing Structures

1. **Ensure that WEOs are well paid or have other sustainable income options** to increase their salary, **and offer honorariums or other incentives** such as health insurance, in-kind payments etc. **to community volunteers (INO)**

2. **Introduce and/or strengthen the insurance of wildlife law enforcers**, by providing a free Philippine Health insurance coverage (including death and disability insurance) for all wildlife law enforcers, including contractual workers (THA)

3. **Consider introducing incentive structures at all levels of DENR** to improve staff motivation and performance **and explore offering more permanent contracts to staff (INO)**

4. **Ensure due diligence in issuing permits under the e-CITES permitting system** and offer incentives to employees to report any suspicious and/or unlawful activities immediately (Chapter 3.2)

5. **Explore the establishment of a Wildlife Conservation Trust Fund**, governed in the form of a trusteeship and operating both as a grant facility and micro-loan facility, which is open to wildlife conservation efforts of communities (KEN)

6. **Establish a certification scheme/logo for shop owners** who explicitly commit to selling only legal wildlife products (INO)

7. **Collaborate with the Department of the Interior and Local Government to award a Seal of Good Governance to leading LGUs that successfully advertise and enforce counter-IWT messages and actions (VIE)**

8. **Ensure that all protected area boundaries are clearly demarcated** to deter poachers and to have a proper basis of evidence in the filing of court cases (MAL)

9. **Ensure due diligence in monitoring breeding facilities and zoos to prevent the laundering of illegally caught wildlife into the legal trade (Chapter 3.2)**

10. **Strengthen the management and regulation of private zoos and living collections of wildlife** by developing improved policies and regulations together with the relevant departments and agencies, NGOs, the academe, animal welfare groups etc. (VIE)

11. **Explore joining the World Port Sustainability Program of the International Association of Port and Harbors**, which rewards ports adhering to certain standards and striving to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals (INO)

12. **Establish a National Wildlife Crime Forensic Science Unit and Laboratory at the DENR-BMB and accreditation to ISO17025** to align with International Standards and ensure there is legally admissible evidence for prosecutions, implementing the standards and guidelines prepared by the **Society of Wildlife Forensic Sciences**.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Task Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Develop a Quality Manual for operations within the wildlife forensics laboratory;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Become compliant with the IS017025 Quality Management System for scientific testing; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Become accredited under the IS017025 Quality Management System (THA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Institutionalize the POGI Task Force further by establishing a National IWT Steering Committee comprised of all relevant law enforcement agencies and stakeholders, meeting bi-annually to discuss challenges and find solutions (ETH)

14. Increase the agencies represented in the POGI Task Force, including among others representatives from the Department of Justice, the Philippine Postal Service and the AMLC (THA)

15. Explore the establishment of differentiated POGI Working Groups, focusing on specific technical matters and species, such as a Pangolin Working Group (THA)

16. Explore the creation of a national wildlife crime intelligence information and intelligence exchange network, including a computer-based intelligence and case management system, to efficiently exchange information and intelligence in real time among POGI and other relevant stakeholders and to efficiently coordinate the implementation of the WildLEAP (THA)

17. Establish a National Intelligence Unit to head the intelligence network (see Strategy 6.19), including representatives from all Philippine law enforcement agencies, such as the PNP, PCG, NBI, and other Bureaus (MAL, THA, Chapter 3.2)

18. Set up a designated Wildlife Intelligence Unit in DENR-BMB closely collaborating with the National Intelligence Coordinating Agency and possibly with the new National Intelligence Unit (see Strategies 6.19 and 6.20) (INO, Chapter 3.2)

19. Explore the creation of a single intelligence platform for key protected areas (NIPAS and locally managed), where IWT has been reported, to better aggregate, analyze, and manage multiple information streams on IWT (THA)

20. Create a national Joint Operations Centre, a role the future EPEB could take on, and Regional Intelligence Diffusion Units integrated into the DENR Regional Offices, to improve nation-wide intelligence gathering by all relevant law enforcement agencies to facilitate effective collaboration and cooperation on the ground and to implement the WildLEAP (BWA)

21. Establish regional or provincial POGI Task Forces, mirroring the representatives of the national Task Force at a sub-national level, thus allowing for faster, more effective, and constant enforcement activities (THA)
22. Establish a Wildlife Cybercrime Unit in DENR-BMB to manage and conduct online investigations, e.g. on social media and e-commerce platforms, if possible by using machine learning tools (MAL and Chapter 3.2)

23. Gain access to digital investigation platforms, such as Magnet Axiom, and, with the appropriate training, undertake forensic analysis of cell phone communications (MAL)

24. Rationalize and upgrade LAWIN/SMART Patrol Data Centers in large protected areas, equipped with computers, solar panels for electricity, etc., and install security surveillance system linked to a network attached storage device for areas with a high poaching intensity (THA)

25. Explore the option of Debt-for-Nature swaps, utilizing generated funds for wildlife conservation related projects (Chapter 3.2)

26. The recommendations of the WRC assessment under the DENR-ADB/GEF project should be used to guide future interventions to improve animal welfare, human safety, and WRC design (VIE)

---

### Strategy 6. Reporting, Monitoring and Evaluation, Research and Technologies

1. Conduct an economic valuation study to quantify the total value of legal and illegal wildlife trade in the Philippines (sourced from, in transit via, and shipped to the Philippines) as well as the losses incurred by the national economy due to e.g. undervaluation of legal trade and IWT taking place (INO, THA)

2. Include information on the origin and planned destination (city and country) of intercepted illegal wildlife/wildlife products in the DENR-BMB confiscation database (Chapter 3.2)

3. Generate detailed profiles on known traders and their networks for law enforcement action (VIE)

4. Conduct an assessment of which anti-poaching technologies have been deployed where with which results to detect possible gaps and to determine which additional tools might be needed, which is particularly crucial in remote areas that are difficult to access and cannot be guarded all the time (MAL)

5. Explore the set-up of a cloud-based geospatial platform to integrate data and information concerning protected area planning and enforcement, in order to inform protected area management, enhance zoning processes, and help in coordinating enforcement operations by systematically organizing information from patrolling reports, observations, and illegal activities (CAM)
6. **Assess LAWIN and determine what works well and which components may need improvements**, based on the feedback from enforcers on the ground (INO)

7. **Collect data on the equipment needs of wildlife law enforcers** and provide equipment required (VIE)

