



Basic Income Trial to Reduce Wildlife Poaching Project Proposal FINAL - April 2018

# Basic Income Trial to Reduce Wildlife Poaching

### **Executive Summary**

This proposal outlines stage 1 of a basic income trial to address the massive damage done to wildlife populations in Southern Africa by the illegal wildlife trade, subsistence poaching and also as a result of human-wildlife conflict.

The proposed approach is to trial paying a basic income to adults and children living in absolute poverty in communities surrounding protected areas (areas of significant importance to wildlife) in Zimbabwe, where there is a high incidence of poaching. The basic income will be positioned to the communities as unconditional, combined with a request that they make a moral commitment on their part to refrain from aiding poachers and engaging in poaching themselves.

Given we are proposing a (near) universal basic income for this trial, the project is expected to also significantly enhance the living standards of low-income families (living on less than USD \$2 per day). The basic income trial is expected to demonstrate significant positive effects on physical and emotional wellbeing, education, health and economic activity in the selected communities.

We are proposing a trial size of 2,500-4,000 adults (defined as age 18+ years) set up as a randomized controlled trial with two control group communities in a similar area. We are further proposing a 2-year trial duration to eliminate seasonal effects often seen in poaching activity.

In parallel we will set up a **Basic Income for Conservation Fund** to collect donations for stage 2 of the trial, to build on the success of stage 1. This will ensure that we can demonstrate to the community we work with that there is a longer term and mutual benefit to getting the conservation outcomes the project is seeking in demonstrating this alternative funding model for wildlife conservation.



The effects of poaching for the international wildlife trade, snaring and human-wildlife conflict

#### Introduction

The illegal wildlife trade (IWT) is usually presumed to be the fourth largest transnational crime, after drugs, arms and human trafficking, and estimated to be worth around USD \$20bn per annum. Illegal

transnational trafficking of species is done to fulfil a range of human desires, including the desire for luxury 'goods', luxury 'foods' and exotic pets. Poaching is also an issue at the local level in range countries, either for wild meat consumption, the bush meat trade or due to beliefs in medical or spiritual of properties of animals or animal parts. Combined with ongoing habitat loss due to population increases, the threat to wildlife populations especially in Africa is immense, with many species facing the real possibility of extinction in the wild.



The current conservation paradigm has been unable to significantly halt the decimation of wildlife. Even though the establishment of protected areas has provided safe havens for populations, poaching still takes place in those areas, especially for species that command high prices on the transnational illegal wildlife market. Currently rhino horn is worth more than gold, the industrial slaughter of 100 elephants a day is severely effecting many elephant populations and an estimated 1 million pangolins are taken from the wild each year. This situation cannot continue if we want to preserve viable wildlife populations and ecosystems.

In proposing a basic income trial to address wildlife poaching, we are working from the assumption that absolute poverty, survival anxiety and lack of food security are major contributors to poaching both from an IWT perspective and for local wild meat consumption. Surveys conducted in several African range countries to understand poaching behaviour usually find that lack of food security and the opportunity to make money quickly are the key





factors driving illegal poaching, often in combination with anger resulting from displacement or resettlement due to the establishment of protected areas. With no jobs on offer beyond a handful of rangers and positions in tourism or hunting lodges, the hypothesis we would like to test with such a guaranteed basic income trial is that it will significantly reduce poaching behaviour, including eliminating the willingness to supply intelligence for trafficking syndicates.

This document outlines how such a basic income trial could be structured and how the hypothesis that it will lead to a substantial reduction in poaching will be tested. Given the proximity of the selected communities to private conservancies or National Parks, we are also looking for a substantial reduction in human-wildlife conflict.

#### Basic Income to Address Conservation Issues

Poaching and human-wildlife conflict are major issues in and around protected areas in Southern African countries (and elsewhere). We want to verify that a basic income can address the following issues directly and within a 2-year time frame:

- 1. Poaching on behalf of traffickers who supply the transnational illegal wildlife trade (IWT)
- 2. Subsistence poaching for wild meat consumption or the bush meat trade

3. Human-wildlife conflict defined as both, death/injury to humans as a result of encroachment into protected areas and the shooting of lions, elephants and hyenas encroaching into human settlements



IWT related poaching is driven by criminal syndicates, but typically relies on recruiting local people who tend to be poor and are motivated to increase their income or improve their livelihood. In most instances,

the majority of poachers recruited by trafficking syndicates come from or are aided by local communities bordering the protected area. The rewards on offer depend on the species being targeted, but poachers can expect to be paid a few hundred to a few thousand dollars for delivering high-value species such as rhino horn, pangolin and elephant tusks.

