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INTRODUCTION

The USAID Wildlife Asia Activity aims to end wildlife crime in Asia by employing a comprehensive approach through improved regional cooperation. The value of illegal wildlife crime globally is estimated to be between $5 billion and $23 billion annually. This organized wildlife crime destroys wildlife populations and wildlife-based livelihoods, creating social and political instability.

The Activity’s desired outcomes include reduction in consumer demand for wildlife parts and products; improved enforcement of existing laws, policies and agreements related to wildlife crime; passing and implementation of new laws, policies or reforms; improved cooperation and collaboration among regional, international, and inter-institutional law enforcement; and increased collaboration and coordination between development partners and USG agencies involved in combating wildlife trafficking.

For consumer demand reduction activities, the USAID Wildlife Asia focus countries are China, Thailand and Vietnam. In China, the project is focusing on reduction of demand for parts and products from four focal species – elephant ivory, pangolin, rhino and tiger. In Thailand, the focus is on reducing demand for elephant ivory and tiger products. In Vietnam, the focus is on rhino. The project applies a social and behavior change communication (SBCC) framework to plan, implement and evaluate demand reduction campaigns. The SBCC framework uses a consumer research-based planning process and a socio-ecological model of change to identify the tipping points for behavior change. It operates through three strategies – advocacy, social mobilization and behavior change communication – to achieve its behavior change objectives.

SOCIAL AND BEHAVIOR CHANGE COMMUNICATION (SBCC)

WHY APPLY SBCC TO REDUCE DEMAND?

Activities addressing the illegal wildlife trade have largely focused on supply and regulations of products but have not addressed the root of consumer demand, leading to continuing high demand for wildlife products. Meanwhile communication campaigns have primarily targeted the general population, resulting in high levels of awareness, but often failing to target buyers/consumers or address the factors that drive their demand for these products (USAID Wildlife Asia Situation Analysis, 2017). Therefore, USAID Wildlife Asia sought to apply SBCC principles and approaches to effectively target consumers and potential consumers, understand the motivations underlying purchase and use behaviors, and move from raising awareness to reducing desire and demand for wildlife parts and products.

DEMAND REDUCTION THEORY OF CHANGE

The Digital Deterrence Campaign Phases 1 and 2 used approaches from behavioral economics to augment more traditional SBCC strategies. This campaign demonstrates how SBCC theories, models, and insights can be useful in understanding online consumer behavior related to wildlife parts and products and in informing the design of digital campaigns to reduce their demand. The use of these behavior change approaches enabled the campaign to go beyond generalized awareness-raising towards targeting actual drivers and concerns for wildlife product consumption among those consumer segments likely to purchase wildlife parts and products online.

The campaign used a socio-ecological model, advanced under the USAID C-Change Project, that combines ecological models with socio-ecological and psychological factors. This socio-ecological...
model was the framework used to examine the drivers and barriers/concerns influencing illegal wildlife consumption behaviors that could be addressed through an SBCC strategy. These influencing factors may act in isolation or in combination. They include factors such as information, motivation, ability to act, and norms. The socio-ecological model is based on existing models, theories, and approaches from several disciplines, including the Health Belief Model, which the digital campaign applied to inform the development of the deterrence messaging among potential online consumers. This socio-ecological model has been adapted as a framework for campaigns to reduce consumer demand for illegal wildlife parts and products (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Socio-ecological Model to Reduce Consumer Demand for Illegal Wildlife

The Health Belief Model assumes that people behave based on their perceptions of personal risk or consequence. People weigh their risk susceptibility (how likely will they experience the risk or consequence), risk severity (how severe their personal risk or consequence will be) against the benefits that they will obtain for performing the desired behavior and the barriers to action (what keeps them from performing the desired action). Using this model and formative research findings, the campaign’s messages warned about the illegality of product purchase and aimed to increase potential buyers’ perception of personal risk susceptibility and severity. Messages communicating that their search was being monitored online aimed to undermine their sense of anonymity and personal security.

