

MONITORING THE ILLEGAL KILLING OF ELEPHANTS

Minutes of the Regional Meeting of the CITES MIKE Programme
Nairobi (Kenya), 10 –11 September 2002

Executive Summary

1. MIKE Progress Report for CoP 12

The draft progress report on MIKE implementation was presented at this regional meeting as a response to the request by range States that the Director for MIKE should provide an opportunity for comment by the range States in advance of the forthcoming CITES Conference of Parties in Santiago, Chile.

Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Congo, D. R. Congo, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea-Conakry, India, Kenya, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Tanzania, Tchad, Togo and Uganda provided their comments and inputs on the draft progress report. Essentially, the following recommendations for improving the draft progress report (Doc. 34.2) for CoP 12 were recommended and agreed by the range States :

- (i) A paragraph to be included in the progress report to emphasize that MIKE is currently building on objectives 3 and 4 as a basis for moving on to achieving objectives 1 and 2 contained in Resolution 10.10 (rev.). (Ghana)
- (ii) To include research activities as a possible influencing factors in Table 4 of the progress report. (Kenya)
- (iii) To include a paragraph emphasizing the concerns raised by several countries with respect to closing the gap between sub-optimal effort and optimal effort in regard to law enforcement.
- (iv) To provide the annual budget and a breakdown of the budget allocations under the current project. (D R Congo).

The following main concerns, *inter alia*, were raised by representatives on the progress of MIKE implementation :

- (a) the resource constraints faced by range States for MIKE implementation for which it was recognized that the MIKE system is a working tool for each range States and the need to find development partners globally to overcome the constraints; and
- (b) the timing of deliverables and long term sustainability of the MIKE system vis-à-vis its raison d'être, i.e. the measuring and recording of levels and trends and changes in levels and trends of illegal hunting as set out in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.).

2. MIKE Data Policy

The draft document on Data Policy was presented as a response to the request by range States that the access and release protocols on MIKE data be drawn up and submitted to the range States for approval.

Benin, Cameroon, Kenya, Mali, Namibia, Niger and Uganda provided inputs. The main concern which many of the wildlife agencies raised was with raw data passing simultaneously to the National Officers, the MIKE Sub-regional Support Officers and the MIKE Central Coordinating Unit, when the normal protocol was for field information to pass through headquarters before being passed on to other recipients.

It was affirmed that passing on the raw data was not the issue, provided the normal Government procedures were observed and because such data was governed by the access and release protocols.

It was unanimously approved that a working group to finalise the Data Policy was not necessary but that written comments should be provided to the Director and he would revise the text accordingly.

It was further approved the African Elephant Database would continue to be the depository of all population estimates produced for MIKE sites.

3. Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) Progress Report for CoP 12

In response to the Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.) which calls for the production of a comprehensive report to each meeting of the Conference of the Parties, TRAFFIC has produced the status report of the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) CoP12 Doc 34.1 to be submitted to the parties at the CoP 12 in Santiago.

The Director of TRAFFIC for East/Southern Africa, Mr Tom Milliken gave his briefing on the history, background, operations and products of the ETIS programme. He continued with an explanation on the analysis of the elephant product seizures data, as well as proving the actual analysis of such data.

The countries which are playing leading roles in the illicit trade in ivory and the characteristics of this involvement were highlighted and an explanation was given of what the country-specific results of the cluster analysis indicate. The conclusions from the analysis of the temporal aspects of ETIS was also touched upon. They demonstrate a clear pattern of raw ivory illegally moving through unregulated domestic ivory markets around the world.

Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, D. R. Congo, Guinea Equatoriale, India, Kenya, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Togo and Uganda sought clarification on the analyses and provided their comments on the findings.

4. IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group

The opportunity was provided for the African Elephant Specialist Group, one of the IUCN Species Survival Commission, to give a presentation on the range of assistance available. Their presentation highlighted the ability of the AfESG to help with :

- Strategic Planning
- Technical Assistance in :
 - Human-Elephant Conflicts (HEC)
 - Elephant translocation & guidelines
 - Illegal Killing, Trade and Law Enforcement
 - Elephant taxonomy
 - IUCN Red List
- Building Capacity
 - Small Grant Fund
- Compiling, synthesizing and disseminating information
 - African Elephant Database
 - African Elephant Library
 - Pachyderm journal
 - AfESG Website

The presentations were made by the Chair of the AfESG, Dr Holly Dublin and Programme Officer Mr Leo Niskanen.

A presentation on the African Elephant Database was made by the AfESG AED Manager, Mr Julian Blanc.

5. Cooperation between MIKE and the World Heritage Convention

The presentation on the “Cooperation between CITES MIKE and the World Heritage Convention – Opportunity for Biodiversity Convention” was made by the Programme Specialist of the Natural Heritage Section, World Heritage Centre, Mr Guy Debonnet.

