Stay Ahead of Poachers: Illegal Wildlife Poaching Prediction and Patrol Planning Under Uncertainty with Field Test Evaluations
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ABSTRACT
Illegal wildlife poaching threatens ecosystems and drives endangered species toward extinction. However, efforts for wildlife monitoring and protection in conservation areas are constrained by the limited resources of law enforcement agencies. To aid in wildlife protection, PAWS is an ML pipeline that has been developed as an end-to-end, data-driven approach to combat illegal poaching. PAWS assists park managers by identifying areas at high risk of poaching throughout protected areas based on real-world data and generating optimal patrol routes for deployment in the field. In this paper, we address significant challenges including extreme class imbalance (up to 1:200), bias, and uncertainty in wildlife poaching data to enhance PAWS and apply its methodology to several national parks with diverse characteristics. (i) We use Gaussian processes to quantify predictive uncertainty, which we exploit to increase the robustness of our prescribed patrols. We evaluate our approach on real-world historic poaching data from Murchison Falls and Queen Elizabeth National Parks in Uganda and, for the first time, Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary in Cambodia. (ii) We present the results of large-scale field tests conducted in Murchison Falls and Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary which confirm that the predictive power of PAWS extends promisingly to multiple parks. This paper is part of an effort to expand PAWS to 600 parks around the world through integration with SMART conservation software.
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1 INTRODUCTION
Illegal wildlife poaching is an international problem that threatens biodiversity, ecological balance, and ecotourism [2]. Countless species are being poached to near-extinction: the ivory, horn, and skin of exotic species such as elephants, tigers, and rhinos render them targets for illegal trade of luxury products and medicinal applications [1, 22]; other species like wild pig and apes are hunted for cheap protein as bushmeat [24]. Their habitats sometimes become designated wildlife conservation areas, but these parks overwhelming lack sufficient resources to protect animals from poachers.
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Timely detection and deterrence of illegal poaching activities in protected areas are critical to combating illegal poaching. Machine learning frameworks can significantly advance wildlife protection efforts by learning from past poaching activity to prescribe actionable recommendations to park managers. The Protection Assistant for Wildlife Security (PAWS) was introduced in [26] and refined through [7, 10, 15, 16, 19]. PAWS uses a two-stage process to assist park rangers in protected areas. The first stage leverages machine learning to build a predictive model of relative poaching risk, and the second stage uses those predictions to optimize the detection of future poaching activity and generate patrol routes.

Prescribing patrol plans to park rangers requires in-depth knowledge of the poachers’ behavior. Learning the poachers’ behavior is a challenging machine learning problem since (a) the wildlife crime datasets are usually extremely imbalanced, with up to 99.5% negative labels; (b) negative labels indicating absence of illegal activity are not reliable due to the inherent difficulty of detecting well-hidden poaching signs in the forest, as shown in Figure 2; (c) historical crime observations are not collected thoroughly and uniformly in many protected areas, so datasets suffer from potential biases; and (d) poaching patterns and landscape features vary from one protected area to another, so a universal predictive model cannot be recommended.

We improve upon the previously proposed methodology by addressing these four challenges. To do so, (i) We use Gaussian processes to quantify uncertainty in predictions of poaching risk and exploit these uncertainty metrics to increase the robustness of our prescribed patrols. We evaluate our approaches on historical crime data from three real-world datasets from Uganda and Cambodia, which have different characteristics from both ecological and data quality perspectives. (ii) We present results from large-scale field tests conducted in Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP) in Uganda.
and Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary (SWS) in Cambodia, which demonstrate that the power of our model to predict risk of future poaching activity extends promisingly to the real world.

To deploy these anti-poaching models, we have worked with park rangers and conservation specialists at the World Wild Fund for Nature (WWF), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), and Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA). During our field tests, park rangers detected 38 attacked cells in MFNP and removed 521 snares from SWS. Along with evaluating the predictive power of our model, these tests enable us to garner feedback from rangers and convince these conservation specialists that a machine learning approach can augment the wildlife protection strategies they employ. The historic patrolling and poaching data we used for both MFNP and SWS was collected over the years using SMART, a monitoring and reporting tool for protected area management [21]. SMART is developed by a consortium of leading conservation organizations and used in more than 600 protected areas across 55 countries. Although SMART records significant amounts of historical data, machine learning techniques have not been systematically applied to predict poacher behavior. In the coming year, PAWS will be integrated into the SMART software and become available to park managers around the world. The enhancements and field tests in this paper outline significant steps to expanding PAWS on a global scale.