There are also reports of traffickers coercing local community members into poaching through the threat of violence or death to them or their family. The main reason for needing to enlist people from the surrounding communities is that traffickers typically lack the required local knowledge about the security measures in the protected area and the likely locations of the animals. Given that poaching is predominantly undertaken at night and on foot, knowing where the patrols and the animals are is critical to successful poaching incursions. Traffickers can also typically offer a few hundred dollars to rangers or monitors employed in protected areas to divulge information about animal locations.



The main continental African species currently being exploited and trafficked are rhinos, elephants, pangolins and big cats. The scale of the problem is huge in relation to the remaining populations of these animals:

- 1. About 1,300 rhinos are killed a year in Africa out of a total population of 25,000
- 2. About 35,000 elephants are killed a year out of a total population of 350-400,000
- 3. The number of pangolins poached each year is estimated to be somewhere between 100,000 and 1 million, with total population numbers unknown

The dominant current strategy of preventing poaching is to use military style protection measures. About 50% of the USD\$1.3billion spent on tackling the IWT between 2010 and 2016 has gone into these measures. Yet this has significant downsides because of:

- High costs (around USD \$1-2million per year for a typical small conservancy),
- Loss of human life for both poachers and rangers (which means loss of livelihood for the family and resentment towards conservation and animals themselves). About 100 rangers and several hundred poachers die every year.

- Low effectiveness for very large areas (e.g. Kruger NP in South Africa),
- Complete fencing of parks and conservancies can lead to overstocking, environmental degradation and impedes natural movement of migratory species,
- Potential impacts on social justice and human rights due to the extended presence of military and, in some cases, armed mercenaries.

# Basic Income to Improve Living Standards

Notwithstanding the benefits for wildlife, the basic income is also expected to deliver the usually observed benefits to impoverished communities, seen more generally in basic income trials and cash transfer programs carried out by GiveDirectly and others. In particular:

- 1. Food security results in a number of crucial flow-on effects:
  - a. Adequate nutrition is a prerequisite for a healthy lifestyle
  - b. A basic income will guarantee regular meals to children, preventing malnourishment
  - c. Drastic reduction in hours normally spent securing food for the next day freeing up time for more valuable activities
  - d. Less need to engage in risky activities to secure food provision (e.g. prostitution, poaching and other crime)
- 2. Cash transfers have been proven to boost economic activity and employment
  - a. Economic insecurity prevents people from taking entrepreneurial risks (because of delayed returns on time invested)
  - b. Income security will free up resources for entrepreneurial risk taking
  - c. Access to funds for transport in rural areas leads to increase in trade (and also better access to healthcare and education)
  - d. Local communities will have the capacity to spend more on locally produced goods and services, this will create more viable and sustainable self-employment opportunities in the rural areas
  - e. More capacity to assist other poor families (the Namibia basic income grant pre-trial survey showed poor families spent 23% of their income assisting other poor families)
  - f. Evidence of 'Around The Kitchen Table Banking' system developing, within trusted groups of people pooling the basic income to help with local business development
- 3. Improvements in Education, Health, Family Wellbeing and Emancipation of Women
  - a. Poverty stops people from seeking treatment for illness, providing cash enables better health outcomes (especially for HIV/Aids)
  - b. Education problems are typically the result of poverty and malnutrition the basic income eliminates both factors and leads to improvements in school attendance and performance
  - c. Having access to a personal, independent income gives women control and enables them to say 'No' the Namibia basic income grant saw a reduction in prostitution
  - d. Having access to a personal, independent income (including BI for children) gives women more status. The Namibia and India basic income trial saw a reduction in domestic violence
  - e. Inability to pay school fees results in children not attending school and teachers not getting paid