The synergies in the cooperation between MIKE and the Convention is aided by the fact that many MIKE sites are also World Heritage sites or proposed sites. The areas of cooperation between the two would encompass :-

- the development of a harmonized LEM system based on existing site systems;
- the production of base maps for sites;
- the execution of base line biodiversity surveys; and
- the development of a geo-referenced monitoring database for all sites.

Discussions are also underway on the possibility of developing a joint training programme to increase monitoring and data gathering capabilities in sites and management authorities. The identification of potential World Heritage sites in Africa and Asia would be important for elephant conservation and would present further opportunity for cooperation.

Welcome and Opening

First Chair of the meeting : Dr Pauline Lindeque, Director of Scientific Services, the Ministry of Environment and Tourism of Namibia

The meeting was opened by Dr Pauline Lindeque who welcomed the delegates to the first CITES MIKE regional meeting the purpose of which was to hear the progress reports concerning the MIKE and ETIS programmes, as well as the presentations by the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group and the World Heritage Convention.

Dr Lindeque noted that this is indeed an unique occasion for both the African and Asian Elephant range States are represented for the first time. In particular, Dr Lindeque thanked the MIKE Director, for honoring his commitment to providing the progress report in advance of the forthcoming CoP 12 in Santiago Chile, thus presenting an opportunity for comment. Thanks was extended to TRAFFIC for presenting the ETIS report at this meeting. It would clearly be an advantage to all concerned that discussions are entered both at the dialogue meeting and the CoP 12 with a common and clear understanding of these two programmes. At the CoP 11 held in Nairobi, confirmation that the EU has committed funds for the MIKE programme was warmly received. Those funds were eventually released under a year ago and the MIKE director was appointed and the central coordination unit created.

Dr Lindeque in reading the MIKE director's report noted that great progress has been made towards the implementation of MIKE in Africa. She shared her hope that the delegates would share in her interest in the presentations and discussions ahead and trust that they would endeavour to conduct discussions in a productive and mutually respectful manner. Then, Dr Lindeque invited the MIKE director to make the introductions.

Mr Hunter introduced himself and added his welcome to all. Before making his introductions, absence with apologies was extended on behalf of the representatives from Rwanda. The meeting was informed that the representatives from Eritrea could be expected to attend at a later stage. There was one representative instead of two from Niger, Guinea-Conakry and Central Africa Republic due to logistical problems. Nevertheless, he welcomed all the representatives in particular, the Asian delegates, and introduced the various participants from the CITES Secretariat, US Fish and Wildlife Service, TRAFFIC, African Elephant Specialist Group, World Heritage Centre, Wildlife Conservation Society, CITES Bushmeat Working Group and the various MIKE sub-regional support officers for Central, East and Southern Africa.

1. MIKE Progress Report for CoP 12

1.1 Presentation by the MIKE Director, Mr Nigel Hunter

The draft MIKE progress report and the presentation by Mr Nigel Hunter are attached hereto in Annex I.

Mr Hunter informed the meeting that any suggestions from the range States would be incorporated in the final progress report before it reaches the CITES Secretariat as document no. 34/2. He covered the following summary topics in his presentation :

1. Summary of MIKE Objectives
2. Requirement for Report
3. Progress in Africa
 - Institutional Arrangements
 - Sites
 - Law Enforcement Monitoring
 - Training in Africa
 - Population Surveys
 - Analytical Framework for Data Analysis
 - Funding Situation
4. Progress in Asia
5. Long Term Funding

1.2 Questions and Answers on MIKE Progress Report

The Chair thanked the Director for his comprehensive update on MIKE implementation in the four sub-regions in Africa and invited the participants to give their comments and recommendations on the draft progress report.

1.2.1 Senegal : Senegal took the floor and thanked the Director for his progress report. They shared their concerns over various issues : (i) a perceived lack of dialogue and communication process between the stakeholders, in particular the Technical Advisory Group (TAG); (ii) the exact role of the MIKE sub-regional officers (SSOs); (iii) funding constraints faced by range States in MIKE implementation, and (iv) the influencing factors in data analysis and data sensitivity. It was recommended that the progress report include the overall budget and the annual budget component for MIKE.

The Director gave his assurance that the process of dialogue and communication between MIKE and the range States is an important issue. With respect to the TAG, he advised that the minutes of the TAG meetings are currently posted on the CITES web-site. However, acknowledging that access to the internet might not be available to everyone, the Director will facilitate the dissemination of the TAG minutes via the sub-regional offices. On the role of the MIKE SSOs, they are to work closely with the range States in their respective sub-regions to *inter alia* (i) facilitate MIKE implementation and the law enforcement monitoring (LEM); (ii) to backstop the work of the site and national officers; (iii) to execute the population surveys and the data analysis. In recognizing that West Africa covers more range States 11 than the other sub-regions, two SSOs have been appointed to support that sub-region. The terms of reference for the SSOs can be circulated upon request.

