Terms of Reference for an evidence review and PESTLE analysis of the illegal wildlife trade in specific countries
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## Introduction

The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (The Authority) is the UK government department responsible for safeguarding our natural environment, supporting our world-leading food and farming industry, and sustaining a thriving rural economy. The Authority also helps to deliver the government’s international poverty reduction and sustainable development priorities through our breadth of international programming using Official Development Assistance (ODA).

At the 2019 UNGA Summit, the Prime Minister and Minister of State for the International Environment announced a £220m UK International Biodiversity Fund and called for urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity:

*Our planet’s rich biodiversity is under threat. As we destroy the world’s forests, we drive ever more species to extinction, we erode nature’s ability to cope with climate change and we undermine the livelihoods of millions of people. The UK recognises that we are at a tipping point and that action now is both urgent and essential.*

*Our contribution through UK aid reflects that and will help turn the tide on the environmental crisis we face.*

In recognition of the threat that the illegal wildlife trade (IWT) poses to global species and ecosystems while fuelling corruption and insecurity, the fund includes up to £30m for work to directly tackle and prevent the illegal trade in wildlife.

The UK has high ambition to tackle the international IWT reflected in obligations and commitments under a number of international forums and policy processes:

* **IWT Conference Series** commitments including in the London Declaration (2014), Kasane Statement (2015), Hanoi Statement (2016) and London Conference (2018),
* **Leaders’ Pledge for Nature** by tackling IWT throughout the supply chain and key to supporting commitments,
* **G7 commitments to tackle Illicit Threats to Nature,** within the Nature Compact, the Climate and Environment, Interior and Finance Ministers Communique.
* **Convention on Biological Diversity** **(CBD)** and work underway developing a new **Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework** with the potential inclusion of a target on IWT,
* **United Nations General Assembly** including Resolution 73/343 on Tackling illicit trafficking in wildlife,
* **Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES)**, and
* **2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development** and **Sustainable Development Goals** including a breadth of goals from the biosphere, society, economy and partnership goals.

The IWT is a complex, fast changing and varied problem, requiring a range of interventions across the supply chain that are responsive and relevant to local contexts**.** The scale and nature of the IWT varies greatly by region and country because of different drivers and influencing factors, such as community interaction, poverty, gender, as well as legislation and different markets’ characteristics. Solutions, therefore, are likely to involve diverse combinations of interventions along the supply chain and will vary between species geographical areas and other contexts.Whilst the nature of the barriers to tackling the IWT are broadly understood, e.g., lack of law enforcement capacity, lack of legal instruments. there is a need to consider the nuances of local issues to support the development of effective solutions.

For the UK to continue to respond effectively through international programming, diplomatic engagement, and other channels of action, there is a need to further develop the evidence base to understand the influencing factors and drivers of IWT and identify the opportunities where the UK is well placed to successfully act

## Background

The illegal wildlife trade (IWT) is a widespread and lucrative criminal activity causing major environmental and social harm globally. The IWT can be defined as the unlawful trade, smuggling, poaching, capture of live animals and plants, or parts and products derived from them, that does not conform with either national or international laws and regulations governing its trade, for example the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). For the purposes of this exercise this excludes Illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing, and commercial scale illegal logging. The IWT has been estimated to be worth up to [£17 billion a year](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/7662/-The_rise_of_environmental_crime_A_growing_threat_to_natural_resources_peace%2C_development_and_security-2016environmental_crimes.pdf.pdf?sequence=3&isAllowed=y)[[1]](#footnote-2). Nearly 6,000 different species of fauna and flora are impacted, with almost every country in the world playing a role in the illicit trade[[2]](#footnote-3). IWT threatens species, ecosystems, livelihoods, security, national economies and public health.

The UK is a long-standing global leader in efforts to eradicate the IWT and is a respected convener and advocate on the issue. The springboard for this was the UK’s support for the ground-breaking IWT conference series, which in London 2018 secured ambitious commitments from 65 governments across the globe to take urgent, coordinated action and has been hailed as a turning point in international efforts to tackle IWT.

To maximise impact, the UK takes a strategic approach to tackling the IWT agreed by global leaders at the IWT Conference Series. This approach is currently based on four pillars of action:

1. Eradicating the market for illegal wildlife trade
2. Ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents
3. Strengthening law enforcement
4. Providing sustainable livelihoods and development.