# Reducing Subsistence Poaching

In addition to drastically reducing poaching for the IWT we also hope to demonstrate that paying a basic income will significantly reduce (or ideally eliminate) the need for subsistence poaching and



poaching for the bush meat trade around protected areas. Food security is a major issue for most poor communities and having 'access' to local game via snaring is often seen as a basic survival strategy. It is also a relatively low risk activity for the poacher and extremely cheap to carry out (no rifle required, only a bit of telephone wire). Whilst the subsistence poachers tend to be targeting smaller antelope species, snaring is in fact indiscriminate and big cats or even rhinos can

get caught in the snares, usually leading to the slow and painful death of the animal. It is often a small step from subsistence poaching to selling some bush meat locally and then to supplying the commercial bush meat trade or, for some, providing information to the IWT.

The extent of local subsistence poaching and the bush meat trade depends on a myriad of local factors that impact both food security and accessibility of the protected area. It is often very difficult to assess the degree of both forms of poaching taking place. We will aim to make local subsistence poaching and the bush meat trade one of the selection criteria for choosing a trial location. The degree of poaching can be established through survey techniques that reveal illegal activity, such as the random response technique.

# Reducing Human-Wildlife Conflict

Finally, we will also study the impact of a basic income on human-wildlife conflict. This conflict exists in two distinct forms – wildlife attacks on humans encroaching into protected areas for poaching or illegal harvesting and wildlife encroachment into human settlements. Both forms of human-wildlife



conflict are major issues for communities neighboring protected areas that are not fully fenced.

Wildlife attacks on humans who enter conservancies to collect fire wood or animal feed are often fatal or lead to serious injuries. Elephants tend to be the main species associated with this type of conflict.

Elephants are also the main species for

encroachment into local communities and the destruction of crops. Big cats such as lions and leopards are the main issue in relation to attacks on local farm animals (goats, cattle). In many instances communities will call on Parks' Services to have the animals shot, resulting in significant losses of both lions and elephants.

Taken together, if possible we will select communities that border protected areas which contain the key species associated with all 3 types of poaching and human-wildlife conflict: elephants, rhinos and big cats.

### Why It Should Work

At the heart of our hypothesis that a basic income will reduce or stop wildlife poaching lies the idea that a basic income reduces survival anxiety. Survival anxiety is a specific form of scarcity, as described by S. Mullainathan and E. Shafir in their book 'Scarcity' (which references the relevant academic research). It leads to an exceedingly narrow focus on immediate survival, selfishness, captures attention, seemingly leads to an inability to plan and ultimately results in poor decision making. It also diminishes community spirit and fuels resentment.

At the same time, it is important to point out that not all poor people become poachers. This has been confirmed by academic researchers such as Daniel Brockington, Annette Huebschle, Rosaleen Duffy, Freya St John and others. This is no different to the fact that not all poor people in western countries become criminals. There is a link to poverty, but in itself it is not enough.

Why then should we expect that alleviating poverty and survival anxiety will reduce poaching? Because it really does not take much to undo the scarcity mindset and because normal cognitive function is restored very quickly once survival anxiety is off the table. In addition, moral considerations and social norms come back into the decision making process once survival anxiety is no longer present.

Further, paying the basic income to the whole community has multiple beneficial effects that will impact poaching behavior. First, it increases the ability to provide mutual support. Poor people receive the most help from other poor people and poor people spend more of their income on helping others than any other group. Mutual support from family, friends and neighbours increases with their capacity to help – hence the basic income will lead to increased mutual support. Second, paying everyone in the community creates a common bond which can be linked to conservation and care for the local wildlife. The latter contrasts sharply with the currently prevailing common feeling of exclusion from protected areas and the money flowing into tourism or hunting.

#### Location

We are proposing to run this basic income trial in Zimbabwe. There are a number of reasons for selecting Zimbabwe:

- 1. Zimbabwe has the highest unemployment rate in the world, at over 90%.
- Zimbabwe is one of the poorest countries in the world, with a per capita GDP of USD \$1,000
- Zimbabwe has a very high rate of absolute poverty (defined as less than USD \$1.90pp per day)
- Zimbabwe has large and significant wildlife populations, including some 80,000 elephants, about 700 rhinos and many other species of high conservation value
- 5. Zimbabwe has a large poaching problem, both for international trafficking and for



food consumption due to lack of food security. Some 6,000 elephants were killed between 2014 and 2016 and Zimbabwe had 2,200 rhinos before the current poaching wave started.