8. **Register the genetic coding of wild and captive-bred species requiring particular protection**, i.e. considered threatened under CITES and/or in the national DAOs, **in a DNA Database**, to reduce the risk of illegally wild-caught species to be laundered into the legal trade (THA)

9. **Conduct baseline surveys on the Top10 species in the Philippines threatened by IWT**, by collecting data on the poaching hotspots, methods of concealment, trade flows, nationalities involved etc., **enabling the development of proper species protection and counter-IWT strategies**, such as the drafting of a National Pangolin Recovery Plan (MAL and VIE)

10. **Set up a national monitoring system for priority species**, possibly under the ERDB, **complementary to the e-CITES system**, to provide data on levels of trade, population numbers, distribution etc. (ZAF)

11. **Conduct research on wildlife population sizes, distribution and habitat use, hotspots and threats, and migration pathways**, complemented by health assessments of the viability of populations, **to combat IWT, inform land use planning, and prevent domestic animal wildlife diseases** (AFG)

12. **Synthesize information for key species**, such as nesting for marine turtles, in the last five years, identify and verify poaching threats based on this data, and address these effectively (THA)

13. **Compile, document and review biodiversity conservation related interventions in protected areas via a respective database** (INO)

14. **Create and publish factsheets for each NIPAS site**, including GPS points, species habitats covered, conservation interventions done, project partners, and a brief description of the protected area **and upload for public access** (INO)

15. **Focus on detecting smuggled agricultural products** as one cog-wheel to secure the integrity of human health (AFG)

16. **Prepare a comprehensive assessment framework for the periodic monitoring of legal and illegal wildlife trade markets**, including suitable approaches to collect relevant information; frequency of subsequent, periodic assessment exercises; and identification of government staff participating in the assessment process (AFG)

17. **Conduct a nationwide market survey on traditional medicine outlets and pet shops to determine the scale of IWT**, particularly concerning African elephant ivory and rhino horn (MAL)
18. Conduct in-depth investigations into shops selling Traditional Chinese Medicine to assess if illegal product components were used as ingredients (VIE)

19. Develop a DNA sequence database for threatened species implicated in IWT in the Philippines (listed under CITES and in the national DAOs), for determining the origin of the seized wildlife, its parts and derivatives (THA)

20. Set up a functional quarterly reporting mechanism for WRCs (WRCs->DENR Regional Offices->DENR-BMB) and an annual audit of WRCs conducted by DENR-BMB national staff (ETH)

21. Develop governance guidelines for stakeholder engagement to determine responsibilities and accountability of community members in combating IWT, e.g. including members’ bill of rights, definitions of roles, and mechanisms for financial and procedural compliance (ZAF)

22. Introduce performance measures to evaluate the success of repatriations (Chapter 3.2)

23. Understand the impacts of road expansion by mapping the (proposed) roads with the distribution of key species in the area, and draft recommendations to mitigate road development impacts and to reduce poaching in that area (INO)

24. Use the results of the ICCWC for designing follow-up interventions to address the gaps that were identified (Chapter 3.2)

25. Conduct follow-up wildlife seizure analyses when data on IWT is submitted from DENR Regional Offices and other regional and/or local law enforcement offices, to better understand the roles of (under-represented) regions in IWT in the country (Chapter 3.2)
6. Stocktaking of Projects combating IWT in selected AMS II: The IWT Project Map and Database for Donor Coordination

Information on past and present counter-IWT projects is essential to facilitate donor coordination, guide investment and funding decisions, assist in project design, and strengthen transboundary and inter-organizational cooperation. Although IWT maps exist, these depict poaching events and confiscations, or counter-IWT projects at an aggregated level, making it difficult to obtain detailed information on individual projects. To date, there have been very few assessments and analyses of initiatives and projects on combating IWT in Southeast Asia. The two most fitting assessments in that regard are the USAID report *Counter Wildlife Trafficking Initiatives Reference Guide* (2017), which provides a description of general project areas of different organizations with a focus on Cambodia, Lao PDR, the PRC, Thailand and Viet Nam, and the report that the World Bank published in 2016, *Analysis of International Funding to Tackle Illegal Wildlife Trade*. This dearth of information complicates the design of new projects, as a significant amount of time is spent on research and on compiling data on which activities were covered by previous projects, project locations, project partners etc. This information is essential, however, to allocate the already scarce resources at hand in the best possible manner, which can be only done with the best possible data at hand. Only then, can it be ensured that our unique wildlife can and will be protected efficiently and within the narrowing time frame that we have to save these species from overexploitation – and thus from extinction.

6.1. Objective

Knowing in detail about the counter-IWT projects that were and are currently implemented in the world’s main IWT hotspots is essential. Only with an appropriate knowledge base on IWT interventions can benefits unfold. The sharing of project details and best-practices allows project developers to propose proper counter-IWT activities, factor in risks, avoid duplications, and invest scare resources efficiently. It also allows for future projects to put the lessons learned from their predecessors to good use, and opens up a possibility to network with practitioners and organizations involved in that very project site and/or with that very project focus. Thus, the second objective of this report is to facilitate donor coordination, inform project design, and guide investment decisions for future counter-IWT projects in Southeast Asia.

6.2. Methodology

Almost all national-level counter-IWT projects that were identified under Chapter 5.3.1, notwithstanding their relevance for replication in the Philippines, were recorded in an Excel file, by listing Country, Project Title, Project Description, Project Sites, Project Start, Project End, Project Funding in USD, Type of Funding, Project Partners, Project Range, Latitude, and Longitude. Initially, projects were mapped with Google My Maps, however, this option did not
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48 Results of the report are graphically also presented at: [https://www.appsolutelydigital.com/WildLife/](https://www.appsolutelydigital.com/WildLife/)
provide a search or sort function in the form of a database, and restricted the project presentation to the map. Taking this into consideration, as well as the objective to scale up this endeavor from the Southeast Asian region to the global scale beyond the project timeline, a website was developed to make the tool publicly accessible and allow for an easy navigation. The website embedded the IWT Project Map and Database, which is a custom-made plug-in that caters to the needs of project designers and managers. Project information recorded was based on, but not limited to, the counter-IWT projects that were analyzed in the previous chapter. Main databases used were the GEF and the USAID database, and these were complemented with information from websites, project factsheets, project documents, and personal conversations. The website was launched on May 25, 2021, wherein numerous donor and implementing organizations participated. Before and after the launch, organizations were contacted with the request to verify the project information already collected for their respective organizations, as well as to add projects that might have been missed. It is important to highlight that the IWT Project Map and Database is a “living tool”, as new counter-IWT would be added to the map on a continuous basis. A hybrid model is envisioned in deploying administrative staff consisting of representatives from some of the featured organizations, who use the backend of the website to record new projects. In order to do this, it is considered important to institutionalize an annual voluntary sharing mechanism of new project information, e.g. via MOUs or a dedicated platform. This could be achieved, among others, by anchoring the website in a coordination mechanism or consortium of organizations involved in combating IWT.