DIGITAL DETERRENCE: PHASE 1

SBCC PROCESS
SBCC is a planned process. The Digital Deterrence campaign Phase 1 was designed, implemented, monitored and evaluated following the 5-step SBCC planning process outlined in the SBCC Demand Reduction Guidebook (USAID Wildlife Asia, 2020) and shown in Figure 2 below.
STEP 1. UNDERSTANDING THE SITUATION
The USAID Wildlife Asia 2018 Consumer Research on Wildlife Products in Thailand provided evidence that online searches for information relevant to trade of ivory and tiger products has become a significant occurrence. Although the quantitative survey component of this research (N=1,550) revealed that offline stores are still the more popular purchase channels—only two percent of ivory consumers and four percent of tiger consumers reporting having bought their ivory and tiger products through social media (Facebook) or online shops—the qualitative research showed that search for information related to these products online was quite common.

This qualitative research component, composed of three focus groups among ivory consumers and 14 individual in-depth interviews of tiger consumers, found that consumers searched the internet to learn more about the ivory and tiger products they had bought. Google, Facebook, Line, and YouTube were popular online channels used for their searches. The consumers shared that they generally use Google to learn more about the wildlife products of interest, typing in simple keywords like “ivory amulet” or “tiger amulet”. Links and pop-ups then appeared that further stimulated their interest. Some of these links directed them to open or closed Facebook pages or websites, solely dedicated to the online trade of wildlife parts and products.

STEP 2. FOCUSING AND DESIGNING
TARGET AUDIENCES
The campaign specifically targeted potential online buyers of illegal wildlife parts and products. Members of this target audience were identified when they used keywords that denoted possible interest in online wildlife product purchase. These “sensitive” keywords were obtained from organizations in Thailand that are monitoring illegal wildlife online trade, such as the Freeland Foundation.

CAMPAIGN STRATEGY AND MESSAGING APPROACH
To deter online purchases, the campaign’s overarching strategy was to counter the sense of personal security and anonymity that potential buyers feel when they are online. This was informed by USAID Wildlife Asia’s 2018 consumer research, which found that concerns about the legality of purchasing...
and owning ivory and tiger products were major concerns among consumers (Figure 3). The campaign’s strategy was also informed by the finding that a key driver for buying and using ivory and tiger parts and products was belief in the power of ivory and tiger to bring good luck/fortune and/or to prevent evil/harm.

Figure 3. USAID Wildlife Asia Consumer Research Findings on Key Benefits and Concerns Related to Purchase of Ivory and Tiger Parts and Products

Based on the above evidence, the campaign’s messaging approach was to: 1) cast doubt among potential consumers who are at increased risk for making an online purchase about the power of wildlife products to bring good luck or prevent harm; 2) significantly raise these consumers’ level of concern about the legality of purchasing and owning wildlife products; and, 3) create the impression that their searches for illegal wildlife parts and products were not anonymous since they were being monitored by online undercover enforcers, thereby increasing their perception of personal risk and decreasing their sense of online anonymity.

**STEP 3. CREATING**

The campaign developed Google ads, corresponding to four message concepts for the four focal species covered by the USAID Wildlife Asia project: elephant (ivory), tiger, rhino, and pangolin. A searcher who used an identified keyword related to these species was served with one of the following paid Google ads (Figure 4), with key messages as follows:

- **Don’t buy bad luck** – to counter the belief that the wildlife product searched brings good luck and prevents harm
- **Can you Afford the Fines?** – to warn about the legal consequences of buying illegal wildlife
- **Searching for You** – to break the sense of anonymity online and increase perceptions of personal risk
- **Official Alert** – to break the sense of anonymity and increase perception of personal risk
Each ad was accompanied by information that the trade in the specific product searched is illegal and that undercover officers are online. Each ad was executed in four languages: Thai, English, Chinese, and Vietnamese. The latter two languages aimed to reach tourists who may search for wildlife products while in Thailand.