## 2 RELATED WORK

The two major components of PAWS are predictive modeling and patrol route planning. In the anti-poaching predictive modeling literature, [26] introduced PAWS as a stochastic behavioral model. CAPTURE [19] used a two-layered Bayesian Network with latent variables to model imperfect detection of poaching activity. In contrast, INTERCEPT [16] was proposed as an ensemble of decision trees that did not assume imperfect detection of poaching activities but achieved better runtime and performance than CAPTURE. Combining the strengths of the previous approaches, [8] introduced a geo-clustering technique to produce a hybrid model consisting of multiple Markov random fields and a bagging ensemble of decision trees. They also conducted the first extended field test in Queen Elizabeth National Park, which demonstrated the predictive power of the model.

The state-of-the-art iWare-E ensemble model [9] addresses one major challenge of anti-poaching predictive modeling: non-uniform one-sided noise on evidence of poaching observations due to imperfect detection of snares and other poaching signs. Evaluated on datasets from two protected areas in Uganda, iWare-E significantly improves runtime while performing at least as well as the hybrid model. This ensemble approach exploits other machine learning models as weak learners; in particular, bagging ensembles of decision trees or SVMs were used as weak learners for evaluation. However, these specific choices of weak learner present exact predictions; prediction uncertainty is not quantified. Consequently, uncertainty cannot be exploited in the patrol planning algorithm.

The patrol planning component of PAWS is developed through a game theoretical framework [5], which extends the game theoretic models of Stackelberg Security Games [17, 23] to the setting of environmental sustainability and wildlife protection, known as Green Security Games (GSGs). In this setting, poachers may not behave as perfectly rational utility maximizers. GSGs have been successfully applied domains such as to logging [14] and fishing [12].

In patrol planning for wildlife protection, patrol generation algorithms have been proposed and tested in real-world settings [6, 7, 26]. However, those studies rely on specific poacher behavior models such as Quantal Response and Subjective Utility Quantal Response [19], which is restrictive when historical data is available and predictive models can be trained to predict complex attacker behavior in a more precise manner. To address this restriction, a patrol planning framework was proposed in [9, 25] to generate implementable patrolling routes against a black-box attacker model. The model from [9] scales up to continuous patrol effort values and handles the one-sided noise on crime observations through an uncertainty-aware predictive model, iWare-E. However, even such an uncertainty-aware model is not consistently confident and reliable across the entire area, since poaching data is not collected uniformly across the area. Previous studies do not quantify or incorporate such confidence scores into their patrol planning algorithms to improve robustness of their approach.

## 3 WILDLIFE CRIME DOMAIN AND DATA

### 3.1 Domain Characteristics

We study Murchison Falls National Park (MFNP) and Queen Elizabeth National Park (QENP) in Uganda, and Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary (SWS) in Cambodia. These protected areas cover 5000 sq. km, 2500 sq. km and 4300 sq. km, respectively. MFNP and QENP are critically important for ecotourism and conservation in Uganda, and provide habitat to elephants, giraffes, hippos, and lions [3]. SWS is the largest protected area in Southeast Asia and is home to leopards, bears, and banteng. SWS once housed a native population of tigers, but they fell prey to poaching; the last tiger was observed in 2007. In the intervening decade, SWS has been identified as a promising site for tiger reintroduction [11]. Effectively managing the landscape by reducing poaching will be critical to successful reintroduction.

To combat poaching, park rangers conduct patrols through protected areas and use GPS trackers to mark their observations. They confiscate animal traps, rescue live animals caught in snares, and arrest any poacher they encounter [4]. Their GPS trackers are connected to the SMART system, recording many years of wildlife crime data [21]. However, the data are biased due to the inability of park rangers to detect all instances of poaching. There are additional data collection issues due to the nature of these patrols: rangers may have to address an emergency in the field, such as hearing a
poacher in the distance, and lose the opportunity to record snares or bullet cartridges they found.

We study SWS in Cambodia for the first time and conduct a month-long field test. This park introduces many challenges. (a) It is particularly under-resourced, with only a few dozen rangers enforcing an area the size of Rhode Island. (b) Unlike MFNP or QENP where rangers conduct foot patrols, park rangers in SWS travel by motorbike. This faster form of transport means that waypoints in the dataset (typically recorded once every 30 minutes) are even more sparse, making it difficult to interpolate their trajectory between sequential points. Additionally, negative labels in the dataset are likely less reliable because patrollers are less able to carefully observe their surroundings when traveling quickly. (c) SWS experiences strong seasonality: many rivers are impossible to cross during the wet season, but dry up during the dry season.