Website
- The **Homepage** gives an overview of the rationale behind this endeavor and the significance of donor coordination.
- The **Illegal Wildlife Trade** website gives a definition of IWT and provides some background information on IWT. In addition, it presents best practices in selected countries, citing examples from the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, and Viet Nam. The Philippine best practice write up includes information on the DENR-ADB/GEF IWT project and links to the ADB e-learn page.
- The **IWT Project Map and Database** website is the core site and offers visitors a map with the recorded counter-IWT projects in SEA. Each marker opens up a pop-up window once clicked upon and offers information on the project, such as a project description, project sites, partners, and funding. Below the map is a database that is linked to the map. It displays the same content, but in a different format, as visitors can use the search function to search for country, species etc. or sort by column. Furthermore, the project title of each project is clickable, opening a pop-up that displays the details of the project. A sub-navigational menu links to this IWT in the Philippine-Southeast Asian Nexus Report and includes information on the Methodology.
- The **Global Initiatives** website gives an overview over initiatives and campaigns that are broad in scope and were thus not taken up in the IWT Project Map and Database. These initiatives are equally important to bring actors together from various organizations, to build alliances across sectors and countries, and to share lessons learned.
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This website was developed by the Consultant to utilize the data collected and to make it publicly accessible and searchable. It can be accessed at [https://illegalwildlifetradeprojects.org/](https://illegalwildlifetradeprojects.org/)
The **Resources** website links to some of the most relevant publications on IWT in the region and beyond and is a helpful repository for practitioners. At the bottom, the website also lists Other Project Mapping Tools.

The **Contact** website gives visitors the opportunity to leave comments via a contact form and/or to provide additional information on projects that are already mapped or on new projects to be included in the IWT Project Map and Database.

**Project Selection**

A project was included when the project title and/or the project description referred to IWT, poaching, hunting⁵⁰, or when SMART, enforcement, patrols, “no-kill zones”, illegal activities, or emergency responses for injured animals were interpreted to be related to IWT. If a project had several phases, and at least one phase included anti-poaching activities, then all previous or subsequent phases were included. All projects that were completed in or after 2015 were included. If project phases existed that were implemented before 2015, these were mentioned in the project description. The limitations listed in Chapter 5.2 equally apply to this project selection.

A project was not included when, despite promoting wildlife conservation, the focus was another than IWT, such as reducing human-wildlife conflict or encroachment leading to retaliatory killings, population assessments, etc. Projects addressing illegal fisheries were not included. Further not included were projects improving natural resources and biodiversity in general, either without IWT or with IWT as one component, as it was not possible to ascertain whether, and if so, which percentage of that funding had been allocated to combat IWT. Further excluded were large counter-IWT projects that did not provide disaggregated information on the countries they were implemented in and/or the funding that accompanied the interventions. Examples are projects that span two or more continents, e.g. the $4M UNDP/GEF project “Reducing Maritime Trafficking between Africa and Asia”, the “Coalition to End Wildlife Trafficking Online” project, or the UNODC-World Customs Organization Container Control Program. Some of these were taken up under “Global Initiatives”. Projects for the sole purpose of financing conference organization and participation, workshops, and the drafting of reports were also not included. As stated above, projects that ended before the year 2015 were not included.

**IWT Project Map**

Each project is indicated by a marker at the respective project site, with the option to open a pop-up window to present detailed project information. Different marker colors categorize the projects as National, National – Additional Project Sites, Regional, Regional – Additional Project Sites, International, and International – Additional Project Sites. The category “National – Additional Project Sites” was applied when a project was implemented in more than one project site. The categories Regional – Additional Project Sites and International – Additional Project Sites were used whenever a project that was implemented in several countries also had several implementation sites within one of these participating countries, e.g. a project implemented in Viet Nam and Thailand, with implementation in Hanoi and in Ho Chi Minh City in Viet Nam. In
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⁵⁰ Hunting may also point to hunting for subsistence purposes, however, this distinction could often not be made based on the project description only.
the rare case only an approximate area was given as a project site in the source document, e.g. “in the southern landscape” of a country, an estimate was made where to place the marker based on the project description and locations of other projects. Project descriptions were for the most part taken from the databases used.

For projects with several phases, the description was taken from the most recent phase. When no project sites were apparent from the project title or the description, projects were allocated to the national level with the marker placed in the capital of the respective country, as were projects that had a clear nation-wide scope. In case regional/international projects were just listed for one country, but the project description mentioned other countries that participated, regional/international markers with the same project information were also added for the other countries mentioned.

**IWT Project Database**

Each marker on the map has a corresponding entry in the IWT Project Database. Only unique national projects are included in the database. For regional/international projects that were recorded for each participating country with the same information, projects are listed both in the map and in the database. As stated above, additional regional and additional international project sites were only listed in the map. The Database also contains a search function, which allows searching for key words, such as “rhino”, or for organizations, such as “ADB”. Results can also be sorted by column, e.g. from A to Z and vice versa, and a pagination at the bottom of the table indicates the total number of entries as well as the number of pages displaying the results of the search. In addition, the project title of each project is clickable, which opens a pop-up window that displays the more detailed project information. The following attributes were chosen as table headers:

- **Country:** This is the country the project was implemented in. Projects classified as Regional or International were implemented in several countries, a list of which can be found under Project Sites of each project, and are therefore listed with the same regional/international project information for each country involved.

- **Project Title:** This column displays the project title, which opens a pop-up window once clicked to provide more information on the project, such as a project description. For projects that were implemented in phases and/or used different grants, the most recent project title and description was used, with previous phases and/or grants listed at the bottom of the description.