Across these our pillars, the UK has supported efforts to tackle IWT globally through a number of mechanisms. Through supporting interventions and innovative projects via the IWT Challenge fund that delivers on the ground to directly tackle IWT, through gathering evidence, leading internationally (e.g. Ivory Act) and through global diplomacy and political commitments, for example through the G7. A comprehensive response requires a cross Government approach, employing the tools and expertise of multiple Departments, such as the Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office, Home Office (and agencies) and Ministry of Defence, to deliver effective policy and programming interventions across IWT supply chains.

This work will provide evidence on the IWT issues within specific countries and build understanding of the key influencing factors that play out in IWT supply chains, as well as providing supporting evidence on what approaches have worked, and consider where the UK Government could focus future efforts to tackle the international IWT.

## Objective

Through this Terms of Reference (ToR), the Authority is seeking a Supplier to carry out an assessment of the IWT supply chain from the lens of key countries. A core component of this assessment will be a political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental analysis to understand to what extent these factors influence IWT supply chains in each country.

This analysis will provide a supporting evidence base for the development of future UK interventions to counter IWT, based on an accurate picture of the IWT situation in country. This includes building an understanding of transnational supply chains, best practice, opportunities, and priority of interventions.

This analysis will be focused within **Cambodia, China, Laos, Malawi, Mozambique, Nigeria, South Africa and Vietnam.** These countries have been chosen due to their interaction with known significant IWT supply chains and represent supply, transit and destination countries. These countries represent an interest for the UK in terms of recognising the scale of the issue and impact on supply chains, building the evidence base to support future engagement, including opportunities to build on existing best practice interventions, and expand on/ complement existing UK programming and engagement.

The analysis will be split into 4 workstreams to be undertaken in each country:

**Workstream 1**: Provide an overview of the IWT situation in each country, and therole of each country directly or indirectly in global IWT, through supply, transit and/or demand of illegal products. Identify the key geographical linkages through the supply chain and review the evidence relating to trends and scale of IWT.

**Workstream 2**: Provide a detailed assessment of the political, economic, social, technological, cultural, and environmental factors in country that are driving the illegal wildlife trade and the significance and scale of each factor in facilitating it.

**Workstream 3**: Identify current interventions within countries, assessing their effectiveness in delivering change (including identifying other donors and their activities), and any gaps in existing approaches.

**Workstream 4**: Building on Workstream 3, identify gaps in counter IWT interventions and outcomes, including where activities could be enhanced and expanded. Applying lessons learned from Workstream 2, assess these gaps for opportunities for future engagement, including considering: evidence of need; evidence of effectiveness; feasibility and potential constraints; impact on IWT; scalability and sustainability.

## Scope

This section sets out the detail and scope of information required under each workstream and indicative questions to frame the analysis. These questions are not exhaustive, and we welcome proposals for further questions and/or changes. The analysis should focus on providing information specific to the countries identified, however given the IWT is transnational in nature, analysis may necessarily go beyond country borders to provide evidence and assessment of IWT supply chains and regional dynamics.

Workstream 1**: Provide an overview of the IWT situation in each country, and the role of each country directly or indirectly in global IWT, through supply, transit and/or demand of illegal products. Identify the key geographical linkages through the supply chain and review the evidence relating to trends and scale of IWT**.

The Authority is seeking to understand the overall situation, bigger picture trends and dynamics with regard to IWT in, and involving, these countries, how these countries interact with transnational IWT supply chains, and the role they play regionally and internationally with respect to IWT. This will support development of the evidence base for potential future UK engagement and intervention. This information should be provided in a comparable format to assist prioritisation across countries and regions.

To include detail on;

* The scale and specifics of the IWT supply chains operating within or across these countries. Giving details of species/products and proceeds, networks and actors involved, systems used, e.g. shipping transit hubs.
* Changes in IWT trends and how they may have evolved over time, for example over the last 10 years. Capturing notable changes to trends as a result of the Covid 19 pandemic. E.g. changes of trade modality, from airfreight to shipping.
* The extent to which cross border cooperation exists with a view to combating the IWT, and what any cooperative activity looks like. e.g. legal frameworks, information sharing.
* The extent to which IWT in this country or along relevant supply chains interacts with other organised crime activities/groups. Capturing any links between IWT activity and other illicit trafficking activity, corruption, and illicit financial flows, and detailing the nature and scale of this convergence, and the key actors.