3.2 Dataset Processing

Patrol observations come from SMART conservation software, which records the GPS location of each observation along with date and time, patrol leader, and method of transport. Park rangers enter their observations: animals or humans spotted; signs of illegal activity such as campsites or cut trees; and signs of poaching activity such as firearms, bullet cartridges, snares, or slain animals. We categorize these observations into poaching and non-poaching. Additionally, we rebuild historic patrol effort from these observations by using sequential waypoints to calculate patrol trajectories.

We augment these patrol observations with geospatial features about each park, provided as GIS shapefiles from the data specialists at WWF, WCS, and UWA. The features differ between parks, but typically include terrain features such as rivers, elevation maps, and forest cover; landscape features such as roads, park boundary, local villages, and patrol posts; and ecological features such as animal density and net primary productivity. We use these static features to build data points in our predictive model, either as direct values (such as slope) or as distance values (such as distance to nearest river). We do not explicitly encode longitude or latitude as features, which could be extrapolated through the various distance values.

To study the data, we discretize the protected areas into 1 km grid cells. Each cell is associated with the geospatial features described above. We partition time into three-month time intervals, which allows us to capture seasonal trends and corresponds to approximately often park rangers plan new patrol strategies. The dynamic features in our dataset are patrol effort and poaching activity. For each time interval, we aggregate the patrol effort at each cell and assign a positive label (y = 1) if park rangers observed poaching-related activity during that time period. We compute patrol effort as the distance walked by park rangers across a cell. Ideally, we would be able to encode the time spent in each cell to measure patrol effort, as walking slowly through an area likely increases chance of detecting illegal activity. However, rangers typically record waypoints only once every 30 minutes and activities such as lunch breaks or setting up camp overnight are not identified.

We build the datasets \( D = (X, y) \) based on these historical patrol observations. The records are discretized into a set of T time steps and N locations to create a matrix \( X \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N \times k} \), where k is the number of features. Each feature vector \( x_{t,n} \) contains multiple time-invariant geospatial features associated with each location and two time-variant covariates: \( c_{t-1,n} \), the amount of patrol coverage during the previous time step \( t-1 \), which models the potential deterrence effect of past patrols; and \( c_{t,n} \), the patrol effort in the current time step, which models the effort devoted to the cell during time t. Additionally, we have the observation vector \( y \in \{0, 1\}^{T \times N} \) as a binary encoding of whether any illegal activity was detected at each data point \( (t, n) \).

3.3 Domain Challenges

While park rangers attempt to record and destroy any signs of illegal activity, they are not always successful—snares may be well-hidden by poachers, and park rangers only walk limited paths within each 1 km cell. The success with which they detect poaching activity depends on the amount of effort exerted in patrolling these regions, creating one-sided noise in the observations. Positive records are reliable regardless of the amount of patrol effort (if park rangers find a snare in a cell, poaching occurred with certainty), but negative labels have different levels of uncertainty which depend on the patrol effort \( c_{t,n} \) spent in cell \( n \) during time t.

As shown in Figure 4, the percentage of illegal activity detected increases proportionally to patrol effort exerted. Thus, given a threshold \( \theta \) of patrol effort, negative data samples recorded based on a patrol effort of \( c_{t,n} \geq \theta \) are relatively more reliable (more likely to be true negatives) compared to the data with less patrol effort \( c_{t,n} \leq \theta \). Since negative labels compose a large portion of the wildlife crime datasets, this uncertainty poses a significant challenge to making accurate predictions in this domain.
4 PREDICTIVE MODELING WITH UNCERTAIN CRIME DATA

The first stage of PAWS is a predictive model to identify the relative risk of poaching throughout a protected area. We use the imperfect observation-aware Ensemble model (iWare-E) proposed in [9]. The ensemble model, diagrammed in Figure 5, generates subsets of the data by filtering patrol effort across different thresholds to produce an ensemble of learners. Each weak learner $C_{\theta_i}$ is trained on a subset of the dataset $D_{\theta_i}$, filtered by a threshold $\theta_i$ for $i \in \{1, \ldots, I\}$ such that $\theta_1 \leq \theta_{i+1}$. For any choice of $[\theta_{\text{min}}, \theta_{\text{max}}]$, $I$ intermediate thresholds $\theta_i$ can be obtained such that $\theta_{\text{min}} \leq \theta_i \leq \theta_{\text{max}}$. Due to the label imbalance, we discard only negative samples and keep all positive samples, even those below the specified threshold. Thus, we train $I$ weak learners based on those subsets of the data. [9] used a bagging ensemble of either decision trees or SVM models as the weak learners.