- 6. Zimbabwe has significant protected wildlife areas such as Hwange NP, Mana Pools NP, Matusadona NP, Matobo NP and others
- 7. Zimbabwe has a significant problem with lions and elephants getting shot as a result of encroachment into local communities, especially at Hwange NP
- 8. We have access to most conservation stakeholders and conservancy owners and managers in Zimbabwe through SAVE African Rhino Foundation, which has been active in Zimbabwe for 30 years
- 9. Zimbabwe has mobile phone networks and mobile payment systems EcoCash, OneWallet, and Telecash, although adoption lags behind other African countries.

# Trial Site Selection

We undertook a 10-day field trip in Zimbabwe facilitated by SAVE African Rhino Foundation in November 2017 to select the most suitable location for our basic income trial. After meetings with key stakeholders in 5 possible locations we believe that there are good options for running the trial either around **Matobo National Park** or bordering **Hwange National Park**.

For these two locations we have been able to verify their suitability based on a number of key selection criteria:

- 1. Presence of high-value IWT species and key species associated with human-wildlife conflict
- 2. Availability of baseline data for poaching going back at least 3 years
- 3. Size of the park, its borders and the number of people in the surrounding communities
- 4. Current knowledge about the poachers and where they come from and what community support they receive
- 5. Stability of the local context and community (e.g. no upcoming or recent disruption)
- 6. Level of anti-poaching protection measures and mandate of rangers (e.g. shoot to kill policy)
- 7. Prior experience in working with community through e.g. community programs, Campfire etc
- 8. Presence of other (e.g. humanitarian/conservation) NGOs in the area
- 9. Proximity to major roads/towns
- 10. Mobile coverage / mobile payment agent within walking distance to receive mobile payments
- 11. Local and regional power structure and potential crime/gang issues
- 12. Park or conservancy not fully fenced



A recent report to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation on mobile payments has highlighted that mobile payment use and penetration in Zimbabwe is lagging other African countries. In addition, mobile coverage in many rural and remote areas is very poor with overall network coverage reaching only 82% of the population (see map above). This issue has impacted location selection, as two of our initial target areas have no mobile reception within walking distance.

# Scale & Design Considerations

Based on the literature and published research we propose a minimum scale of 2,500 adults for our basic income trial. The exact scale will be determined based on the location selected and our partnership with GiveDirectly, as overhead costs fall with the number of people enrolled.



Most wards around our two preferred trial locations have total populations of 2,000-6,000 people (including children). This means they have between 1,000 and 3,000 adults, as the average ratio of children to adults is about 50/50 due to high mortality rates from HIV/AIDS. In the regions considered for the trial rates of HIV/AID infections are 22%, compared to the national average of 13%. Population density in those areas is quite low (around 30 people/km<sup>2</sup>), so this trial will cover a large land area.

In addition to the trial location we will select two 'control' locations, communities in a similar area also implicated in poaching. These communities will not receive any basic income, but will be used as the control group for the trial.

We further suggest running the trial over a 2-year period. Poaching for international trafficking can be seasonal and dependent on the weather and the moon (most such poaching is done at night). It will be easier to generalize the results from the basic income trial if it covers at least two years.

The trial is meant to examine a number of key questions in relation to poaching and human-wildlife conflict:

- 1. Does receiving a basic income sufficiently address food security and cash shortage to eliminate or at least drastically reduce subsistence poaching and supplying the bush meat trade?
- 2. Does receiving money to cover school fees eliminate or at least drastically reduce subsistence poaching and supplying the bush meat trade?
- 3. Does receiving a basic income eliminate or at least reduce the poaching of elephants, rhinos and similar species of high value to traffickers?
- 4. Does receiving a basic income reduce the incidence of human-wildlife conflict and the resulting loss of lions and elephants?

In addition, the trial is expected to demonstrate the proven benefits to low-income families and their standard of living as observed in previous basic income trials in India, Namibia and Kenya.