Workstream 2**: Provide a detailed assessment of the political, economic, social, technological, cultural, and environmental factors in country that are driving the illegal wildlife trade and the significance and scale of each factor in facilitating it.**

The Authority would like to understand the drivers and influencing factors that contribute to, or interact with, the IWT within countries and across supply chains and regions. This will facilitate tailored design of potential future interventions, engagement, and programming. Consideration of key factors should include detail on;

**Political - questions to consider**

* What are the political and institutional factors contributing to, influencing, or driving the IWT?
* Who are the key political actors involved in IWT policy, government departments, law enforcement, judiciary etc? What is the political will for action?
* To what extent does political stability contribute to the IWT, both in terms of scale of IWT, and appetite for action to tackle the issue?
* How does conflict or unrest within the country, or region impact on the IWT?
* What efforts are being made by key actors and governments to tackle the IWT, how effective are those efforts?
* What international commitments have these countries made to tackle the IWT, within what international frameworks? To what extent are countries ambitious with respect to international IWT engagement? How effective are they at implementing international commitments?
* To what extent is the public/civil society engaged in counter IWT activism? What activity do they undertake and what is their level of influence?

**Economic - questions to consider**

* What are the incentives for key decision makers for the prioritisation of efforts/resources to address the IWT?
* How does the private sector engage in the IWT? Who are the significant players and what is the profile of these sectors/corporations, e.g. travel, banking, goods? Is there appetite/potential for partnerships with corporations/private sector to respond to IWT?
* To what extent are drivers of IWT exacerbated by/linked to poverty or wealth, and how?
* What is the economic impact of IWT on the country’s economy, e.g. loss of gov revenue? Does economic impact affect particular sectors? Who is benefiting economically from the IWT?

**Social – questions to consider**

* What are the key social, cultural factors contributing/influencing the supply and demand of IWT?
* What level of awareness exists among the public with respect to the scale and impact of IWT in their country?
* Which groups are impacted by the IWT? How are they impacted (positively/negatively) What are the profiles of these groups?
* How do local communities where wildlife is sourced for the IWT value wildlife and biodiversity? What value does it hold?
* To what extent are local communities engaged in IWT supply chains and solutions?
* To what extent do local communities rely on wildlife resources for their livelihoods?
* How does gender play a role in actors engaged in IWT? both from the solutions perspective and the activity itself?

**Technological – questions to consider**

* What is the interaction between technological sectors and the IWT? Both in terms of the supply chains and the existing solutions? E.g. online platforms facilitating sales, and technological solutions of detect/identify IWT products such as DNA profiling.
* What opportunities/incentives barriers exist for the tech sector to support counter IWT efforts?
* What data are being collected with regards to the IWT? What is the quality of this data/reporting? How is that information being shared nationally/internationally?

**Legal – questions to consider**

* What laws/regulations exist to tackle the IWT? How are these being implemented?
* How are laws and regulations that support legal trade systems being implemented? To what extent are they seen to be effective? What are the challenges and opportunities around supporting better implementation of relevant laws?
* Is there evidence to show how effective legal frameworks have been in efforts to tackle the IWT? Have there been positive of negative consequences, i.e. displacement of trade to other species/countries?
* What level of ambition exists within countries to push for strengthened legal efforts to facilitate sustainable legal trade, and combat illegal trade? Do they support stronger controls? Have they opposed specific measures, i.e. through CITES?

**Environmental – questions to consider**

* To what extent is environment/biodiversity a priority for the countries Government?
* What species are being directly and indirectly impacted by IWT? How is this contributing to biodiversity loss in the country/region?
* What is the public perception of environmental/biodiversity matters? Are there awareness campaigns? Is local civil society engaged in these issues?

Workstream 3: **Identify current interventions within countries, assessing their effectiveness in delivering change (including identifying other donors and their activities), and any gaps in existing approaches.**

Within each country, the supplier will consider what activities and interventions exist along the following themes in relation to IWT;

* Eradicating the market for illegal wildlife trade including behaviour change
* Ensuring effective legal frameworks and deterrents
* Strengthening law enforcement, including serious and organised crime aspects
* Providing sustainable livelihoods and development, and consideration of gender and marginalised communities

This exercise should prioritise identification of interventions that align with the findings of Workstreams 1 and 2, where PESTLE factors are identified to have significant interaction or influence on the IWT. For example, if analysis of evidence in Workstream 1 & 2 suggests existing legal frameworks are weak and a poor deterrent against IWT, Workstream 3 should focus on understanding what current activities and interventions are in place to support that.