A link to the campaign’s landing page (www.illegalwildlifetrade.org) accompanied each ad. Online searchers who were not deterred by the ads and clicked on the link, were led to this landing page. The page was sponsored by Thailand’s Department of National Parks, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation (DNP). It warned searchers that the content being searched may be prohibited, that enforcement authorities across Southeast Asia are now monitoring illegal wildlife trade online, and that they may not buy, sell, or trade illegal wildlife parts and products in the country. Visitors were also invited to learn more about wildlife products, send a message to the DNP, or call its hotline to...
report any observed infractions of the law. The color of the page was black and the text was written in bold red, with two circles simulating a pair of eyes. These visuals were designed to create the impression among visitors that they were being watched, thus, increasing their personal risk perception and decreasing their sense of anonymity.

Figure 5. Digital Deterrence Campaign Landing Page

![Digital Deterrence Campaign Landing Page](image)

**STEP 4. IMPLEMENTING AND MONITORING**

The Digital Deterrence campaign was live online for 223 days from August 4, 2018 to March 15, 2019. The following results were achieved based on the digital analytics conducted.

The campaign tracked 596,370 keyword searches in Thailand related to its focal species, of which 560,470 (94% of searches tracked) were served with Google ads. Among these searchers, 17,410 clicked through to the DNP landing page. Around 2,600 searches were tracked daily.

Thai was the predominant language used (89% of searches) with English a far second (10% of searches) and the remaining 1% in Vietnamese and Chinese. No major seasonal variations in searches were observed during the campaign period. Since Vietnamese and Chinese language searches were extremely low, the Vietnamese and Chinese ads were terminated on January 17, 2019 and February 5, 2019, respectively. **Cost per actual single reach (ads served) was US$ 0.015,** demonstrating high-cost-effectiveness.

**SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SEARCHERS**

Among the identifiable searches, the largest age segment served with messages were from those 25 to 44 years old (39%). More searches were conducted by males (44%) than females (34%). Searches mostly emanated from Bangkok (around 90%), with the remaining searches largely coming from Chiang Mai (northern border to Myanmar and Laos), Pattaya (tourist city and seaport in the south), Hat Yai (southern border to Malaysia), Khon Kaen (central eastern mainland), and other Thai cities.
Most English language searchers tracked by the digital campaign came from the top 10% income bracket. Although 50% of Thai language searches came from the lower 50% income bracket, a fairly large number came from the top 20% income range.

**KEYWORD SEARCH TERMS USED**

Ivory was the most searched term in both Thai and English (90% of searches). The search keywords in English were categorized as “broad” ivory searches (55%), “accessories/items” (20%), “animal parts” (5%), “price of animal” (5%), “product/purchase information” (5%), and “other” (10%). Examples of keywords and phrases are below:

- **Accessories/items** - tiger amulet, tiger tooth fang, ivory caps, ivory necklace, ivory seals, tiger tooth necklace
- **Animal parts** - pangolin scales, tiger teeth, rhino horn, tiger fang, black ivory tusk
- **Purchase of animal** - tiger for sale, real baby tiger for sale, buy elephant
- **Product/purchase information** - real tiger teeth price, ivory mahout real or fake, how do you tell ivory from bone?

The search terms in Thai were categorized as “broad” (40%), “accessories/items” (25%), “religious/spiritual” (20%), “price/purchase information” (10%), and “other” (5%). Searches using “religious/spiritual/belief/luck-related” keywords were not significantly observed in the English language searches. The Thai language searches were also more specific for the types of ivory that have different beliefs or impact purposes (e.g., for luck, power, or fortune) and also included types of products (amulets, bracelets, etc.). Unlike English-language searches, authenticity, rarity, and pattern-related terms were also common, suggesting informed consumers. Questions regarding legality and registration were also identified. Examples of Thai keywords used include “สร้อยงาช้างแท้” or “Real Ivory Necklace” under the category “accessories” or asking about the benefits of “งาจัด” or Ivory Kamjad, a type of ivory that is believed to hold special powers under the “religious/spiritual” category. Under “price/purchase information” keyword searches such as “ร้านขายกำไลแหวนงาช้าง” translated as “store that sells ivory bracelet ring” were found.