On the issue of funding, MIKE funding is essentially (i) to support the provision of GPS, computers hardware and software and peripherals; (ii) to deliver the training on LEM/GPS at training workshops; (iii) to support and facilitate the Steering Group meetings and (iv) to facilitate the visit to MIKE sites by the SSOs. Three million dollars when divided over 18 months by 30 countries come to quite a small amount for each range State. The Director reiterated that he had dealt with the funding issue at length in all the sub-regions and they have achieved a good understanding that MIKE is not a donor for it does not have a source of funding. The agreement that is being reached with the sub-regions is that if a site faces funding constraints, MIKE would render assistance to find partners who could work with the wildlife agency and their treasury department to overcome the financial constraints. The bottomline is that MIKE is about capacity

development and sustainability and it must work together with the respective wildlife agencies to make the range States as self-sufficient as possible. This principle has been fully endorsed by the CITES Secretariat and the range States.

On the influencing factors illustrated in Table 4 of the draft progress report, the Director clarified that not all are negative factors, but rather a check-list of possible influencing factors, which could be either positive or negative. At this point in time, it is not possible to say which of these factors would prove to be truly influencing and which would be of little impact. Time will tell how they influence.

1.2.2 Togo : Togo next took the floor to thank the Director for his progress report and to request the Director for an outline on the training progress.

The Director briefed that pending the procurement of French keyboards, the computer equipment and software will be shipped to each SSO in each sub-region, for despatch to the national and site officers within the next six weeks. In the meantime, thanks to support from the US Fish and Wildlife Department, a training team of 5 or 6 is being put together in order to accelerate and execute the training programme on the database in each sub-region simultaneously to overcome the delay in implementation. Once the initial training on the database is undertaken at site, the sites officers would be encouraged to use data that they are collecting on the database. This would be followed by a re-enhancement of the training, using data collected. From the experience of the pilot programme, this process should take place over the next 6 months. There will be an initial workshop earlier rather than later for the site officers. When they meet for the second workshop, there would have been time enough to collect data and if more training is needed, the training would carry on.

1.2.3 Guinea-Conakry : Guinea-Conakry requested the Director to address his concerns on the immediate deliverables and the long term sustainability of the MIKE process.

The Director clarified that MIKE is not going to be a monitoring program that could in just a few months of operation, deliver information on illegal killing and why it may be occurring in various places. In just a few months, MIKE is not able to make any immediate deliverables. It might begin to do so over 2 to 3 years, and the longer it goes on, the better it starts a chance to give the deliverables that tells what is happening, whether there is an increase or decrease, and why there is such change. It is necessary for all to be very clear that MIKE is a longer term programme.

The fact that the monitoring system will need time does not mean it should be criticized because if it is not started now, there would be not any information in 3, 4 or 5 years' time. That MIKE cannot make a short term benefit to range States does not mean that it has no real value. It is now covering 55 sites which is a much larger spread than hitherto. It should be able to start picking up a sudden illegal killing which requires attention now even if the exact cause of the illegal killing is not known immediately.

On the long term sustainability of the programme, the Director went on to explain that the objective of MIKE is very clear – to help the range States start on their LEM work using their existing staff and undertake population surveys which have not been routine before but which MIKE would provide the initial support to make it so. This should give a breathing space for each of the wildlife directors to discuss with MIKE and see how to develop a sustainable capacity for such work.

The issue of dialogue and sustainability is not going to be won simply by the MIKE staff and wildlife directors. There is a need for range States to engage their ministers on the financial

resources, to reset current budgets, to tackle the lack of funding and staff. The experience of the implementation support stage would guide all as to how the stakeholders should work together to achieve the objectives of MIKE. MIKE had come about because of the decision taken in Harare by the majority of range States that they would like to know about what their elephant populations are doing, what is happening to them and why this is happening. The range States had said that they want to do the monitoring for themselves and that is why there is a 10 year provision because it was known that building an internal sustainability for the programme could not be achieved overnight.

1.2.4 Kenya : Kenya next took the floor and made the request that the comments from the range States be recorded and reflected in the minutes of the meeting. The following comments and queries were raised:

Whilst MIKE has made tremendous strides in developing the last two objectives contained in Resolution 10.10 (rev.), which were to establish the decision base and building capacity in the range States, the progress report, however, has not addressed the first objective – namely “measuring and recording levels and trends and changes in levels and trends of illegal hunting and trade in ivory”, which was the reason why MIKE came into being in the first place.

Secondly, Kenya has contributed to many changes to the way MIKE is currently operating at present but there has been some changes for which range States have not been informed, for instance the “model-based approach” for forest surveys mentioned in the progress report. If MIKE is going to be an African system owned by African countries, it is important to recognize and take advantage of the expertise available in Africa in developing the system that is to be used to analyse the data.

Thirdly, it was queried why no data is available for presentation in the progress report. It was particularly important for range States to understand the time-frame involved in the MIKE process, i.e. in order to establish the levels and trends of elephant populations and mortality, how much data will be needed and how long will it take to get that data.