### Implementation

We are in discussions to partner with GiveDirectly for all practical aspects of conducting the trial. This covers gaining government support, final selection of communities, enrolment, dispersion of funds, monitoring and on-the-ground support. It also covers all aspects of risk mitigation in relation to theft, fraud, cash-out of mobile payments and handling adverse events. Final selection of communities will be kept secret until enrolment is complete and the first payment has been received and successfully cashed out to prevent non-locals from trying to 'gate-crash' the trial. The baseline surveys outlined in the measurement section will take place before enrolment starts.

Our current plan is to enroll adults with a National Registration Card as ID, which is required for all people over 16 years of age in Zimbabwe. This will be done with the help of locally recruited support staff and in our presence. Enrolments will be voluntary, but we expect similar up-take rates as in other recent trials in Kenya (95%).

Participants will be provided with mobile phones and receive instructions in relation to mobile payments and where to go to cash out their payments. We will work with mobile payment agents to ensure that cash will be available on payment days and that no fraud/theft takes place when participants cash out their payments. This includes being present at payment agents' locations, verifying participants have received the full amount in cash and calling on recipients to ensure no adverse events have taken place after receiving their cash (such as theft, extortion or requests for bribes). We believe that because of the economic and cash situation in Zimbabwe we will need to actively manage this aspect of the basic income trial.

Our primary implementation partner will maintain a support and monitoring presence in the selected communities throughout the trial. This presence will allow us to learn about any potential issues quickly and devise strategies to prevent adverse events for the future. It will also allow us to use the trial for media and social media coverage, as someone will always be present to assist should media organisations wish to visit.

Beyond managing risks and support on the ground the exact aspects of the execution phase will be defined during the design stage in collaboration with our funders and partners.

# Payment and Enrolment Considerations

In setting the level of payment and frequency of disbursing the funds, we need to consider the current economics of poaching for wildlife traffickers. In many instances traffickers will recruit people from the local communities surrounding the park or conservancy to carry out the poaching or provide information to poachers. Traffickers are prepared to pay for both intelligence about animal locations and anti-poaching activities and also for carrying out the actual poaching. Payments can vary between a couple of hundred to a thousand or more USD. In Zimbabwe captured poachers typically report being offered up to USD \$10,000 for a pair of rhino horns (it takes at least 3-4 people to poach a rhino).

We therefore propose to set the level of annual payments for the basic income at USD \$600 per adult per year (disbursed as monthly payments of \$50). We further propose to pay children USD \$240 per year (for up to 3 children to prevent fraud, see below). The following issues were considered in setting this payment structure and level of payment:

- 1. There are a range of motivations to engage in poaching, including desire for personal enrichment, desperation, having to look after extended family, getting cash for school fees, anger at absence of other opportunities. The basic income needs to be high enough to eliminate or suppress most of these.
- 2. Only the community as a whole (village level) can stop the poaching. The basic income therefore needs to be universal in an area.

- 3. Men are often absent from the community, either through working away from home or looking for work in town. Women therefore need to receive enough income directly to cover food and children's needs.
- 4. In our trial locations there is a high incidence of single-parent and other fragmented household structures as a result of HIV/AIDS related deaths and illness. Covering both adults and children will address this issue.

In contrast to other basic income trials, we are not going to select the 'poor' who will receive the cash transfers. Our model is closer to the universal basic income ideal – we are proposing to enroll all adults (aged 18+ years) and most children in a community who agree to participate, irrespective of their current income or 'wealth'. We know that employment opportunities in the areas under consideration are extremely rare and we want to encourage social collaboration, so we consider this a more suitable approach for testing our hypothesis in relation to poaching and human-wildlife conflict.

The only exception is that we are proposing to restrict payments to 3 children per household to prevent fraud. We have been told by everyone we spoke to in Zimbabwe that paying every child is not an option in Zimbabwe, as relatives would send their children from across the country to the community to benefit and both political (council) and traditional (chiefs) authority structures would be complicit in enabling fraud. The level of corruption is quite staggering at all levels and apparently communities are well versed in exploiting NGO 'handouts'. This was experienced directly by one organisation which took the 'every child' strategy with the result of families 'growing' from 3 children to 17 children overnight.