- **Project Start and Project End:** This signifies the time period when the project was implemented. The database contains projects that were completed in or after 2015. For projects that were similar in scope and project site, and thus implemented in phases, but were not implemented continuously, e.g. 2014-2016 and 2017-2019, the implementation period also covers the time in-between, here 2014-2019, as long as the next project phase was continued in the following calendar year.

- **Project Partners:** The project partners listed here include the donor and the implementing organizations. It was not distinguished between these two categories, as mostly the funding information available did not include co-financing and thus rendered it
difficult to make an informed decision. Government partners are not listed, as it is often one single Department that is designated to lead counter-IWT projects in each country. Mostly, these are the CITES Management Authorities, which are listed here.

- **Project Range**: The project range can be classified as National, Regional, or International, whereas Regional indicates that the countries involved in the implementation of the project belonged to one region as defined by the United Nations Statistics Division (see listing and Figure 35). Project implementation in more than one region was classified as International.

![Figure 35. United Nations geographical sub-regions, Source: Arnold, based on UNSTATS, n.d.](image)

- **Project Funding in USD**: Please refer to the section below on Project Funding.
- **Type of Funding**: The type of funding refers to the recorded “Project Funding in USD” and specifies which type of funding these figures represent. It distinguishes between multilateral and bilateral funding, as well as between Total Project Cost (TPC), which includes the grants, co-financing and administrative costs, and Grant, including only the grant provided by the agency listed in brackets without an indication of leveraged funds.
- **“N/A”**: Signifies that this information has not yet been made available.

**Project Funding**: Funding information was most easily procured for projects funded by multilateral and bilateral donors, and was more difficult to identify for international conservation NGOs. The project funding listed for GEF-funded projects is identical to the Total Project Cost, including the grant, co-financing, and administrative fees. The two main bilateral donors, USAID and UK Defra, both confirmed to list only their grants, without including additional leveraged financing. Information on funding from USAID was gathered from its funding databases.
With assistance from USAID and Guidehouse staff, the following process was identified to obtain the correct funding figures:

- Download data as .csv file per selected AMS from the ForeignAssistance.gov database at: https://foreignassistance.gov/
- Hide all columns, except the following: E, I, J, K, L, O, Q, R, V, AG, AH
- Sort by “Transaction - U.S. Foreign Assistance Sector Name” (AG) (first level)
- Hide all rows except “Natural Resources”
- Sort by “Award Title” (second level)
- Sort by “Award Identifier” (third level)
- Identify all award IDs for one project – disregard the 632a/b ones as they are internal transactions from USAID to DOI except if only 632a/b results
- Identify latest “Transaction Date” (V) for each award ID
- Identify corresponding “Award - Total Economic Value” (O)
- If only one ID for a project, use that value or, if several award IDs for one project, sum up the Total Economic Values (latest dates for all award IDs for that project)

This resulted in disaggregated USAID project funding figures for projects funded and/or managed by USAID. It should be further noted that, for on-going projects, the Total Estimated Value is not final, yet. Information on the funding for UK Defra was gathered from the IWT Challenge Fund Summary File. An official request was sent to the UK government on the IWT Challenge Fund funding figures to enquire if these equally only represent bilateral grants without any indication of co-financing, which was confirmed.

When a listed project contained different phases that were recorded, the funding of the indicated phases was added up. Funding for project phases that ended before 2015 was only included, if that very project had been on-going in subsequent years, e.g. Phase 1 = 2012-2014, Phase 2 = 2015-2017. If the funding amount was given in another currency than USD, a currency converter was used to convert it.

For regional and international projects, only the total regional/international funding was recorded as opposed to disaggregated funding per country, as these figures were available for only a few regional/international projects. In a few instances where the total funding was not available, the funding of the countries involved in that project was summarized. For calculation purposes, each regional/international project should be included only once, which requires the subtraction of duplicates (based on Project Title) for both categories (see Chapter 6.3).

6.3. Results

In the selected AMS, 252 unique counter-IWT projects that were completed in 2015 or after have been implemented at the national level (see Table 1). The term “unique” accounts for the fact that national projects are implemented in several project sites, and regional and international projects are implemented in several countries, but each project should be counted
only once in the calculations. As an example, 48 markers were placed in the map for Cambodia with 37 unique projects and 11 additional project sites at the national level. Most unique national-level projects have been implemented in Indonesia (60), followed by Cambodia (37), and Viet Nam (35). Only 10 unique national-level Projects have been implemented in the Philippines, and none have been implemented in Brunei Darussalam and in Singapore so far. A total of 15 unique projects have been implemented at the regional level, and 27 unique projects at the international level. Indonesia (6), Thailand (6), and Viet Nam (5) have been the countries included most often in regional projects, and Viet Nam (16) and Lao PDR (10) have the best track record in being part of international projects. One reason may be that both countries share a border with the PRC, and many projects focused on demand reduction and reducing transboundary IWT flows between the PRC and both countries.

Table 1. Number of counter-IWT projects implemented in selected AMS completed from 2015 onwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National all sites*</th>
<th>National unique Database</th>
<th>Regional/country Map and Database</th>
<th>Regional unique Calculated</th>
<th>Intl./country Calculated</th>
<th>Intl. unique Calculated</th>
<th>TOTAL No. of projects per country**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL No. of projects per category</strong></td>
<td><strong>252</strong></td>
<td><strong>189</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>47</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>266</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* National Unique + National Additional Sites
** National Unique + Regional/country + International/country