On page 10 of the progress report, it was queried how many surveys are required to establish population trends. Echoing the recommendation of Senegal, a request was also made for the overall budget for MIKE illustrating the annual budget and how it would cost over the 10-year period.

It was suggested that one of the variables that could be included into Table 4 of the progress report (list of factors having a possible influence on illegal killing and/or elephant abundance) could be the level of intensive monitoring in an area. The example given was the Amboseli National Park, which in contrast with the other park such as Tsavo, was not impacted by the poaching in 1970s and 80s because of the level of long term research programme in place. It was asked whether this variable can be measured and be integrated into the list of the influencing factors.

The Director clarified the position he has made for several months to range States that there would be no data in the MIKE progress report for CoP 12, nor to expect any, as there was no way for MIKE in a few months to produce data when there are 29 African range States, one or two of which may have 2 years of data while another has only 2 weeks of data which would not be statistically significant. It would be unfair to start giving data until there has been sufficient time to iron out just that one issue in itself. Some countries too were not even sure of the quality of data. It has been a learning process and he believed this to be the correct position to adopt and would welcome any challenge to the contrary.

On the question of MIKE objectives, it would be unfair to say that because the progress report has dealt with objectives 3 and 4, it did not deal with objectives 1 and 2. To analyse the data and show changes is not going to be possible in a few months. It would take 2 to 3 years before that type of analysis can be carried out. What MIKE has been doing is getting the platform in place, by assisting the countries to start delivering the information so that the objectives in 1 and 2 would be fully met. The objectives have not changed, the issue here is that MIKE has not had enough time to demonstrate objectives 1 and 2, but it is on the right path towards achieving them.

In regards to the changes, the Director clarified that there had not been a sudden change in the design or intention of MIKE. As increasing attention was being given to achieving good data and valuable analysis, some weaknesses have become apparent. For example, the site selection in Central African forest situations is not as representative as was intended. This weakness is being addressed by evolving sites and their boundaries to cover more variables. However, it would also be necessary to consider a more model-based approach for interpolating these results. The evolving process is being done in consultation with the TAG. Out of the 10 TAG members, 7 are African citizens or have considerable African experience. However, Asian members need to be represented as well. As the MIKE process unfolds, it will evolve and become clearer especially with feedback from the training programme, field work and the national officers. In the meantime, it is hoped that the modelling approach will tackle the weaknesses in the current system for forest populations.

On the issue of population trends, the Director informed that the issue of power to detect population trends is being actively addressed at the TAG level. It could be that the MIKE system could pick up a 30% or 40% change between two surveys but, as time goes on, with more repeats, it might be possible to bring that percentage down. It was unlikely that the MIKE monitoring system is going to pick up a 10% a change in population in 2 years' time. What the system is striving for is to at least to pick up a 30% change or a crisis change without belittling the fact that any decline is worth knowing.

On the funding status, the Director noted that the progress report was commenting on the existing situation and that he would share the funding implications for MIKE over 10 years when they become available.

1.2.5 India : India requested the Director to share the weaknesses encountered in the process of site selection and how it is intended that these weaknesses should be overcome.

The Director used the Central African (CA) sub-region as an example to illustrate his explanations. At the time of putting together the original list of sites, the 15 CA sites tended to coincide with protected areas or national parks. However, it turned out that there are elephants outside these protected areas and parks for which the variables have not been taken into account, such as logging concessions. Rather than rejecting the sites, an evolutionary approach is being taken to tackle this problem. The sites that have already been chosen will have their boundaries extended to cover some of the non-protected zones. Gradually with more resources being available, the variables for the non-protected zones will be added and addressed.

The other issue that has come up during the site selection process was that some range States had felt uncomfortable that they did not have much say during the selection process. In these cases, discussions were held together with the range States during selection which helped to address the capacity and national needs without compromising the statistical requirements. That

has been the experience to date in Africa. It is also the way the Director would like to see happen in Asia.

1.2.6 The Chair : At this point of the meeting, the Chair took the chance to remind the participants to keep in mind when discussing the progress report that the MIKE monitoring system is essentially a program belonging to the elephant range States. It produces the opportunity to obtain more coordination in the way that elephant data is collected throughout the region. It is also a great opportunity for capacity building. In many countries, monitoring and LEM is not something new nor invented by MIKE, it has been going on for many years and has become an integral part of their elephant management program. Therefore, when discussions center on data, there is a lot of data both on population estimates or illegal activities. It should be kept in mind that MIKE has been designed in a way to standardize the way these data are collected, and to enable data on the effort to be captured too.

The Chair then continued by inviting the interventions from the following countries :

1.2.7 Mali : Mali desired to know the computer equipment and training programme that will be put in place at the sites for implementing the MIKE program. They would also be keen to know about the collaborations on transborder populations, as well as to know when the Gourma survey results would be available. Finally, they expressed concern over the visa problems the Mali representatives had encountered at the Nairobi airport.

On the transborder issues, the Chair encouraged the representatives to discuss this with representatives of the bordering countries. She recommended that opportunities for discussing these situations should be provided in this meeting and during the range States meeting.