Among the 560,470 searches that were served with Google ads, 17,410 (3%) clicked to the landing page. Among these visitors, 523 took action—384 clicked to the DNP website, 118 sent a message to the DNP, and 21 called the DNP hotline. The ad “Searching for You” had the lowest click rate to the landing page, suggesting the highest deterrence effect. The “Official Alert” ad had the second-lowest click rate.

**ANALYSIS OF KEYWORD SEARCH TERMS**

The analysis of keyword search terms used shows that terms categorized under “price or purchase information” (5% for English and 10% for Thai) are more specific to purchase and indicate highly probable purchase intent. These searchers, though proportionately small, still represent a sizeable number of probable online buyers of wildlife products (2,802 English and 49,882 Thai searches) within the 223-day, or seven-month, campaign period. A cause for serious concern is the proportion of English searches classified under “animal parts” (5%) and “purchase of animal” (5%) which translate into fairly large numbers (2,802 for each category) and suggests active online searches for and trade in live animals and animal parts.

The Thai language searches corroborate findings from the 2018 USAID Wildlife Asia Thailand Consumer Research that showed ivory is more in demand than tiger, and that the two main drivers
underlying the desire for ivory and other wildlife products among Thai consumers are “religious or spiritual” beliefs (20% of Thai searches) and perceived “beauty” of accessories/jewelry items (25% searches). It is important to note that “religious/spiritual” search terms were used only by Thai searchers and they did not appear significantly in English searches. Searches for wildlife products under the “religious/spiritual” and “accessories/items” categories indicate strong, informed interest and probable online purchase intent, particularly since questions regarding authenticity, rarity, and pattern-related subjects were common and hinted at informed consumers. Searches classified as “broad” (55% in English and 40% in Thai), since they lack specificity, could be composed of audiences that may or may not be strongly interested in illegal wildlife products.

Overall, the large number of searches indicates a very large potential universe of searches that are worth investigating, and, in the case of illegal activities, may warrant initiatives from Google to support better purchase intent monitoring, which could have both commercial and social good benefits.

**STEP 5. EVALUATING AND REPLANNING**

**ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT**

The Google ads were launched in four languages: English, Thai, Vietnamese, and Chinese. The latter two languages anticipated possible interest to search for information or buy wildlife products online among Vietnamese and Chinese tourists visiting Thailand. Despite the very low searches in the first few months of the campaign, the ads in these two languages were retained in anticipation of the Lunar New Year season in early February 2019 when a large number of tourists, especially from Mainland China, were expected to travel to Thailand. However, since there were no major seasonal variations in search volumes and extremely low search numbers in Vietnamese and Chinese, the Vietnamese ads were terminated on January 17, 2019 and the Chinese ads ended on February 5, 2019. This decision also allowed for more funding to be allocated to Thai Google ads.

**TARGETED REACH AND COST-EFFECTIVENESS**

The campaign reached a large number (560,470) of the targeted audience segment (potential online buyers of wildlife products) within seven months. The cost per ad served was US$ 0.015. Compared to traditional media (TV, radio, and print) and face-to-face channels, this unit cost per reach proved to be highly cost-effective. Also, reach targets for traditional media are based on viewership, listenership, or circulation figures and demographic profiles; rarely can they target audiences based on observable behaviors. Reach for this campaign was very focused and directed specifically at those with observable interest and potential intent to buy illegal wildlife products online.