The information from the IWT Project Map and Database can equally be used to assess the type of interventions, such as allocating project activities to the 25 techniques of situational crime prevention adapted to wilderness problems (Lemieux and van der Ploeg, 2020), or to categorize projects by the species/taxonomic groups protected. Table 2 shows the number of counter-IWT projects for selected AMS that focus on specific taxonomic groups protected. The coloring facilitates the interpretation of the values (see the legend below the table). The table shows that Indonesia implements a high number of projects to protect tigers (10), elephants (11), and rhinos (11), and that Thailand has the highest number of projects protecting tigers (13) among all selected AMS. Projects focusing on pangolins are underrepresented (15), as well as projects focusing on the protection of these specific taxonomic groups in the Philippines (1). The highest total number of projects for all selected AMS focuses on the protection of tigers (39).
Table 2. Number of unique national-level counter-IWT projects per selected taxonomic group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tiger</th>
<th>Elephant</th>
<th>Rhino</th>
<th>Pangolin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the most important indicators to be derived from the information in the IWT Project Map and Database is the project funding, which is based on unique projects only to avoid double-counting. The total funding recorded for unique national-level projects implemented in selected AMS amounts to $502,622,340 (see Table 3). The Type of Project Funding recorded were exclusively multilateral and bilateral grants. Of this, most of the national-level funding was allocated to Indonesia ($179M), followed by Lao PDR ($81.2M) and Malaysia ($74.9M) and least funding was allocated to Viet Nam ($17.0M). Brunei Darussalam and Singapore did not receive any funding for counter-IWT projects at the national and international level (see Table 1). The low funding figure for Viet Nam seems unusual, as 35 unique national-level projects were recorded to have been implemented in Viet Nam, however, the figure could be explained by the small funding amounts allocated per project, with the average amount remaining quite low (median = $83,677) and only two large projects ($3.3M and $9.9M). However, Viet Nam was the country involved most in the implementation of counter-IWT projects at the international level (16 projects), which is assumed to contribute significantly to funding in the country and to the scope and impact of projects implemented. The total funding for unique counter-IWT projects at the regional level amounts to $6.6M, and the funding for unique counter-IWT projects at the international level to $203.4M.

Table 3. Funding of counter-IWT projects in selected AMS completed from 2015 onwards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National unique</th>
<th>Regional unique</th>
<th>International unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>59,409,468</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>178,699,502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>81,177,759</td>
<td>6,598,612</td>
<td>203,410,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>74,930,020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>26,734,248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>64,680,471</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>16,990,872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>502,622,340</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,598,612</strong></td>
<td><strong>203,410,130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, funding for projects combating IWT seems to be on the rise. From the GEF-6 to the GEF-7 funding cycle, GEF increased its funding from $131M to $168M (GEF, 2018). Moreover, the $131M GWP launched in 2015 helped mobilize an additional $704M in co-financing from governments, multilateral and bilateral donors, GEF agencies, the private sector, foundations, and civil society for counter-IWT projects worldwide (GEF, 2018). In 2016, the GWP released a review of international donor funding channeled into combating IWT in Africa and Asia, which yielded a result of $1.3B committed by 24 international donors between 2010 and 2016, equaling approximately $190M per year (The World Bank, 2016). This included the funding of 1,105 projects in 60 different countries and various regional and global projects, with 29% ($381M) of the funds going to Asia, 6% ($81M) to global programs and initiatives, and 2% ($35M) to projects covering both Africa and Asia (The World Bank, 2016). However, it is crucial to ensure that these funds will reach the organizations working on the ground, and will not disappear on the path from disbursement to action. Galster (2021) criticizes that 60-70% of the funds remain with large development companies and that funds are often paid out late, severely impacting operations on the ground and forcing NGO-workers to bankroll the funds. The focus thus does not only have to be on the acquisition of funds, but also on the distribution of those and on the minimization of overhead and administrative costs.

The total number of project partners amounts to 75 organizations that were involved in counter-IWT projects in the region. As stated above in the Methodology, it was not feasible to distinguish between donors and implementers, seeing that the funding data available is mostly presented without any indications of co-financing. It can thus not be determined if an organization was merely an implementer or also co-financed a project. Therefore, Table 4 lists and categorizes organizations that were identified in the context of this assessment as “Project Partners”.

Table 4. Project Partners recorded in the assessment per category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International NGOs/Charities/Foundations/Funds</th>
<th>Regional and local NGOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Alliance of Religions and Conservation</td>
<td>1. The Australian Orangutan Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fauna and Flora International</td>
<td>5. Endangered Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. FREELAND Foundation</td>
<td>7. Indo-Myanmar Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Health in Harmony</td>
<td>8. Katala Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. International Rhino Foundation</td>
<td>11. Persatuan Penyelidik Rimba Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Panthera, Inc.</td>
<td>12. Planet Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TRAFFIC International</td>
<td>14. Taman Safari Indonesia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Wildlife Conservation Society</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. WildAid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Wild Earth Allies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Wildlife Alliance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral Donors</td>
<td>International Organizations/ Unions/ Conventions/ Work Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. German Development Cooperation</td>
<td>1. ASEAN Centre for Biodiversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. UK Centre for Environment, Fisheries and Aquaculture Science</td>
<td>2. CITES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs</td>
<td>3. EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. IWT Challenge Fund</td>
<td>4. INTERPOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Darwin Initiative</td>
<td>5. IUCN SSC Pangolin Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. U.S. Department of the Interior</td>
<td>7. UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td>8. UNEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. U.S. Government - Department of Justice</td>
<td>9. UNODC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. U.S. Government - Peace Corps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multilateral Development Banks</th>
<th>Consulting Firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. The World Bank</td>
<td>2. Chemonics International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Development Alternatives, Inc. Global</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. RTI International</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academe, Institutes, and Think Tanks</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Lancaster Environment Centre</td>
<td>10. University of Vinh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Lancaster University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Looking forward: The Path ahead

It is hoped that the recommendations for potential counter-IWT activities in the Philippines may guide the country’s efforts in combating IWT in the future, and that these can become embedded into the national framework e.g. during the planned review of the WildLEAP in 2022/23. Even though the country has made great efforts to curb illicit wildlife-related activities, there are challenges that remain and need to be addressed in order for IWT to be discouraged from the start and for the rate of detection of smuggled items to further increase.

Although the recommendations listed in Chapter 5.5 pertain specifically to the Philippines, they may be equally of interest and relevant to other countries, as the proposed activities can form the basis for a review of current efforts in combating IWT. This stocktaking of projects should be further complemented by other efforts to reduce IWT, such as national, regional, and international campaigns, agreements, baseline research, efficient enforcement, the development of tools and resources etc. A good listing of social and behavior change campaigns for some AMS and the PRC is published in the USAID Wildlife Asia Counter Wildlife Trafficking Digest Series for Southeast Asia and the PRC, with the latest issue published in 2021, covering the period from January to December, 2020 (USAID and MCR Society, 2021). The Digest also includes information on trade routes/hotspots, seizures, and prosecutions with regard to the IWT of pangolins, tigers, elephants, and rhinos. Additional investigative tools, techniques and resources, electronic platforms, training materials etc. to combat IWT are presented in the report Tools and Resources to Combat Illegal Wildlife Trade, published by the Global Wildlife Program.