On the computer training programme, the Director confirmed that this is high on the list of priority for MIKE over the next six months and the response made to Togo earlier should be seen as part of the response to Mali.

On the elephant population census in Gourma, he welcomed the assistance offered by the Mali representatives in the production of the report and its translation into French, and requested that they liaise with the MIKE SSOs for West Africa. The Director also took the opportunity to introduce and to thank Mr Iain Douglas-Hamilton who had assisted in undertaking the Gourma census.

On the collaborations on transborder populations, the Director seconded the Chair's recommendation and requested the MIKE SSOs to work together with the representatives from Mali, Cote d'Ivoire and Niger to discuss how to progress on that issue.

The Director noted the concerns raised by the Mali representatives on the difficulties they had encountered during immigration clearance at the Nairobi Airport. He reassured Mali that all the necessary visa requirements had been complied in accordance with the procedures set down by the immigration department, and full support had been received from the Kenya Wildlife Service which took on the task of explaining the importance of this meeting to the immigration. He confirmed that he would liaise with the Director of the Kenya Wildlife Service to see how such difficulties may be overcome in future meetings.

1.2.8 Cameroon : Cameroon queried if MIKE data would be used in the country proposals being tabled for the CoP 12. They had also hoped or expected to see some analysis done on a regional basis in the MIKE progress report.

The Chair intervened to say that proponent countries would be providing the data on a national basis to support their proposals. Regional analysis is not presently possible as the MIKE Director had pointed out.

On the use of MIKE data in the country proposals to CITES, the Director reiterated the position that MIKE is neutral and is intended to be objective. MIKE and its staff would never make a recommendation about which proposal to support for that would result in a loss of its objectivity and neutrality. Such recommendations are for the range States, NGOs and CITES Secretariat respectively to make their suggestions, whereas MIKE is there to deliver information which is respected and trusted. All 29 range States must have the confidence that the information which MIKE provides in due course is good and can be used.

For the forthcoming CoP 12, MIKE is in no position to give any information that would satisfy that neutrality and objectivity. However, by CoP 13, MIKE should be in that position. He urged the participants to await the progress report of ETIS, a system which has collected data on illegal trade on ivory over a much longer period of time, and see how this is the way that progress reports for MIKE would go given enough time as well.

1.2.9 Gabon : Gabon noted that in the Libreville report, four sites were listed as MIKE sites: Lope, Minkebe, Lampasa and Gamba. Only the former two sites were mentioned in the progress report. They requested to know the status of the latter two sites.

The Director reassured that the four sites in Libreville were recorded, but while Libreville went on to record them, MIKE could not go on to do all four sites simultaneously. That is the rationale why there is an existing site and a reserved list. Both Gamba and the other site are in the reserved list. The MIKE implementation in these two sites have not been forgotten but rather had to be phased in, as resources permit.

1.2.10 Tanzania : Tanzania next took the floor and conveyed greetings on behalf of Dr Emmanuel Severre, who is a member of the CITES Standing Committee and Chairman of the East African sub-region. They requested the Chair for permission to circulate to the members a paper which shares Tanzania's experience of some of the problems they have encountered on site during MIKE implementation.

The areas they wished to highlight at his meeting are (i) capacity building; (ii) sustainability, and (iii) funding. On the issue of capacity building, it was urged that the computer training undertaken by MIKE must go hand in hand with the other management skills required for elephant monitoring. The MIKE programme should also be extended to other species in the protected areas. On the issue of sustainability, he understood from the progress report that only 66% of the EU funding for the programme has been released to date. It was urged that the Director should be assisted in the availability of funds because the national budgets for the capacity training, transport logistics and patrol equipment in expansive sites in Tanzania (Selous or Rungwa-Ruaha) were insufficient and should therefore be met by MIKE.

The Chair welcomed copies of the report prepared by Tanzania to be distributed to all participants.

The Director welcomed the comments by Tanzania. Tanzania is an important Range State in terms of its population numbers. The MIKE SSO for East Africa has worked closely with Mr Julius Kibebe and the Director is only too aware of the problems faced by Tanzania in the implementation of MIKE. The problem which MIKE and all the 29 Range States collectively face is that resources available at hand are limited. He urged that MIKE and Tanzania should work

together to arrive at a strategy that would allow implementation to go forward without overstressing the MIKE budget. Both parties could work together to develop a project to submit to interested donors in funding the extra resources and logistics equipment needed for patrol while leaving MIKE to deliver the training on the actual monitoring and data analysis. However, it would be very important that the Ministry of Finance of Tanzania understands the need for sustainability and agrees to fund the incremental resources on project completion.

The Director clarified that it was not a MIKE objective to deal with elephant management strategy. That is an area which the range States could look for assistance from the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group. However, it is hoped that the information that MIKE produces would contribute to the involvement of the elephant conservation and management strategy by range States and to their implementation on a day-to-day basis.