We may further have to consider mobile payment agent cash availability and fees when setting the disbursement schedules and also the risk of extortion/assault by criminal gangs. A recent field research report to the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation found that mobile agent payment fees can be quite high in Zimbabwe and mobile coverage is poor in many of the areas under consideration for our trial, so there may not be enough agents/enough cash on hand to handle the large transfers. GiveDirectly have



found in Uganda that mobile payment agents will travel large distances to service remote communities if there is sufficient demand for mobile payment transactions, so this may be less of an issue than presently assumed.

# Control Group and Backup Pool

Both locations still under consideration for the trial are sufficiently large to allow for local control group communities. For example, below is a map of the council wards around Matobo National Park.

We have been told by a number of stakeholders (especially from the law enforcement side) that the need for cash to pay school fees plays a big role in motivating poaching activity. Primary school fees in rural Zimbabwe are between USD \$45-60 per child per year. We are therefore proposing to have two control group communities:

- 1. One community that doesn't receive the basic income, but where we pay all primary school fees directly to the schools
- 2. One community that doesn't receive either the basic income or school fees



This setup does complicate the trial, but it also allows to test the hypothesis that the need for paying school fees is a major driver of poaching behavior.

In addition to the basic income component of the trial we would also like to establish a 'backup pool' depending on the outcomes in year 2 of the trial. Such a pool would be created to alleviate the concerns of the conservation sector that there needs to be a budget to deal with any (unlikely) increases in poaching activities as a result of the introduction of the basic income. With this pool in place, the current local conservation bodies are less likely undermine the trial being set up.

If, as expected, poaching activities decrease, the pool would be paid to the community as a whole and used for education purposes (e.g. local schools or higher education scholarships).

### Budget

On top of the basic income payments, we will allocate ~15% additional funds to cover overheads such as setup-costs, research, enrollment, monitoring, travel and project management. This is consistent with the level of overheads reported by GiveDirectly for their currently running basic income trials in Kenya and Uganda.

The high-level budget in US Dollars for the full 2-year trial can be broken down as shown in the table below. GiveDirectly require a minimum commitment of USD \$5million to make entering a new country viable in view of the setup costs, so we have set this as the minimum amount. As seen above, this size is compatible with the ward sizes around the likely protected areas we are considering for this trial.

Budget Item	USD Amount based on 2,500 adults	USD Amount based on 4,000 adults
Basic income payments @ \$600per adult and \$240 per child per year (assuming 1:1 ratio of children to adults) Note: Actual amounts paid out will be ~4% lower because of transaction costs	\$4.2 million	\$6.7 million
Primary school fees for control group community (assumed to be same size, 25% of population are in primary school)	\$150,000	\$240,000
Costs – Set-up, Project Management, Fieldwork, Support, Research, Evaluation, Administration, Travel	\$650,000	\$850,000
Backup Pool for risk-management / potential reward (see above)	\$100,000	\$100,000
TOTAL	\$5.1 million	\$7.9 million

The detailed budget will be worked out and verified after we have selected the location(s) and worked out the exact nature of the setup costs, ongoing overheads and research grants with our partners. Obviously, the population size of the selected trial area has a large impact on the cost, but some of the less populated areas under consideration are not poaching hot spots, so the final selection will have to take both budget and trial objectives into account.

### What to Measure and How

Whilst the exact nature of the research will be defined during the design stage in collaboration with our university research partners, a number of primary measures will definitely be included:

- Poaching Baseline Survey broken down into IWT related poaching and subsistence poaching. Poaching data for high-value species poached for the IWT is usually derived from carcass surveys in the protected areas. Poaching data for low-value species poached for the IWT (such as pangolins and reptiles) is very hard to come by and will be included in the community surveys. Subsistence and bush meat trade poaching data can be revealed in community surveys using techniques specifically designed for surveying illegal activities (such as random response technique).
- 2. Human-Wildlife Conflict Baseline Survey will also be included in the community survey to establish type and frequency of park encroachment and type and frequency of human-wildlife conflict. This also includes encroachment of wild animals into the community and type and magnitude of damage inflicted on humans, crops and livestock. The number of lions or elephants shot is typically known as it is carried out by ZimParks or licensed hunters.
- 3. We will repeat the above surveys at the half-way mark to establish progress achieved during the trial and again at the end of the trial period.
- 4. Measures on **socio-economic and emotional wellbeing indicators**. The exact nature of this research will be agreed with the funders and the partners during the design stage.