4.1 Enhancements to Address Uncertainty

A key challenge we address in this paper is the need to explicitly reason about the uncertainty in the model predictions. Hence, we augment the iWare-E method with Gaussian process (GP) classifiers [20] as the weak learners:

$$f(x_i) \sim GP \left( \mu(X), \Sigma(X) \right),$$

with mean $\mu(X)$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma(X)$. Due to the formal definition of the covariance functions, GPs enable us to explicitly quantify the uncertainty of predictions as a percentage. We then use these uncertainty values to make more informed decisions in patrol planning.

In the iWare-E ensemble method, a classifier trained on data at threshold $\theta_i$ can make predictions on a new observation with effort at threshold $\theta_i$ if there is a value in the corresponding vote matrix $V^\text{QP}$, that is, if $V^\text{QP}[i,j] > 0$. [9] proposed a voting matrix with values only in the upper triangular matrix, so classifiers trained on data with high patrol effort would only predict on data with equal or higher patrol effort. However, our experiments showed that we could improve the approach. We achieved the best results by setting the voting matrix as a lower triangular matrix, which means that each classifier predicts on data points with patrol effort equal or less than data it was trained on. For example, the final classifier with threshold $\theta_1$ will be used in all predictions. This finding aligns with the intuition that higher classifiers provide better predictions, as they have been trained on higher quality data: negative labels at high patrol effort are more reliable to be true negatives.

In picking thresholds $\theta_i$ for patrol effort, [9] used 16 equally-distanced values from $\theta_1 = 0$ to $\theta_7 = 7.5$. However, we found that the best approach was to select these thresholds based on patrol effort percentiles, to produce a consistent amount of training data for each classifier. This approach then simplifies the model such that the number of classifiers becomes a single hyperparameter, rather than having to pick $\theta_{\text{min}}, \theta_{\text{max}},$ and $\Delta\theta$ separately. The number of classifiers should be selected based on the characteristics of the data; we used more classifiers (20) for QENP and MFNP, which have well-behaved label imbalance (see Figure 4), than for SWS (10). In addition, selecting thresholds based on percentile better accounts for sparsity in the data: there may be very few cells patrolled with effort between 5 and 6, and those points may all be negative labels.

4.2 Evaluation on Historical Data

We generate predictive poaching models with four years of data for each park, training on the first three years and testing on the fourth. This setup simulates the ability of each model to predict future incidences of poaching. Although we have up to 18 years of data for each park, earlier years are increasingly less reliable: a park may hire more rangers; the sale price of illegal wildlife goods may increase, making poaching more attractive; or logging may increase in a region, thus changing the landscape.

The dataset from SWS created new challenges of class imbalance. Observe in Table 1 the extreme label imbalance in SWS for test year 2017, with only 0.3% positive labels in the training set and 0.1% in testing. Given these new challenges of significantly imbalanced data, we used a balanced bagging classifier to undersample negative labels [13, 18]. This undersampling approach improved our AUC by 10% on average. With datasets in the wildlife crime domain, undersampling is preferred to oversampling the minority class because the positive labels are inherently more noisy due to random factors that influence whether rangers detect poaching activity.

We implement the iWare-E ensemble method with three base classifiers: bagging ensembles of SVMs (SVB-iW), bagging ensembles of decision trees (DTB-iW), and bagging ensembles of Gaussian process classifiers (GPB-iW). We compare these models to baseline models, using those same weak learners but without iWare-E (referred to as SVB, DTB, and GPB).

The performance of the different predictive models evaluated on MFNP, QENP, and SWS for various choices of weak learners used in iWare-E is presented in Table 2*. The year listed is the test set; for example, MFNP (2016) indicates that 2013–2015 were used for training and 2016 for testing. We conducted three experiments on each of the parks: with test sets 2014, 2015, and 2016 for MFNP and QENP, and 2016, 2017, and 2018 for SWS. The iWare-E approach consistently improves AUC across all models. In general, SVMs are suboptimal weak learners in this domain, and decision trees and GPs

*Additional performance metrics and available in the online appendix: https://www.dropbox.com/s/s46pz94sxsyoz8h/KDD19_PAWS_appendix.pdf
have comparable performance. Thus, introducing GPs to the iWare-E method does not inhibit performance. As we will show, the ability of GPs to estimate uncertainty provides important advantages in patrol planning that make it the preferred weak learner.

Algorithm runtime for all models is listed in the online appendix†. Overall, DTB-iW is the most efficient and runs nearly instantly, and SVB-iW completes in under two minutes. GPB-iW is significantly more computationally expensive, requiring up to 7 hours. To improve runtime with GPB and GPB-iW, we used bagging classifiers on small subsets of the data with minimal trade-off in performance.