It is anticipated that this objective would consider the following questions;

* What programmes – government, donor-funded, NGO or private sector, etc – exist in the country?
* What information is available on their performance, status and likely sustainability?
* How has the global pandemic affected IWT activity? What might be the consequences of this going forward?

Workstream 4**: Building on Workstream 3, identify gaps in counter IWT interventions and outcomes, including where activities could be enhanced and expanded. Applying lessons learned from Workstream 2, assess these gaps for opportunities for future engagement, including considering: evidence of need; evidence of effectiveness; feasibility and potential constraints; impact on IWT; scalability and sustainability.**

The Authority aims is to identify outcomes and interventions in key jurisdictions which will support efforts to tackle illegal wildlife trade for the benefit of biodiversity, people and security.

By building an understanding of existing programmes and best practice through Workstream 3, the Authority would like the supplier to highlight gaps in current approach. This does not need to be limited to areas where there is a void of activity but can also consider where there may be opportunities to expand or build on existing activity.

To assist prioritisation of efforts against gaps, the Supplier will assess these based on **evidence of need and effectiveness, feasibility, and wider constraints, as well as whether the opportunities would have significant impact on IWT in the country, region or along supply chains, and whether there are prospects for scalability and sustainability of outcomes**. This aspect of the assessment will be informed by the understanding gained through Workstream 2, in particular the key influencing factors that are driving and influencing the IWT and where they might act as barriers to future interventions.

In particular this should reflect on;

* A review of the evidence to show where there are existing gaps in interventions, and where there are opportunities for new interventions or for existing interventions to be expanded upon or scaled up.
* Identification of opportunities that may exist for the UK Government to build upon current activity and strengthen existing initiatives.
* The risks/opportunities in relation to the UK engaging on IWT issues within country based on opportunities identified.

## The Recipient

The primary recipient of this exercise will be the Authority & other interested government departments, for example, the FCDO, including country offices.

## The Requirements

The Supplier must have knowledge of the IWT, experience and a track record of producing similar products on the IWT, biodiversity, development, and security issues, have existing partnerships within the countries selected for analysis or be in a position to subcontract to organisations with established in country knowledge. Other requirements include;

* Language: Reports must be written in English. Meetings with the Authority must be held in English.
* Format: Digital PDF document.
* Length: Each final report on each country totalling 20 pages maximum, with 4 distinct sections to align with the workstreams, including a summary note at the beginning giving key findings.
* Structure: Supplier to produce an initial inception report with the proposed structure and methodology for the analysis. The Authority will provide feedback before agreeing final structure. There should be four core elements to the report for each country, in line with the objectives set out. Where findings call for additional sections to be added these will be discussed and agreed with the Authority beforehand.
* Review: The Authority will endeavour to review reports in the following timescales: two weeks to review and comment on the inception report after oral presentation and three weeks to review and comment on the final written documents.
* Deadline: The Authority prefers work to have concluded within 4 months of the start date.

## Implementation requirements

It is expected that the Supplier will undertake a mixture of literature research, one-to-one interviews, and consultations, virtually or face to face with a wide variety of stakeholders including FCDO in-country Posts, government, private sector, bilateral and multilateral donors, academia, civil society, Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and communities representing a mix of international, central, regional and local levels. Information provided by interlocutors may require double-checking before being presented as fact.

The Supplier will engage openly and constructively with FCDO Country Posts, facilitated by the Authority. Entry and exit meetings with HMG representatives at British Embassies or British High Commissions will be held to brief the Supplier prior to in-country work and to feedback findings to FCDO Country Posts on completion of in-country work. British Ambassadors / High Commissioners or their staff, may choose to accompany the Supplier to some meetings, e.g. with Ministers or government officials. The Supplier must seek approval from British Ambassadors or High Commissioners, as relevant, or their authorised representatives prior to arranging meeting with foreign government officials.