**DETERRENCE EFFECTS AND METRICS USED**

Google is built to deliver relevant results in response to a user’s search terms. Most industry measurements and tracking in this platform have been built with that purpose in mind and have focused on increasing clicks on digital ads. However, for the purposes of this campaign, the intent was the opposite, i.e., to interrupt and deter the buyer’s online journey during their purchase consideration phase, with firm deterrent messaging about the risks. Therefore, we were seeking to reduce click rates in response to our ads.

By writing the message in the second person and using the term “You,” the ad directly addressed the searcher, which may have been interpreted by the searcher as a direct threat, increasing his/her
personal risk perception, decreasing his/her sense of anonymity, and creating a feeling of high vulnerability. The ad “Official Alert” had the second lowest click rate; we propose that this ad may have been slightly less threatening since the statement was not in the second person and did not directly address the searcher.

**DIGITAL DETERRENCE: PHASE 2**

**STRATEGY AND TARGET AUDIENCE**

Based on the positive digital analytics results from Phase 1, USAID Wildlife Asia decided to implement a follow-on phase (Phase 2) from November 18 to April 30, 2019. The strategy for Phase 2 was to:

- Serve deterrence ads to those tracked in Phase 1 (retargeted audience) and to potential online buyers with similar socio-demographic characteristics as those tracked in Phase 1.
- Add social media platforms (Facebook and Instagram) to Google ads.
- Integrate messaging/materials from the Beautiful Without Ivory (BWI) campaign launched in September 2018.

The target audience was divided into three categories depending on their level of intent to use wildlife products: Green, Amber, and Red.

- **GREEN**: The Green group were those matching the demographics of the campaign target group but did not demonstrate any intent to purchase wildlife products, i.e., did not search for said products online. The Green target group would be persuaded to disseminate the demand reduction messages to peers in their online social circles. Messages were positive (using BWI ads featuring Cindy Bishop) and were disseminated through Google Display Banners ([https://instapage.com/blog/search-ads-vs-display-ads](https://instapage.com/blog/search-ads-vs-display-ads)). Users were invited to click to a pledge page [www.beautifulwithoutivory.org](http://www.beautifulwithoutivory.org). The campaign targeting the Green group ran from November 18, 2019 to January 31, 2020.

- **AMBER**: The Amber group were those who have demonstrated potential intent to purchase, i.e., by making search queries on Google regarding price and location to purchase wildlife products. Some of those in the Amber group would be retargeted from
data obtained in Phase 1. The Amber target group were served “warning” ads to deter them from pursuing their search. Messages were warnings (using BWI ads) in nature and disseminated through Google search results. The campaign targeting the Amber group ran from November 18, 2019 to January 31, 2020.

**RED**: The Red group were those who have demonstrated clear and repeated intent to purchase, i.e., by making search queries on Google regarding price and location to purchase wildlife products. This group comprises those retargeted from data obtained in Phase 1. The Red group were served “warning” messages to deter them from pursuing their search through Google Display Banners that would follow them when they browsed the internet. The campaign targeting the Red group ran on Google from November 18, 2019 to January 31, 2020 and on Facebook/Instagram from April 1 to April 30, 2020.
CAMPAIGN DISSEMINATION AND REACH RESULTS

The Phase 2 campaign served around 21.4 million ads on all platforms and reached an estimated 7.8 million unique users. Below are reach results for each target group category.

### GREEN | GDN BANNERS RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Served Ads</th>
<th>Reach</th>
<th>Clicks to BWI Pledge Page</th>
<th>Avg. CPM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2019 - Jan 2020</td>
<td>14.7M</td>
<td>5.9M</td>
<td>48.7K</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Translation:**

สวยที&ใจไม่ใช่ที&งา = Beautiful without Ivory

Ivory is never beautiful and never acceptable.