4.3 Uncertainty in Crime Prediction

We analyze the predicted probabilities and the uncertainties associated with the predictions of the GPB-iW model. By construct, in the Gaussian process model, each probability score is associated with a variance value which indicates the amount of uncertainty in the prediction. Figure 6a depicts the joint probability of detection of attack and attack [Pr[a = 1, o = 1]], generated by GPB-iW, for different levels of patrol effort in MFNP. For instance, the middle plot shows the predicted probability of detecting an attack if each 1 sq. km area in the park is patrolled with 1 km of patrol effort by park rangers during three months of patrolling. Although the predicted probability for many cells increases as patrol effort increases, several cells show a zero or near-zero change in predicted probability. Such observations indicate that there is either no potential attack (Pr[a = 1] ≈ 0) or no high-quality patrol coverage in those regions.

Algorithm runtime for all models is listed in the online appendix†. Overall, DTB-iW is the most efficient and runs nearly instantly, and SVB-iW completes in under two minutes. GPB-iW is significantly more computationally expensive, requiring up to 7 hours. To improve runtime with GPB and GPB-iW, we used bagging classifiers on small subsets of the data with minimal trade-off in performance.

5 EVALUATION IN THE FIELD

Previous studies evaluated PAWS with field tests in Queen Elizabeth National Park [9, 16]. However, it is critical to test PAWS on the ground in other protected areas to ensure predictive performance across diverse environments.

5.1 Field Tests in Murchison Falls National Park

In collaboration with the Uganda Wildlife Authority, we conducted field tests in Murchison Falls National Park to compare with previous results from Queen Elizabeth. QENP and MFNP are both in Uganda but 500 km apart. They are both large savannas, but QENP contains more scrub and woodland while MFNP has large grasslands. The shape of QENP is long so it is easy to access the center from the boundary, while MFNP is circular with a more protected core, so most poaching occurs at the edges of the park. Additionally, from a computational perspective, the label imbalance differs between the parks, with MFNP having a threefold higher proportion of positive labels (see Table 1).

To conduct these field tests, we selected 2 × 2 km regions and classified our recommended areas into three risk groups (low, medium, and high). These areas were all infrequently patrolled in the past, to ensure we test the predictive power of our algorithms rather than

| Table 1: About the datasets: percentage of positive labels |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | number of points | percent positive |
|                 | train | test   | train | test   |
| QENP 2016       | 9,254 | 4,285  | 14.0% | 16.3%  |
|                 | 11,150| 2,055  | 15.4% | 12.6%  |
|                 | 11,150| 2,055  | 15.6% | 13.4%  |
| QENP 2014       | 10,541| 2,755  | 4.3%  | 3.7%   |
|                 | 9,436 | 3,335  | 4.2%  | 6.1%   |
|                 | 9,025 | 3,233  | 4.6%  | 5.6%   |
| SWS 2016        | 18,534| 7,636  | 0.2%  | 0.4%   |
|                 | 20,664| 8,491  | 0.3%  | 0.1%   |
|                 | 23,805| 11,166 | 0.3%  | 0.7%   |

| Table 2: Comparing performance (AUC) of each model across all three datasets |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                 | without iWare-E | with iWare-E     |                 |
|                 | SVB  | DTB  | GPB  | SVB  | DTB  | GPB  |
| MFNP 2014       | 0.52 | 0.59 | 0.63 | 0.69 | 0.72 | 0.72 |
|                 | 0.51 | 0.61 | 0.66 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
|                 | 0.52 | 0.60 | 0.62 | 0.66 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| QENP 2014       | 0.50 | 0.68 | 0.69 | 0.60 | 0.72 | 0.64 |
|                 | 0.50 | 0.59 | 0.60 | 0.62 | 0.70 | 0.71 |
|                 | 0.50 | 0.64 | 0.60 | 0.64 | 0.74 | 0.74 |
| SWS 2016        | 0.81 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 0.76 | 0.72 | 0.68 |
|                 | 0.68 | 0.71 | 0.73 | 0.86 | 0.83 | 0.82 |
|                 | 0.51 | 0.53 | 0.55 | 0.67 | 0.69 | 0.71 |

Figure 6b presents the corresponding uncertainties in the predictions from Figure 6a. These uncertainty heatmaps show the model’s confidence about each prediction. For example, the southeast region of the park suffers from the highest amount of uncertainty in the predictions. As expected, the past patrolling data (shown in Figure 3a) reveals that patrolling has been minimal in this region, due in part from few large mammals and lack of patrol posts. Since this region has the least historic data, the predictions are the least certain. This information is valuable for robust defender patrol planning which strategizes against the worst-case attack scenarios, and could also be used to plan patrol routes that explicitly target areas with high model uncertainty in order to reduce the existing data bias.
We deployed the PAWS predictive algorithm in Cambodia for the first time. Partnering with WWF Cambodia, we conducted field tests in Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary beginning in December 2018. As discussed in Section 3.1, this park differs in many ways from MFNP and QENP including having significantly greater label imbalance, denser ecology and terrain, and more limited patrolling resources.