In order to complete analysis and where FCDO Country Post resource allows, the Supplier must work closely with FCDO Country Posts in each country to explore any pre-existing work of this nature that has been completed and utilise their wealth of experience in this field. The Authority will also seek to share relevant background documents and evidence pieces to support literature review, for example IWT Challenge Fund project documents.

The Authority expects the Suppliers activity to include:

* Review of existing documentation.
* Review of relevant material identified.
* Review broader issues related to IWT, local community engagement, poverty, law enforcement, corruption and serious and organised crime
* Describe relevant data sources.
* Stakeholder consultations with a selection of hotspots in country (virtual or face to face)
* Informal discussions with HMG staff on progress and reflections upon emerging findings.
* Preparation of updates and final report covering findings, including diagrams to represent the dynamics of IWT.

## Reporting

Following consideration of this ToR the Supplier will return an initial proposal setting out how they meet the relevant criteria and requirements to carry out this analysis, and details of the methodology they will use to conduct the analysis and meet the outcomes, this will be no longer than 10 pages in length. The Authority are open to having discussions with the supplier about how outputs can be delivered and the sequencing of those, as well as how the scope could be tweaked to align with the expertise of the Supplier where they complement or enhance the objectives.

Following confirmation and signature of contract, details of outputs and estimated expected timelines are set out in the table below, following discussions with the Supplier on overall timeline for delivery this should be tweaked and agreed accordingly.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Workstream/output** | **Key Milestone & Deliverable** | **Indicative Timetable** |
| **Inception phase and periodic updates:** | | |
| ***Output 1***  Inception report detailing the scope, objectives governance arrangements, methodology, stakeholder engagement plan, workplans and outputs.  Updates every 4 weeks throughout the agreed delivery timeline via Microsoft Teams. | 1. Outline of inception report 2. Meeting to discuss outline inception report 3. Inception report – no more than 20 pages 4. Ongoing update to SRO and Project Officer | 1. [Within 2 weeks of contract signature] 2. [After a week to consider outline inception report] 3. [2 weeks after meeting to discuss inception report] 4. Updates every 4 weeks until completion |
| **Reports against Workstreams and objectives:** | | |
| ***Output 2***  Workstream 1: Provide an overview of the IWT situation in each country, and therole of each country directly or indirectly supporting the global illegal wildlife trade, through supply, transit and/or demand of IWT. Identify the key countries/regions that the country is linked to via IWT supply chains, and reviewing the evidence relating to trends and scale of IWT. | 1. Outline of proposed report(s) including details of length and content of annexes. 2. Meeting to discuss initial findings 3. Final report against workstream objectives | [TBC - Subject to agreement ahead of contract signature] |
| ***Output 3:***  Workstream 2: Provide a detailed assessment of the political, economic, social, technological, cultural, and environmental factors in country that are driving the illegal wildlife trade and the significance and scale of each factor in facilitating the IWT. | 1. Outline of proposed report(s) including details of length and content of annexes. 2. Meeting to discuss initial findings 3. Final report against workstream objectives | [TBC - Subject to agreement ahead of contract signature] |
| ***Output 4***  Workstream 3: Identify current interventions within countries, assessing effectiveness to support change (including identifying other donors and their activities), and any gaps in approach. | 1. Outline of proposed report(s) including details of length and content of annexes. 2. Meeting to discuss initial findings 3. Final report against workstream objectives | [TBC - Subject to agreement ahead of contract signature] |
| ***Output 5***  Workstream 4: Conduct SWOT analysis at country level of current approach to IWT/interventions, including and potential gaps for future interventions considering, inter alia, evidence of need, evidence of effectiveness and gaps in current approach in particular considering gaps which UK could support or address. | 1. Outline of proposed report(s) including details of length and content of annexes. 2. Meeting to discuss initial findings 3. Final report against workstream objectives | [TBC - Subject to agreement ahead of contract signature] |
| **Final Products:** | | |
| ***Output 6***  Final Report, Summary and presentation of findings | 1. Summary final presentation of all outputs to the Authority and other relevant cross-Whitehall stakeholders in PowerPoint. 2. A complete set of the final approved deliverables for all outputs and workstreams 3. Review of final report | [TBC - Subject to agreement ahead of contract signature] |

If there are any objectives of the ToR that cannot be for any reason, the Supplier must update the Authority, and any changes in expected outputs must be detailed and agreed by the Authority.