### AMBER | SEARCH ADS RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Search Ads Served</th>
<th>Clicks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nov 18, 2019 - Jan 31, 2020</td>
<td>270K</td>
<td>3.5K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5K</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Searches general keywords related to ivory could be neutral or informative**

Beautiful without Ivory | Pledge to stop using ivory

www.beautifulwithoutivory.org

Ivory is never beautiful and never acceptable.

Pledge to stop using ivory.

**Keywords with purchase intent, i.e. ivory price, selling genuine ivory**

1. Beautiful without Ivory
2. Pledge to stop using ivory
3. ivory price
4. selling genuine ivory

**Please refer to the attached images for visual representations.**
MINI ONLINE TRACKING SURVEY

A mini online tracking survey aims to monitor differences in attitudes, social norms, intention to buy, and past purchase related to exposure to the Digital Deterrence campaign. Trends Digital, USAID Wildlife Asia’s media agency, conducted the survey from April 30 to June 4, 2020. The survey was released to exposed audiences and non-exposed audiences within the target demographic and affinity profiles. No incentive was provided for the completion of the survey.

A self-administered, close-ended questionnaire with five questions was sent to two groups, those exposed and those not exposed to the campaign. Of 144,000 people in the total audience reached
by the questionnaire invitation, 428 respondents (205 exposed and 223 non-exposed to the media) accomplished the questionnaire.

Key results showed significant differences in intention to buy, perceived social acceptability, and attitudes regarding ivory and tiger products promoted by the campaign between those exposed and not exposed to campaign messages.

### Key Results: Digital Deterrence 2 Online Mini-Tracking Survey (428 respondents)

The results show a significant change in intention to buy, social acceptability and attitude towards ivory and tiger parts and products after the audience exposed to the campaign materials.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (agreement to statement)</th>
<th>Exposed to ad (N=205)</th>
<th>Not Exposed to ad (N=223)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intend to buy ivory and tiger products in the future</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory and tiger products are socially acceptable among family and friends</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory and tiger protect from harm and bring good luck</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory accessories are beautiful</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THAILAND MONITORING SURVEY 2020**

In July 2020, the project carried out an online survey to evaluate the Digital Deterrence campaign and other SBCC demand reduction campaigns implemented in Thailand, including the Beautiful Without Ivory and Spiritual Beliefs Campaign Phase 1 and Phase 2. The survey objectives were to assess: 1) level of recall of the SBCC campaigns among target audiences, and 2) changes in the desired attitudes, perceptions of social acceptability and intention to use ivory and tiger parts and products among those exposed to the campaigns, compared with data on these same indicators from the 2018 consumer research. The 2020 survey protocol and instruments received ethical review and approvals from FHI 360 and Chulalongkorn University’s Institutional Review Board.

The survey was conducted online through the Survey Monkey platform. The questionnaire was an expanded version of that used during the 2018 baseline research, with the addition of questions to determine campaign recall. The survey was conducted with a randomly selected sample of 421 adults, 18-49 years old, who met the following inclusion criteria: resident in Bangkok (or surrounding area) for at least the last 12 months, household income of at least 35,000 THB per month, and owned or bought ivory or tiger products or self-reported intention to buy any of these products in the past three years. These demographic characteristics are the same as the consumer sample in the 2018 baseline research. Among the 2020 sample (N=421), 70% owned ivory or tiger parts or products, while 30% had intended to buy these items within the last three years. This is compared with 55% owners and 45% intenders in the 2018 baseline research.

The survey measured the same set of demand reduction indicators measured in the 2018 baseline research.
RECALL OF MESSAGING FROM THE DIGITAL DETERRENCE CAMPAIGN PHASES 1 - 2

Key findings related to campaign recall from the evaluation are presented below.

- Overall recall of any USAID Wildlife Asia campaign was high, with 88% of respondents having seen or heard at least one ad from any of the three major SBCC campaigns in Thailand, while 75% had seen or heard at least one celebrity talk about the campaign messages.