Since SWS experiences high seasonality, where many rivers dry up during the dry season, we trained our model based only on data from dry months (November through April), using a two-month discretization to get three temporal points per year. We trained an iWare-E model, using the enhanced approach described in this paper, with GPs as the weak learner on data from January 2015 through April 2018, and made predictions on November–December of 2018. Using these predictions of poaching risk for 1 × 1 km cells, we averaged the risk predictions over the adjacent cells by convolving the risk map to produce 3 × 3 km blocks. We then discarded all blocks with historic patrol effort above the 50th percentile, to ensure we were assessing the ability of our model to make predictions in regions with limited data. From this set of valid blocks, we identified high-, medium-, and low-risk areas by considering blocks with risk predictions within the 80–100, 40–60, and 0–20 percentile. We selected the final areas used during the field tests based on criteria the park manager specified, including proximity to roads and being within a high-protection core zone. In total, we selected five 3 × 3 km blocks from each of the three risk categories, shown in Figure 7.

To deploy these tests, we gave the park rangers GPS coordinates of the center of each block and asked them to target those regions during their patrols. Again, we did not reveal to them the risk category of each region to prevent bias. In December 2018, 64 park rangers in teams of eight conducted one month of patrols throughout SWS, with 16 days on the ground. The results from this real-world experiment are shown in Table 3. Since we selected an equal number of high-, medium-, and low-risk groups, we count the number of 1 × 1 km cells that were patrolled from each set of regions to normalize the number of observations of poaching activity. A chi-squared test confirms that the results are statistically significant at the 0.05 level with a p-value of 1.17 × 10^{-2}. These results bolster our findings from the MFNP experiments: our predictive model effectively evaluates the poaching threat for different regions across the park. Interestingly, park rangers spent more time in low-risk than medium- or high-risk areas, which suggests that revealing our risk predictions to them would grant them valuable insight into their patrol strategy.

### Table 3: Field test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk group</th>
<th># Obs.</th>
<th># Cells</th>
<th>Effort</th>
<th># Obs. / # Cells</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFNP trial 1: Nov–Dec 2017</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MFNP trial 2: Jan–Mar 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>197.4</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SWS: Dec 2018</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During this one-month field test in SWS, park rangers detected poaching in 32 cells and removed 521 snares—each of which represents the life of one animal potentially saved. They also confiscated a firearm and they saw, but did not catch, three groups of poachers in the forest. By comparison, the average number of snares confiscated each month in 2018 was 101. We are enthusiastic about these results, and believe that a data-driven approach can bolster wildlife protection efforts. These tests are ongoing, and we will continue to improve PAWS based on our findings.

![Regions in SWS used for field tests. Risk categories are obscured to maintain security of the protected area.](image-url)
The defender utility is conditioned on a successful detection of attack. Let $a_v(x_v) = O$ denote a successful detection of snares at grid cell $v$. Note that the detection success probability is also a function of the defender’s mixed strategy coverage. The defender expected utility is then the probability of detecting snares at a grid cell, given that there is an attack at the cell, summed over all cells $U^d(a, x) = \sum_{v \in N} P[r_{a_v} = O \mid a_v = A]Pr[a_v = A]$. Note that we have omitted the dependence on $x_v$, for ease of notation. We compute an equilibrium solution to this game where the defender attempts to maximize her utility function $U^d(a, x)$ and each of the adversaries maximizes their own utility function $U^a(a_v, x_v)$. If the adversaries were perfectly rational, this would correspond to a strong Stackelberg equilibrium with each of the adversaries as in standard Stackelberg security games. However, in Green Security Games, the adversaries are bounded rational and we learn adversary behavior models from data, as described earlier in the paper. Thus, we achieve equilibrium with non-rational attackers as in [19, 26].

6.2 Prescriptive Modeling with Certain Crime Predictions

The adversary utility and the probability of detecting snares given that the adversary chooses to attack are both unknown functions. We use past data to learn a predictive model of the adversary’s response to the defender mixed strategy $x$ as well as the defender detection probability. To compute solutions to the patrol planning game, we then need to optimize this predictive model, which we treat as a black box function. We use a similar framework as in [9] to perform this optimization, which allows us to not only plan with a black box objective function, but also to reason about continuous decision variables such as patrol effort. The model uses a piecewise linear objective function to approximate predictions of the model. This formulation was shown to have significant improvements in runtime compared to previous methods for patrol planning with a black box function, which could only reason about discrete levels of patrol effort.