## Safeguard Considerations

All organisations that work with or come into contact with **children** should have safeguarding policies and procedures to ensure that every child, regardless of their age, gender, religion or ethnicity, can be protected from harm.

Protection from **violence, exploitation, and abuse** through involvement, directly or indirectly, with Authority programmes. This includes sexual exploitation and abuse but should also be understood as all forms of physical or emotional violence or abuse and financial exploitation.

The Supplier must have appropriate policies and procedures in place to expressly prohibit sexual exploitation and abuse and to receive and address reports of such acts.

## Disability Considerations

For the Authority disability inclusive development means that people with disabilities are systematically and consistently included in and benefit from international development. Civil Society and Private Sector partners should outline their approach to disability inclusion and how people with disabilities will be consulted and engaged throughout the project.

## UK Aid Branding

The Supplier, and all organisations associated with the delivery of this Contract, that receive funding from the Authority must use the UK aid logo on their development and humanitarian programmes to be transparent and acknowledge that they are funded by UK taxpayers. The Supplier, and all organisations associated with the delivery of this Contract, must acknowledge funding from the UK government in broader communications but no publicity is to be given to this Contract without the prior written consent of the Authority.

The UK aid logo can be provided to the Supplier by the Authority upon written request.

## Transparency

The Authority has transformed its approach to transparency, reshaping our own working practices and pressuring others across the world to do the same. The Authority requires Suppliers receiving and managing funds, to release open data on how this money is spent, in a common, standard, re-usable format and to require this level of information from immediate sub-contractors, sub-agencies and partners.

It is a contractual requirement for all Suppliers to comply with this, and to ensure they have the appropriate tools to enable routine financial reporting, publishing of accurate data and providing evidence of this – further IATI information is available from;

<http://www.aidtransparency.net/>

## Delivery Chain Mapping

Delivery Chain Mapping (DCM) is a process that identifies and captures, usually in visual form, the name of all partners involved in delivering a specific good, service or charge, ideally down to the end beneficiary.

DCM addresses risk throughout the network to reduce exposure and vulnerability. DCM will capture risks such as poor performance, financial melt-down or financial corporate responsibility.

Before engaging with private sector, civil society or multilateral partners the Supplier must carry out a DCM exercise. The DCM will from a part of the Suppliers due diligence, decision making, and tender process. The Authority is required to report the above throughout the intervention to ensure all monies can be tracked through the chain.

## Duty of Care

The Supplier is responsible for the safety and well-being of their Personnel and Third Parties affected by their activities under this Contract, including appropriate security arrangements.

The Authority will share available information with the Supplier on security status and developments in country where appropriate.

The Supplier is responsible for ensuring appropriate safety and security briefings for all of their Personnel working under this Contract and ensuring that their Personnel register and receive briefing as outlined above.

Travel advice is also available on the FCDO website and the Supplier must ensure they and their Personnel are up to date with the latest position.

The Supplier understands that the Supplier remains fully responsible for Duty of Care in line with the details provided above. In particular the Supplier understands that:

* The Supplier is fully responsibility for security and Duty of Care.
* The Supplier understands the potential risks and affirms that the Supplier has the required knowledge and experience to develop an effective risk plan.
* The Supplier have the capability to manage their Duty of Care responsibilities throughout the life of the contract.

The Authority will not accept any responsibility with regards to the Suppliers Duty of Care obligations.

Whilst the Authority and our wider Government partners, will share information pertinent to security status, developments or other similar pieces of information, the Authority makes no warrant, commitment or guarantee regarding the accuracy of any information which is shared. The Supplier shall be responsible for making their own enquiries regarding their Duty of Care obligations.

1. Nellemann, C. et al. (2016) The Rise of Environmental Crime: A Growing Threat to Natural Resources, Peace, Development and Security, A UNEP-INTERPOL Rapid Response assessment. Whilst there are many uncertainties, various estimates place the 2016 global value of illegal wildlife trade between $7bn and $23bn. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. [UNODC (2020)](https://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/wildlife/2020/World_Wildlife_Report_2020_9July.pdf) World Wildlife Crime Report: Trafficking in protected species. Nearly 6000 different species of fauna and flora were seized between 1999 and 2018, as recorded by The World WISE Database. Suspected traffickers of some 150 citizenships have been identified. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)