On the issue of extending monitoring to other species, the Director explained that MIKE was started on elephants as a priority and it would not object to any range State which feels confident and comfortable to extend the monitoring programme to other species.

1.2.11 Nigeria : Nigeria expressed their appreciation on the progress which MIKE has made to date and the endeavour it had undertaken to obtain the balance of the funds under the EU matching funds requirement. They expressed their particular interests to work on the transborder issues with the countries of Niger, Cameroon, Benin and Tchad.

The Director welcomed his initiative and requested the MIKE SSOs to assist in coordinating the necessary meetings on the transborder issue.

1.2.12 Niger : Niger shared their concern that range States, in the face of budget constraints, need to find means of raising the extra resources to manage the sites.

This concern was acknowledged by the Director who urged that the MIKE system should be used as a catalyst to raise the resources necessary for MIKE implementation and site management.

1.2.13 Ghana : Ghana referred to the comment by Kenya that although the last two objectives of Resolution 10.10 (rev.) have been dealt in the current progress of MIKE, however, the first two objectives have not been addressed in the progress report. It was recommended that a paragraph be included in the progress report to emphasize that MIKE is currently building on objectives 3 and 4 as a basis for moving on to achieving objectives 1 and 2 contained in Resolution 10.10 (rev.).

The recommendation was accepted and would be followed up by the Director in the revision

1.2.14 Congo : Congo expressed the reservation that MIKE does not have enough staff to carry out MIKE implementation on the field while certain range States are not willing to deploy more staff to cater for MIKE activities.

The Director explained that MIKE could not take every responsibility at site and as it expands, it would have to face more financial burden. The main reason why support units are understaffed is to direct more of the funding for equipment and training towards range States and sites. MIKE would be available to assist and negotiate with range State governments to extend further support to the budgets of wildlife agencies.

1.2.15 Benin : Benin congratulated the Director for the progress carried out to date. They reminded the range States that the issue of funding is not a problem for MIKE alone. The MIKE

system is a working tool for each range States to make their own efforts to find development partners globally. It was suggested the use of alternative sources of data collection to overcome the lack of personnel on the sites, for example local communities.

The Director assured that there is no barrier to participation by local communities in the MIKE process and that local communities located in Samburu and Laikipia in Kenya are already involved. As the MIKE programme grows, such opportunities for local community participation should certainly be explored.

1.2.16 Uganda : Uganda shared their experience on MIKE implementation and how they have integrated the MIKE process into ongoing national programmes. The logistical support from MIKE should be seen as complementary to existing efforts by wildlife agencies. They highlighted the need for MIKE to work with regional programmes such as the Lusaka Taskforce Agreement. Uganda requested the Director to ensure that the computer programmes would be compatible with the current management information system (MIST) of the Uganda Wildlife Authorities.

1.2.17 Burkina Faso : Burkina Faso shared their interest in the use of the MIKE process to facilitate cross-border collaborations between countries, for example the use of corridors. It was requested that MIKE progress report could highlight the human elephant conflicts and the resultant social problems faced by local communities in Africa today. It was urged that range States should get together on agreements to tackle the problems of elephant mortality resulting from human elephant conflicts and epidemics.

1.2.18 Tchad : Tchad noted that this regional meeting is not in the position to address the human elephant conflicts and resultant social problems faced by local communities. These issues would be addressed by the Governments in a report addressed to the CoP 12 which would aim to explore the possibilities of setting up a platform to assist the victims of human-elephant conflicts. MIKE is a programme with specific objectives, and therefore it cannot go beyond its objectives. He would suggest that the progress report be completed with an explanation of the problems which range States are facing on the ground.

1.2.19 Tanzania : Tanzania reiterated on the need to resolve the problem of resource constraints on MIKE implementation. It was proposed that with the consent of the participants at the meeting, the CITES Secretariat could flag this funding issue in a separate report to the parties at the conference. This would allow the range States or their CITES authorities to either decide to move forward with the implementation of MIKE or to turn over to the donor countries to address and negotiate on why remaining funds have not come up.

The Director assured Tanzania that the way to resolve the problems of resource constraints would be for them to work together on projects and to identify the potential donors. He highlighted his reservation whether the route of referring the issue to the Secretariat and the conference of parties would be a constructive way of resolving the issue.

The representative from Tanzania clarified that their proposal was not intended to lay the blame on the inadequacy of the MIKE's budget as a possible reason for non-implementation in Tanzania. This proposal should be taken from the angle that resource constraints for MIKE implementation is a common concern shared by many range States at this meeting, and not an issue raised by Tanzania alone.

1.2.20 Democratic Republic of Congo : DRC requested the Director to include a financial breakdown in the progress report to elaborate whether the funds are being shared on 'per country' or on 'per activity' basis. This explanation would assist range States in understanding

the funding mechanism for MIKE. In respect of the proposed targets for 2003, it was queried how the time frame targets in the progress report were decided. They urged all member states to work hard to achieve these targets in the coming year.