The predictive model produces, for each cell, a function $g_{v} : c_v \rightarrow P_{v}$ which maps the total defender patrol effort at a particular grid cell $v \in N$ to a corresponding likelihood that there will be a detected attack $P_v$ at that grid cell. The defender patrol effort is a function of the defender mixed strategy $c_v = x_v K$ where $K$ is the number of patrols that the defender conducts. As in [8], piecewise linear (PWL) approximations to these functions $g_v$ are constructed using $m \times N$ sampled points from the $N$ functions $g_v$.

These define the optimization problem $(P)$ which can be expressed as a mixed integer linear program (MILP):

$$\max_{c, f, \ell} \sum_{v \in N} g^\text{PWL}_{v}(c_v)$$

subject to:

$$f_{u', v'} \in \mathcal{F}$$

$$\sum_{u' \in \mathcal{E}} f_{u', v'} = 1 \quad \forall (u', v') \in \mathcal{E}$$

$$\sum_{v \in N} c_v = T \times K$$

Our objective function is given by the PWL approximation to the machine learning model predictions, which we refer to as $g^\text{PWL}_v$. The first constraints are the flow constraints on the time unrolled graph $G(N', E')$. The second constraint enforces that the patrol
We use predictions from the GPB-iW model to plan patrol routes for ranger parks. We only have black box access to the predictions as a function of the rangers patrol effort, which we need to be able to optimize in order to compute patrol paths. The planning model in [9] allows us to create paths, but does not account for uncertainty in the predictions and does not have a game theoretic component. To account for this, we augment the model by using the variance evaluated by varying the $\beta$ parameter as well as the number of segments in the piecewise linear functional approximations to $U_v$. The robustness of our approach.

The new GPB-iW machine learning model now gives for each grid cell a variance function $v_r : c \rightarrow V_r$, where $V_r$ becomes the uncertainty score for each prediction $q_r(c)$, with likelihood $P_r$ that there will be a detected attack at that cell. We want to compute a series of patrols which not only maximize the probability of detecting attacks over the entire area, but also takes into account the uncertainty of each prediction. To do this, we take a robust approach by penalizing the expected probability of detection given by $q_r$, by a scaled function of the uncertainty score $v_r$. The utility of patrolling any grid cell $v$ as a function of the patrol effort $c_v$ is:

$$U_v = g_v(c_v) - \alpha v(c_v).$$

The uncertainty scores that we get from the GPB-iW model are scaled to the range $[0, 1]$ through a logistic squashing function. We then choose $\alpha = \beta g_v(c_v)$, with $\beta \in [0, 1]$ to rescale the uncertainty score and ensure that the objective function is always positive. Larger values of $\beta$ allow us to optimize for plans which are more risk averse; $\beta$ thus becomes a parameter that enables us to tune the robustness of our approach. $\beta > 0$ corresponds to a pessimistic approach where we will patrol less in cells where there is greater uncertainty. We can compute the optimal patrol by substituting $U_P^{\text{PWL}}(c_v) = \sum_{v \in V} g_v(c_v) - \beta v(c_v)$ as our objective function in $P$, where, as in [9] we construct PWL approximations to $g_v$ and $v$ so that the optimization problem is expressible as a MILP.

### 6.3 Prescriptive Modeling with Uncertain Crime Predictions

We use predictions from the GPB-iW model to plan patrol routes for park rangers. We only have black box access to the predictions as a function of the rangers patrol effort, which we need to be able to optimize in order to compute patrol paths. The planning model in [9] allows us to create paths, but does not account for uncertainty in the predictions and does not have a game theoretic component. To account for this, we augment the model by using the variance evaluated by varying the $\beta$ parameter as well as the number of segments in the piecewise linear functional approximations to $U_v$. The robustness of our approach.