Seeing the inter-connectedness of countries worldwide and the transboundary nature of IWT, it is hoped that the IWT Project Map and Database can be further populated. To obtain a more comprehensive picture of counter-IWT activities, it is recommended to expand the assessment from SEA to cover countries on a global scale. First efforts to this effect have already been undertaken. As shown in Chapter 6.3, it is hoped that the data can encourage further analyses, either by species, by country, by area of intervention, by protected area etc. Most importantly, this cannot be successful as a one-sided effort only, but instead requires the collaboration of all organizations involved in combating IWT. As a “living tool”, the IWT Project Map and Database is equipped to continuously add projects, leading to the repository of information needed in order to make the best decisions possible. It is crucial to understand that the tool is only as strong as the data it contains. It is therefore envisioned and recommended to institutionalize the administration of the database, possibly via a global donor hub and/or Secretariat. This would facilitate creating an annual voluntary reporting mechanism for organizations combating IWT, and allow for the data to be continuously updated. An annual report could inform about the latest trends and present an analysis of collected data. This form of cooperation would ensure that the latest information on counter-IWT projects is available to all relevant stakeholders, and that funding is directed to where it is needed most.
ADB’s funding capability, credibility, and network provide an excellent basis for continued engagement in combating IWT in the region. Close collaboration should be sought with like-minded international organizations and NGOs working in SEA, who can share expertise and lessons learned. Even though IWT has traditionally not been a core area of work for the Bank, the interconnectedness of stable wildlife populations to more conventional topics, such as poverty alleviation and livelihoods, sustainable development, and human health is undeniable. Steering investments towards the very parameters that can determine groundbreaking changes in the entire landscape of development assistance is essential as it means funding activities that act as catalyzers and thus have the most impact. IWT is an underestimated field of work in that regard. Apart from the necessary investments, combating and vanquishing IWT will require more sustained efforts still, and we are racing against time: It will require humanity to recalibrate its perspective on human-nature interaction, acknowledge the interconnectedness and the fragility of ecosystems, and to question gridlocked lifestyles. Hopefully, this will make people reconsider the elements they deem inevitable for their survival. And hopefully, this will lead to the right prioritization, which will allow humanity to pursue a balance between its desires and the natural resources available – and thus to reverse population declines and halt extinction.
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Annexes

Annex 1. Detailed Implementation Steps of the ICCWC Tools in selected AMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMS</th>
<th>Implementation Steps for Analytical Toolkit</th>
<th>Indicator Framework</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BRU</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAM</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INO</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAO</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAL</td>
<td>- X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHI</td>
<td>X X X*</td>
<td>- X (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIN</td>
<td>- X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THA</td>
<td>- X</td>
<td>- X (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIE</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Philippines published the Wildlife Law Enforcement Action Plan (WildLEAP) in 2019, which presents a roadmap from 2018-2028 on combating IWT. The Analytical Toolkit assessment was thus considered repetitive and was deferred to the years 2022/23.
### Annex 2. ROUTES Country Profile Map for selected AMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMS</th>
<th>No. of Trafficking Incidents</th>
<th>Country Enforcement Index</th>
<th>Top cities/airports for IWT seizures</th>
<th>Top routes</th>
<th>Year with most recorded wildlife seizures</th>
<th>Goods that were part of trafficking instances</th>
<th>Method/s of trafficking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>No data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