We anticipate that all research conducted as part of the trial will be conducted by one or several university research partners and registered with the appropriate organization prior to commencement of the trial. We plan to select research partners with pre-existing experience in evaluating cash transfer programs and measuring poaching rates. All research will be submitted to a peer-reviewed academic journal for publication at the end of the trial.

To conduct a randomized controlled trial, we will also survey the two control group communities sharing the same characteristics according to the selection criteria, but not receiving a basic income. The final approach in this respect will be agreed with the funders and the research partners during the design stage.

In addition to the formal surveys and research the on-the-ground monitoring will include information collection through informal interviews and conversations during the entire duration of the trial. This will allow us to get early indications of behaviour change (or the lack thereof) and it may inform any potential changes to the trial methodology / suspension of the trial should the nature of the insights gained warrant such a change (e.g. if poaching goes up instead of down).

#### Who We Are

Nature Needs More (<u>www.natureneedsmore.org</u>) is a non-profit company incorporated and registered as a charity in Australia. Lynn Johnson and Peter Lanius are directors of the company and Lynn is also the CEO. For brief biographies of Lynn and Peter please see below.

Lynn and Peter are partners in life and in business and have started 6 companies over the last 16 years. Our primary business is Leadership Mastery Pty Ltd, which provides executive and business coaching and strategy consulting to CEOs and senior managers of large and medium sized private, NGO and public sector clients. Our core business expertise is in coaching, strategy, behaviour change and project management. Lynn and Peter are both physicists by training and both hold PhDs in particle physics.

Lynn and Peter have actively worked on the illegal wildlife trade since 2013, through Breaking The Brand (<u>www.breakingthebrand.org</u>). This project was dedicated to designing and delivering demand reduction campaigns to the primary consumers of rhino horn in Viet Nam. It has also been influential in the wider conservation sector in terms of educating the sector about demand reduction and behaviour change campaigns. We raised over USD \$250K for campaigns in Viet Nam during this period. Breaking The Brand has now been incorporated into Nature Needs More.

We have a strong relationship with SAVE African Rhino Foundation (SARF) based in Perth, Australia, which is the second-oldest NGO dedicated to rhino conservation in the world. SARF is almost exclusively focused on Zimbabwe and has raised and distributed over AUD \$8 million since its inception. We also have good relationships within the main NGOs working in the IWT part of conservation.

#### Lynn Johnson, CEO

Lynn originates from the UK and immigrated to Australia in 1996. She holds a PhD in particle physics and worked as a research physicist for ICI in the UK before embarking on a journey that led her from

a career in management consulting before setting up Leadership Mastery in 2001 and Breaking The Brand in 2013.

Lynn has extensive experience in designing & delivering behaviour change interventions and business strategy development. She has delivered such interventions to more than 3,000 clients in the private and public sector. She has further designed and delivered behaviour change programs for at-risk young adults and indigenous Australians.

In her conservation work Lynn's focus have been demand reduction campaigns targeting the primary users of rhino horn in Viet Nam. She has conducted the research into the users and designed and delivered the campaigns, raising over USD \$250K since 2014. She has also acquired broader knowledge of the illegal wildlife trade and trafficking chain.

Lynn has a long-standing interest in wildlife conservation and is a member of the SARF subcommittee. She has travelled to a number of African countries in recent years as part of our conservation efforts.

#### Peter Lanius, Director

Peter originates from Berlin, Germany and immigrated to Australia in 1996. He holds a PhD in particle physics. Peter spent the first ten years of his career as a consultant and project manager in the IT&T industry. He held senior project management positions in blue-chip companies including Hewlett-Packard, Telstra and Texas Instruments.

In early 2003 Peter joined Lynn and became a director of Leadership Mastery where his focus has been executive coaching, business strategy development and business coaching. He has also been the primary finance manager for all our business ventures.

Peter has assisted Lynn's work in Breaking The Brand and has recently joined her in becoming a director of Nature Needs More. He has been researching the basic income model since 2015.