The new GPB-iW machine learning model now gives for each grid cell a variance function $v_r : c \rightarrow V_r$, where $V_r$ becomes the uncertainty score for each prediction $q_r(c)$, with likelihood $P_r$ that there will be a detected attack at that cell. We want to compute a series of patrols which not only maximize the probability of detecting attacks over the entire area, but also takes into account the uncertainty of each prediction. To do this, we take a robust approach by penalizing the expected probability of detection given by $q_r$, by a scaled function of the uncertainty score $v_r$. The utility of patrolling any grid cell $v$ as a function of the patrol effort $c_v$ is:

$$U_v = g_v(c_v) - \alpha v(c_v).$$

The uncertainty scores that we get from the GPB-iW model are scaled to the range $[0, 1]$ through a logistic squashing function. We then choose $\alpha = \beta g_v(c_v)$, with $\beta \in [0, 1]$ to rescale the uncertainty score and ensure that the objective function is always positive. Larger values of $\beta$ allow us to optimize for plans which are more risk averse; $\beta$ thus becomes a parameter that enables us to tune the robustness of our approach. $\beta > 0$ corresponds to a pessimistic approach where we will patrol less in cells where there is greater uncertainty. We can compute the optimal patrol by substituting $U_P^{\text{PWL}}(c_v) = \sum_{v \in V} g_v(c_v) - \beta v(c_v)$ as our objective function in $P$, where, as in [9] we construct PWL approximations to $g_v$ and $v$ so that the optimization problem is expressible as a MILP.

### 6.4 Evaluation of the Prescriptive Model

To demonstrate the benefit of accounting for uncertainty when planning patrols, we compare the patrols computed with and without uncertainty scores by evaluating them on the ground truth given by the objective with uncertainty. We refer to the plan computed using uncertainty weighted with value $\beta$ as $C_\beta = \arg\max_{\sum_{v \in V} U_P^{\text{PWL}}(c_v)} \sum_{v \in V} g_v(c_v) - \beta v(c_v), such that $C_{\beta=0}$ is a plan which does not account for uncertainty and $C_{\beta=1}$ is a fully robust plan. We then evaluate each of the plans using a utility function $U_P(c)$ and compute the ratio of the solution quality of the plan at a given $\beta$ to the baseline of $\beta = 0, U_P(C_\beta)/U_P(C_{\beta=0})$. For each dataset, we looked at the gain in solution quality for plans generated for each patrol post in the park, evaluated by varying the $\beta$ parameter as well as the number of segments in the piecewise linear functional approximations to $U_v$. The results are shown in Figure 9, where we consider both the average gain over all patrol posts as well as the maximum gain achieved. Not only does this demonstrate the benefit of robust planning, but rangers may also use this knowledge to help decide where to collect more data. By looking at the ratio $U_P(C_\beta)/U_P(C_{\beta=0})$ we can determine whether reducing the uncertainty in the predictive model will affect the computed plans. When this ratio is close to 1 there is little benefit in collecting data in order to reduce uncertainty in predictions as it does not change the utility of the computed patrols. However, when the ratio is large, the computed patrols are highly dependent on the areas where the model is uncertain; therefore there can be significant gains in utility through the reduction of uncertainty through collecting more data. We also demonstrate the scalability of this approach in Figure 10a, which shows the runtime with increasing number of breakpoints in the PWL function approximation. Figure 10b plots the convergence of the utility of the computed solutions. We looked at the utility of the robust solutions $U_{P\beta}(C_{\beta=1})$ with increasing number of segments in the PWL function and see that utility of the optimal solution converges around 20–25 segments.
Thank you to our partners at Uganda Wildlife Authority, Ministry of Environment, Cambodia, Wildlife Conservation Society, and the Ministry of Environment, Cambodia, for their thorough feedback on an earlier draft. We are grateful to the park rangers in MFNP and SWS for their support of wildlife protection and ought to be implemented more widely. A data-driven approach to combat poaching is an effective strategy and confiscated 521 snares in SWS. Our results confirm that we can quantitatively predict relative risk, which demonstrate that our model correctly predicts relative threat of poaching and can be effectively applied on the ground. During these tests, park rangers detected 38 attacked cells in MFNP and confiscated 521 snares in SWS. Our results confirm that we can convincingly train classifiers to learn poachers’ behavior. A data-driven approach to combat poaching is an effective strategy for wildlife protection and ought to be implemented more widely.

7 CONCLUSION

To assist park rangers in combating illegal wildlife poaching, we enhance PAWS by incorporating Gaussian processes into the state-of-art model, iWare-E. By using GPs to make predictions on poaching risk, we can quantify uncertainty in the predictions and exploit this uncertainty into the patrol planning model to improve robustness of the prescribed plans. Additionally, we present results from field tests in Murchison Falls National Park and Srepok Wildlife Sanctuary, which demonstrate that our model correctly predicts relative threat of poaching and can be effectively applied on the ground. These results confirm that we can convincingly train classifiers to learn poachers’ behavior.

Figure 10: Prescriptive model runtime (a) and patrol plan utility (b) as a function of the number of segments in the PWL function approximation to the GPG-iW model.
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