51 Here define as “unique interdiction of wildlife or wildlife products”.
52 Here defined as “singular incident of wildlife trafficking through a country, whether or not it was stopped (i.e. a country that makes few seizures may still have a high trafficking instance count”).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AMS</th>
<th>No. of Trafficking Incidents</th>
<th>Country Enforcement Index</th>
<th>Top cities/airports for IWT seizures</th>
<th>Top routes</th>
<th>Year with most recorded wildlife seizures</th>
<th>Goods that were part of trafficking instances</th>
<th>Method/s of trafficking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMS</td>
<td>No. of Trafficking Incidents</td>
<td>Country Enforcement Index</td>
<td>Top cities/airports for IWT seizures</td>
<td>Top routes</td>
<td>Year with most recorded wildlife seizures</td>
<td>Goods that were part of trafficking instances</td>
<td>Method/s of trafficking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Singapore, Singapore</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>1. 2017</td>
<td>1. Reptiles</td>
<td>14.3% Air freight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Jakarta, Indonesia - Singapore</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. 2013</td>
<td>2. Ivory</td>
<td>7.1% Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>1. Bangkok</td>
<td>1. Nairobi, Kenya - Bangkok, Thailand</td>
<td>1. Reptiles</td>
<td>59.6% Checked luggage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Bangkok, Thailand -&gt; Chennai, India</td>
<td></td>
<td>9% Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>1. Hanoi</td>
<td>1. Bangkok, Thailand - Hanoi, Viet Nam</td>
<td>1. Rhino horn</td>
<td>41.3% Checked luggage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ho Chi Minh City</td>
<td>2. Nairobi, Kenya - Hanoi, Viet Nam</td>
<td>2. Ivory</td>
<td>35.0% Air freight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Nha Trang</td>
<td>3. Paris, France - Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5% Passenger clothing/items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Da Nang</td>
<td>4. Ho Chi Minh City, Viet Nam -&gt; Hanoi, Viet Nam</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3% Mail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0% Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Database accessed on 16 December 2020
### Annex 3. Funding and Implementing Agencies of Global Wildlife Program projects in selected AMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Co-financing</th>
<th>IA</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism Project</td>
<td>$4,422,020</td>
<td>$57,580,000</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Cambodia (IDA and GEF-7 for additional financing (here included))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Species in Indonesia</td>
<td>$6,988,853</td>
<td>$44,948,742</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Indonesia (GEF-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and enhance protection of iconic wildlife in Malaysia</td>
<td>$7,139,450</td>
<td>$66,175,644</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Malaysia (GEF-7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines</td>
<td>$1,834,862</td>
<td>$1,325,757</td>
<td>ADB</td>
<td>Philippines (GEF-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade, Focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand</td>
<td>$4,018,440</td>
<td>$27,809,379</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>Thailand (GEF-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Endangered Wildlife in Viet Nam</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
<td>$10,200,000</td>
<td>WB</td>
<td>Viet Nam (GEF-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,403,625</strong></td>
<td><strong>$208,039,522</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4. Global Wildlife Program partner countries and their projects used for the stocktaking assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Species Focus</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>GEF Implementing Agency</th>
<th>GEF Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Afghanistan*   | Conservation of Snow Leopards and Their Critical Ecosystem in Afghanistan    | Snow leopards and Marco polo sheep | - Landscape approach for conservation and promotion of conservation-compatible land uses and livelihood improvement  
- Analysis of snow leopard ecology including impacts of climate change  
- Assessment and mitigation of Human-Snow Leopard conflict  
- Improved government capacity to combat illegal wildlife trade  
- Knowledge management, education and outreach to promote snow leopard conservation and trade reduction | UNDP                     | $2.7M              |
| Botswana*      | Managing the Human-Wildlife Interface to Sustain the Flow of Agro-Ecosystem Services and Prevent Illegal Wildlife Trafficking and in the Kgalagadi and Ghanzi Drylands | Lions, cheetahs, wild dogs     | - Recognition and management of conservation areas for protecting wildlife migratory corridors  
- Community rangeland management and pastoral production practices  
- Strengthening of institutional and community capacity for implementing landscape planning and integrated sustainable management  
- Establishment of value chains and ecotourism businesses  
- Development and implementation of National strategy for combating wildlife crime | UNDP                     | $6M               |
| Cambodia       | Sustainable Landscape and Ecotourism                                         | N/A                            | - Strengthen protected management  
- Improve enabling environment for ecotourism and conservation-compatible | World Bank               | $4.4 M             |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Species Focus</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>GEF Implementing Agency</th>
<th>GEF Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ethiopia* | Enhanced Management and Enforcement of Ethiopia’s Protected Areas Estate       | Elephants and big cats                      | • Development of protected area management plans, support initial implementations, building management capacities and operational systems  
  • Integrated Landscape management (value chains for forestry and agro-biodiversity products, microcredit schemes for local communities, agreements for access/use of natural resources)  
  • Strengthen law enforcement and IWT legislation (international cooperation, strengthen national IWT committee and task forces and Environmental crime unit, management system for confiscated wildlife products & live animals)  
  • Information campaign to increase public knowledge and responsiveness | UNDP                                  | $7.3M |
| Indonesia | Combating Illegal and Unsustainable Trade in Endangered Species in Indonesia | Sumatran and Javan Rhinoceros, Sumatran Tiger, Asian Elephant and Sunda Pangolin, Sunda | • Strengthen national frameworks to reduce IWT (Policies and legislation; improve implementation of CITES; operationalize a National Wildlife Crime Taskforce)  
  • Economic assessments to quantify the value of legal and IWT and its impacts on the national economy  
  • Develop institutional capacity for | UNDP                                  | $7M  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Species Focus</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>GEF Implementing Agency</th>
<th>GEF Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kenya*  | Combating Poaching and Illegal Wildlife Trafficking in Kenya through an Integrated Approach | Elephants, rhinos, buffaloes, giraffe | - Establishment and support to Community Wildlife Conservancies  
- Develop and implement Ecosystem Management Plans for Tsavo and Maasai Mara ecosystems through participatory approaches  
- Management agreements for Transfrontier Conservation Areas  
- Interagency community wildlife security hub and anti-poaching task force established  
- National strategy to combat poaching and illegal wildlife trade | UNDP | $3.8M |
| Malaysia | Building institutional and local capacities to reduce wildlife crime and enhance protection of iconic wildlife in | Tigers and orangutans | - Strengthen institutional capacities to combat wildlife crime and reduce poaching of iconic wildlife species at the national level  
- Conserve the Malayan tiger and its habitats in the Malaysian Peninsula  
- Conserve the Bornean Orangutan and its habitats in the protected areas of | UNDP | $7.1M |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Species Focus</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>GEF Implementing Agency</th>
<th>GEF Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Malaysia         | Conserve the Bornean banteng and its habitats in Sabah                       | Sarawak                                    | - Implementing policy, legal, and regulatory reforms  
- Improving legal and tactical enforcement operations in targeted “hotspot” areas  
- Enhancing capacity to implement electronic CITES permitting system  
- Reducing demand for illegal wildlife products                                                                                     | ADB                     | $1.8M            |
| Philippines      | Combating Environmental Organized Crime in the Philippines                   | Elephants (demand reduction), pangolins, turtles and reptiles. | - Sustainable livelihood and community-based natural resources management (training, pilot projects, sub-grant program)  
- Integrated Management Plans for protected areas (including law enforcement and wildlife monitoring, and establishment of functional zones around protected areas)  
- Mainstreaming sustainable natural resource management practices in other economic sectors  
- Implementation of National IWT enforcement strategy (capacity development, establishment of National Wildlife Crime Enforcement Unit, detection dog units  
- International agreements between Congo, Gabon, and Cameroon for wildlife crime enforcement                                                                 | UNDP                    | $3.13M           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Species Focus</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>GEF Implementing Agency</th>
<th>GEF Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| South Africa*| Strengthening Institutions, Information Management and Monitoring to Reduce the Rate of Illegal Wildlife Trade in South Africa | Elephants, rhinos, and big cats        | • Centralized system for wildlife trade monitoring and assessment (establishment and training)  
• Establishment of Electronic permitting system for CITES listed species  
• Strengthen Environmental Monitors Program  
• Co-develop governance guidelines and project activities with target communities                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           | UNEP                   | $4.9M            |
| Thailand     | Combating Illegal Wildlife Trade, focusing on Ivory, Rhino Horn, Tiger and Pangolins in Thailand | Elephant ivory, rhinoceros horn, tiger and pangolins | • Strengthening Thailand WEN, information management and analytical capacity, and piloting an integrated approach to wildlife crime surveillance and enforcement  
• Supporting infrastructure & capacity of Wildlife Forensic Science Laboratory  
• Conducting standardized market and consumer research and targeted social and behavioral change communications to reduce demand for illegal wildlife products and support law enforcement activities  
• Strengthening coordination between organizations engaged in demand reduction and advocacy on illegal wildlife trade                                                                                                                                                                                                                  | UNDP                   | $4.02M           |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Species Focus</th>
<th>Project Focus</th>
<th>GEF Implementing Agency</th>
<th>GEF Project Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Viet Nam | Strengthening Partnerships to Protect Globally Significant Endangered Species in Viet Nam | Primates, turtles, gaurus, Edward’s pheasant; demand reduction of endangered species prioritized for protection regulated by Viet Nam including elephants, pangolins, tigers and rhinos | • Strengthen legal and regulatory framework (amendments to the articles of the Law on Biodiversity; regulatory framework for management of ex-situ wildlife conservation facilities; review the implementation of the Law on Biodiversity in tourism sector)  
• Capacity development and collaboration to implement and enforce the country’s wildlife protection laws and regulations (training & equipment’s; anti-poaching monitoring technology; Database and information sharing mechanism for improved and systematic monitoring and reporting of endangered species)  
• Conservation program for selected species  
• Coordination mechanism and regular information sharing on the status of enforcement and conservation operations agreed | World Bank | $3M |