The Director welcomed the endorsement of the targets for 2003 and the recommendation to add details about the financial expenditures to the progress report. On the targets for the year 2003, these were drawn up in response to the needs and desires expressed by the range States over the past CoP discussions which the Director has been a party to. With the help and support of the range States, the Director hoped to achieve the population surveys by 2003 and to ensure that the law enforcement work that has already begun and the data analysis that would be carried out would become routine by then.

Second Chair of the meeting : Mr Adrien Nougou, Directeur de la faune et de la chasse, Ministère de l'économie forestière, des Eaux, de la Pêche, chargé de l'Environnement et de la protection de la nature, Gabon

2. MIKE Data Policy

The draft copy of MIKE Data Policy is annexed hereto in Annex II.

The Director introduced the draft document on Data Policy as a response to the request by range States at various meetings that he should prepare such a document for consideration. The regional meeting therefore seemed an appropriate occasion for seeking comments on the draft from the range States.

Kenya, Benin, Uganda, Mali, Cameroon, Niger and Namibia provided inputs. Essentially the document was felt to be well crafted, but there was one important concern with the wording of the first bullet point under 2.2 - Handling. Many of the Wildlife Agencies were uncomfortable with raw data passing simultaneously to the National Officers, the MIKE SSOs and the MCCU, as it was normal protocol for field information to pass through headquarters before being passed on to other recipients. It was reaffirmed that passing on the raw data was not the issue, provided the normal Government procedures were observed and because such data was governed by the access and release protocols.

After clarifying a few other queries, it was agreed that the main concern was as stated as above. It was therefore felt that a working group was not necessary, but instead written comments should be provided to the Director and he would revise the text accordingly.

The Director then introduced another suggested addition to the wording for the third bullet under 2.1 - Definitions, whereby it was agreed that the African Elephant Database would continue to be the depository of all population estimates produced for MIKE sites. This was unanimously approved.

3. Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) Progress Report for CoP 12

3.1 Presentation by TRAFFIC Director, Mr Tom Milliken

An extract of the presentation on ETIS Progress Report for CoP 12 is attached hereto in Annex III.

The Director of TRAFFIC for East/Southern Africa, Mr Tom Milliken, presented the history and background of the ETIS. While ETIS is derivative of TRAFFIC's earlier Bad Ivory Database System (BIDS), its present manifestation is traced to Resolution Conf. 10.10 at the 10th meeting of the Conference to the Parties (Harare, 1997). One of the differences between ETIS and MIKE is that ETIS was established to monitor the illegal trade in ivory on a global basis, whereas MIKE is a site-based system to track the situation on the ground in African and Asian Elephant Range States.

To meet the requirements of CITES, ETIS is a comprehensive information system to assess current levels and trends of illegal trade in ivory and elephant products. The means to monitor illegal trade is by tracking elephant product seizure records from around the world. It is appreciated that whether or not seizures occur is a consequence of a number of variables. For example, law enforcement ability and efficiency affect whether seizures occur, and rates of reporting by individual countries affect the number of seizure records in ETIS. There is, therefore, a need to find proxy measures to understand and track these variables. Within ETIS, a series of sub-databases have been developed to help understand the data and to assist in analysis and modelling. The central database contains information on elephant product seizures since 1989. Other databases hold time-based and country-specific data on Law Enforcement Effort, Ivory Markets, Background Economic Data, and Legal Trade.

ETIS operates through a dynamic feedback loop, where:

- i) Parties report seizure records to TRAFFIC or the CITES Secretariat,
- ii) Data are then verified and entered into the data bases,
- iii) TRAFFIC then compiles annual country reports, and
- iv) Parties review reports and give critical feedback.

To date, two ETIS Country Reports, that summarize all of the data in ETIS for each individual country, have been compiled and circulated by the CITES Secretariat to the Parties. A third report is currently in progress. In addition, a comprehensive analytical report is being compiled for the CoP 12.

The ETIS data collection form is available on the internet, but is not essential if countries have their own database systems that meet the minimum requirements of the ETIS data collecting process. TRAFFIC is happy to adapt and use other pre-existing formats. The ETIS process is best supported by good collaboration and communication between all law enforcement bodies within a country. These include, for example, ports, customs, police and wildlife authorities. Depending on available resources, TRAFFIC is able to provide training to build capacity and improve a country's implementation of ETIS at the national level. ETIS capacity building activities center around:

- a) empowering key players,
- b) setting schedule and action plans,
- c) ensuring data collection,
- d) networking with relevant authorities,

- e) sending in of data and reports, and
- f) monitoring, evaluating and improvement of the system.