### Partnerships

We are in discussions with GiveDirectly to establish a partnership for this basic income trial. GiveDirectly are the only NGO with significant long-term experience in running basic income and similar cash transfer programs in Africa. GiveDirectly would be responsible for all practical aspects of running the trial – from gaining government support to enrolment, dispersion of funds, monitoring and on-the-ground support.

For the baseline measurement and final evaluation of the primary measures around wildlife poaching and human-wildlife conflict we plan to partner with a university that has current research programs in the area of IWT and poaching. For all other research we will partner with a university with experience in evaluating the social and economic impacts of cash transfer programs.

We have an existing strong relationship with SAVE African Rhino Foundation (SARF) based in Perth, Australia, which is the second-oldest NGO dedicated to rhino conservation in the world. SARF is almost exclusively focused on Zimbabwe and has excellent relationships with all conservation stakeholders in the country.

# Risks & Mitigation

The risks and mitigation strategies will be refined over time as we get closer to implementation of the trial. Apart from the obvious funding risk, there are going to be risks which are common with other basic income trials in Africa and we have also identified a number of location specific risks already.

Risk	Severity	Probability	Mitigation
Insufficient Funding for trial	High	Medium	Only commit to run trial once we have secured 80% of total funds required.
Political Instability	Low	High	Zimbabwe is not politically stable at present, but we do not foresee this impacting the trial. We will make this part of our location selection criteria.
Local Politics	Medium	High	Many communities have existing experience with CAMPFIRE programs and the appropriation of funds by local politicians. This might cause issues with fraud/collusion or outright rejection of the trial and has to be investigated as part of the trial design.
Local Disruption	High	Low	In some of the areas under consideration there could/will be severe disruption due to infrastructure projects. This needs to be taken into account during location selection.
Lack of Mobile Coverage	High	Medium	Mobile coverage in many areas under consideration is patchy or non-existent. This will need to inform location selection.
Lack of cash at mobile payment agents	High	High	Zimbabwe has a chronic cash shortage and we will need to investigate if mobile payment agents can actually pay out the amounts based on the payment schedule.
Fraud by mobile payment agents	High	Medium	Local monitors will be present on payment days and we will also call select recipients in real-time to check they have been paid the full amount received via mobile payment. Senior staff will oversee the first few payment cycles.
Increase in Poaching	High	Low	Should an increase in poaching be observed the trial will be suspended and the bonus pool funds will be used to fund additional security and anti-poaching measures

# Potential Trial Extension (Stage 2)

Should the trial prove to be successful in drastically reducing poaching, we would propose to extend the trial to a second stage after the conclusion of the first stage. In this second stage, we suggest to extend the scope in both size and in the way the basic income is positioned. We would like to test the hypothesis that a tiered basic income model can be used to encourage community participation

in conservation related activities. The nature of these activities would depend on the location and local needs, but may involve rewilding, rehabilitation and revegetation of areas.

This concept was first outlined in an August 2016 Breaking The Brand Blog: Can a Tiered Basic Income Model Provide an Alternative to Sustainable Utilization?: <u>http://breakingthebrand.org/can-a-tiered-basic-income-model-provide-an-alternative-to-sustainable-utilization/</u>

### Summary & Next Steps

We are proposing a 2-year basic income trial to test the hypothesis that paying a basic income to communities bordering protected areas in Zimbabwe will significantly reduce poaching for both the illegal wildlife trade and also subsistence/bush meat trade poaching. We also wish to test the hypothesis that such a basic income is going to reduce the incidence of human-wildlife conflict.

We are proposing to run such a trial with 2,500-4,000 adult recipients and in partnership with experienced academic institutions and NGOs which will conduct the research and provide the practical implementation of running the trial.

We are currently in discussions with GiveDirectly to establish a partnership for this trial and have started the fundraising effort. Once we have secured funding in-principle and established the partnerships we will return to Zimbabwe in mid-to late 2018 to make the final selection of the trial area and the control groups. We hope to start the trial in early 2019.

#### **Contact Information:**

	Lynn Johnson, CEO	Peter Lanius, Director
Mobile:	+61 418 124 660	+61 405 213 264
Email:	lynn@natureneedsmore.org	peter@natureneedsmore.org
Skype:	lynn.johnsonlm	peter.lanius