* No AMS, but activities listed in the Project Documents of these countries were taken up in the narrative and applied to the Philippine context as they provided excellent entry points for combating IWT.
### Annex 5. CITES Management Authorities, Scientific Authorities, and Enforcement Focal Points of selected AMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CITES MA</th>
<th>CITES SA</th>
<th>CITES EFP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>Ministry of Primary Resources and Tourism&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;-Department of Forestry • Department of Forestry</td>
<td>Ministry of Primary Resources and Tourism-Department of Forestry • Department of Forestry</td>
<td>Ministry of Primary Resources and Tourism-Department of Forestry • Department of Forestry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries • Fisheries Administration Conservation Department • Experts Group on Science in CITES for species of Aquatic Resources • Forestry Administration • Expert Group on Science in CITES for Terrestrial Forest and Wildlife resources</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries-Forestry Administration • Department of Legislation and Enforcement • Department of Wildlife and Biodiversity • Wildlife Rapid Rescue Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Forestry • Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation • Directorate General of Conservation on Natural Resources and Ecosystem Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries • Directorate of Conservation and marine Biodiversity • Directorate General for Marine Spatial Management</td>
<td>Indonesian Institute of Sciences • Research Center for Biology - Cibinong Science Center • Expert Board of SKIKH</td>
<td>Directorate of Prevention and Forest Protection • Directorate General of Law Enforcement for Environment and Forestry Ministry of Marine Affairs and Fisheries • Directorate of Conservation and Marine Biodiversity • Directorate General for Marine and Fisheries Resource Surveillance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry-Department of Forestry • Wildlife and Aquatic Division</td>
<td>Ministry of Science and Technology • Biotechnology and Ecology Institute</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry • Department of Forestry Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>General Policy • Ministry of Energy and Natural Resources o Biodiversity and Forestry Management</td>
<td>Flora • Forest Research Institute Malaysia • Forestry Department of Peninsular Malaysia</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Land and Natural Resources • Biodiversity and Forestry Management Division Interpol Malaysia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>53</sup> Formerly Ministry of Industry and Primary Resources
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peninsular Malaysia, terrestrial animals</th>
<th>Marine animals</th>
<th>Philippines, except Palawan and BARMM</th>
<th>Terrestrial animals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks Peninsular Malaysia</td>
<td>• Rantau Abang – Head of Fisheries Institute (Branch)</td>
<td>Philippines, except Palawan and BARMM</td>
<td>• Sarawak Forestry Corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Federal Territory</td>
<td>o Department of Fisheries Malaysia</td>
<td>• Department of Environment and Natural Resources</td>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks Peninsular Malaysia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Penang</td>
<td>Freshwater Fish</td>
<td>• Ecosystems Research and Development Bureau</td>
<td>o Ex-Situ Conservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks, Johor</td>
<td>Turtles</td>
<td>Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Rantau Abang – Head of Fisheries Institute (Branch)</td>
<td>• Rantau Abang – Head of Fisheries Institute (Branch)</td>
<td>Philippine National Museum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forest Department Sarawak</td>
<td>o Department of Fisheries Malaysia</td>
<td>University of the Philippines - Los Baños</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sabah Wildlife Department</td>
<td>Corals, Seahorse and Sea Anemones</td>
<td>Bureau of Customs</td>
<td>• Enforce Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Fisheries Malaysia</td>
<td>• Batu Maung – Head of Fisheries Research Institute</td>
<td>Bureau of Fisheries and Aquatic Resources (BFAR)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Malaysian Timber Industry Board</td>
<td>Terrestrial animals</td>
<td>• Fisheries Regulatory and Quarantine Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Forestry Department of Peninsular Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td>National Bureau of Investigation</td>
<td>• Environmental Crime Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Department of Fisheries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sarawak Forestry Corporation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks Peninsular Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bureau of Customs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Enforcement and Security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rantau Abang – Head of Fisheries Institute (Branch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Department of Fisheries Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corals, Seahorse and Sea Anemones</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Rantau Abang – Head of Fisheries Institute (Branch)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Department of Fisheries Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Batu Maung – Head of Fisheries Research Institute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrestrial animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sarawak Forestry Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Department of Wildlife and National Parks Peninsular Malaysia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>o Ex-Situ Conservation Division</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

54 The DENR-BMB is the main official CITES Management Authority.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>National Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Palawan Council for Sustainable Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;o Manila Liaison Office&lt;br&gt;o ECAN Regulation and Enforcement Division</td>
<td><strong>College of Arts and Sciences</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Services</strong>&lt;br&gt;Palawan Council for Sustainable Development&lt;br&gt;o ECAN Regulation and Enforcement Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bangsamoro Government</strong>&lt;br&gt;BARMM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singapore</strong></td>
<td>National Parks Board – Headquarters&lt;br&gt;o Singapore Botanic Gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thailand</strong></td>
<td>Department of National Parks, Wildlife and Plant Conservation&lt;br&gt;o CITES Office&lt;br&gt;Department of Agriculture&lt;br&gt;o Office of Plant Varieties Protection-Group of the research on CITES Plants&lt;br&gt;Department of Fisheries&lt;br&gt;o Fisheries Resources Management and Measures Determination Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Viet Nam</strong></td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (Hanoi)&lt;br&gt;Southern Representative Office of CITES Management Authority (Ho Chi Minh City)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55 With the passing of the Bangsamoro Basic Law, the Bangsamoro Government will constitute another CITES Management Authority.
### Annex 6. ADB Country Codes used in the Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>ADB Country Code for Member States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>AFG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunei Darussalam</td>
<td>BRU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>CAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People’s Republic of China</td>
<td>PRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>INO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao PDR</td>
<td>LAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>MAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>PHI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>SIN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>THA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>VIE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country Name</th>
<th>Country Codes according to ISO 3166 international standard (Alpha-3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>BWA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>ETH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>KEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>COG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>ZAF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>