- Specific recall of ads from the Digital Deterrence campaign messages from Phase 1 was high, with 56% recalling the message “Trade in trafficked ivory/tiger is illegal. Undercover officers are online.” Twenty-three percent (23%) also recalled the ad “Searching for illegal ivory/tiger? Then we’re searching for you.”

- Recall of the Beautiful Without Ivory ad integrated in the Digital Deterrence Campaign Phase 2 “Ivory is never beautiful, never acceptable” was 27%.

- 57% recalled one or more messages from the Beautiful Without Ivory campaign messaging, which was integrated in the Digital Deterrence Phase 2 campaign.

- The most frequently recalled message from the Beautiful Without Ivory campaign was “True beauty does not need ivory” (32%) followed by “Ivory is never beautiful, never acceptable” (27%).

- Over one third (38%) of respondents recalling seeing campaign ads three or more times and one quarter (25%) recalling seeing campaign ads twice.

- Among those exposed to any campaign, perception that ivory is beautiful decreased from 65% to 43% from 2018 (based on data from the 2018 USAID Wildlife Asia research) to 2020.

- Among those exposed to any campaign, perception that ivory and tiger bring good luck decreased from 86% to 54%, and 62% to 49%, respectively from 2018 to 2020.

- Among those exposed to any campaign, perception that ivory and tiger protect from harm decreased from 80% to 48%, and 62% to 52%, respectively, from 2018 to 2020.

### ADS RECALLED (N = 421)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMPAIGN - AD</th>
<th>PERCENT (N=421)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Digital Deterrence:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade in trafficked ivory/tiger is illegal. Undercover officers are online.</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching for illegal ivory/tiger? Then we’re searching for you.</td>
<td>23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spiritual Beliefs:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop buying, stop using products made from tiger and elephant ivory.</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Products that come from killing, are you sure they are auspicious?</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You want a good life, why take the life of another?</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do products created from death bring you value or make you the killer?</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How could ivory and tiger fang protect you when these animals could not protect themselves?</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you ever asked yourself, you want to have a good life but why take a life?</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can tiger fang and ivory really protect you?</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Beautiful Without Ivory</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True beauty does not need ivory.</td>
<td>32.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory is never beautiful, never acceptable</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think wearing ivory is fashionable?</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think wearing ivory is beautiful?</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You think wearing ivory is acceptable?</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USAID.GOV
Among those exposed to the Digital Deterrence campaign, those who say that buying ivory and tiger products is acceptable among family and friends decreased from 91% to 44%, and 51% to 33%, respectively, from 2018 to 2020.

Among those exposed to the Digital Deterrence campaign, those who say they intend to buy ivory and tiger products in the future fell from 79% to 39%, and 75% to 32%, respectively from 2018 to 2020.

**CONCLUSION AND INSIGHTS**

The implementation and evaluation of the Digital Deterrence campaign phases 1-2 demonstrated that digital campaigns are effective in reducing demand among potential consumers of wildlife products. This Digital Deterrence campaign precisely targeting potential online buyers of illegal wildlife products was a pilot innovation that aimed to move from raising awareness to changing consumer behaviors (deterring online purchase). The campaign adopted an SBCC strategy and used the most popular internet search engine (Google) as well as social media platforms (Facebook and Instagram for phase 2) in Thailand to: 1) design the campaign targeting audiences based on observable behaviors (use of keywords that denote possible online wildlife purchase); 2) develop messages based on consumer research data on the drivers and barriers to wildlife consumption among consumers and on theories of behavior change and behavioral economics; and, 3) monitor and assess results through digital analytics and an evaluation. It used adaptive management to respond to online results.

Monitoring data from digital analytics on the number of ads served, views and clicks, showed that this digital strategy was effective and highly cost-efficient in precisely targeting those with potential interest in buying or consuming wildlife products. The 2020 Monitoring Survey demonstrated that the campaign messaging was highly recalled and this recall had a positive impact in decreasing intention to buy ivory and tiger products and the social acceptability of these products.