In the first set of analyses of ETIS data, a fundamental question is directed at which countries play an important role in the illegal trade of ivory. The data from all ivory seizures were transformed into a raw ivory index and analyses were based on the transformed data. At the time of these analyses, the ETIS seizure records represented a total of 198,734 kg of raw ivory on the basis of 7,817 records since 1989. Six variables were used to assess the importance of individual countries in the illegal trade of ivory:

- a) frequency as indicated by the mean number of seizures of both in-country and external seizures;
- b) the mean weight of ivory seized from both in-country and external seizures;
- c) the mean change in weight between the period 1989-1995 and 1996-2002;
- d) a measure of law enforcement efficiency represented by the Corruption Perception Index of Transparency International;
- e) a measure of law enforcement effort represented by the ratio of in-country seizures to external seizures; and
- f) a comparative domestic ivory market score.

Using these variables a cluster analyses was done to group countries into homogeneous clusters representing similar characteristics. Countries were then ranked on a scale depicting their role of importance in the illegal ivory trade. The scale ranged from China, as the highest importance, to Namibia at the bottom of the scale. China, Nigeria, CD and Thailand were the countries that were shown to play the most significant role in the illegal ivory trade.

In further analyses, the correlation of the variables showed the relationship between the domestic ivory trade score and the law enforcement ratio had the highest significance. In other words, when the domestic ivory trade was large and unregulated, the law enforcement effort ratio was very poor. These two characteristics stand behind the greatest volume of ivory in illegal trade.

An analysis of the trends in the illegal ivory trade is in progress for Cop 12.

Third Chair of the meeting : Mr Juma Kayera, Assistant Director, Wildlife Utilization of the Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Tanzania

3.2 Questions and Answers on the ETIS Report

The following questions and comments were taken by the Chair and Mr Milliken from the floor:

3.2.1 Uganda : Uganda queried if the ETIS analysis does include data from Interpol and Ecomessage reports.

Mr Milliken noted that the official data collection form for ETIS asks whether or not an Ecomessage has been filed with Interpol. In general, however, ETIS contains far more elephant product seizure records than Interpol has. He added that there is a need for training and capacity building amongst Customs officials and that ETIS is planning to work with individual countries depending on available funding and resources.

3.2.2 Nigeria : Nigeria acknowledged the fact that it was a transit area for ivory and attributed this to prevailing political instability. Changes have been made within the country and these have been communicated to the CITES Secretariat, but most ports of entry and exit in the country remain under the control of the military and this has created problems. Communication problems with documentation not reaching the CITES office in Nigeria have added to the situation, but recent changes made within Government will hopefully change this. Nigeria has also made changes in their legislation of endangered species, and expressed hope the CITES will assist them in this regard. However there is still a general need for manpower development and capacity building which it is hoped that ETIS and MIKE could address.

3.2.3 Benin : Benin respects CITES quotas and have not issued CITES permits for ivory, and therefore they do not understand how the seizures where Benin was mentioned as country where ivory originated from were made.

Mr Milliken explained that although there were no reports of seizures in Benin, the country was implicated in 10 seizures that occurred elsewhere. The ETIS Country Reports will provide details on these seizures. He urged the representatives from Benin to contact those countries where seizures were made for more details.

3.2.4 Congo-Brazzaville : Congo-Brazzaville noted that it was not mentioned in the ETIS report, but explained that they have data on recent seizures within their boundaries, resulting from a Government policy on the control of ivory trade. It was the intention of Congo to share this information with ETIS. Congo noted it had yet to receive an ETIS Country Report to date.

Mr Milliken welcomed any additional data from Congo. He mentioned that while there had been no seizures yet reported by Congo to ETIS, Congo had been implicated in 65 seizures which had taken place elsewhere. He also mentioned that the city of Brazzaville had been noted as having ivory curios for sale in its handicraft markets. He also assured Congo that the ETIS Country Reports were generally sent by courier by the CITES Secretariat and they should be reaching the Republique du Congo.

3.2.5 Democratic Republic of Congo : DRC requested an explanation of the basis for interpreting the figures in the column on "Mean change in weight" in the summary statistics for the 13 clusters, and the relationship between law enforcement and domestic ivory market. They queried what is the level of trust that TRAFFIC assigns to the data it receives, and wondered whether the information must be verified with the source country. They also raised the concern that the ETIS report does not indicate how illegal ivory leaves the borders of a country. Under the present political situation in DRC, border posts are not operational, and ivory may pass through ports that are not under the Government's control. Unless these problems are explained, it will reflect poorly on DRC and may result in developments like the current ban on CITES trade out of DRC.

Mr Milliken confirmed that all reports and data are verified and ranked for quality and reliability. 'A' denotes cases from government officials, 'B' from reliable NGO sources, and 'C' from newspaper and other secondary reports. Three-quarters (76%) of the ETIS records fall in the 'A' category, while only 1% fall under the 'C' category. With respect to the problems of control, ETIS is aware of the UN report which verifies the exploitation of natural resources by other nations engaged in the conflict in the DRC. In the ETIS reports to CoP 12, it is clearly stated that the war and civil unrest has contributed to the illegal trade and ivory poaching activities in the DRC.

On the summary statistics for the 13 clusters, the "mean change in weight" column refers to the change in the two periods of activity, 1989-1995 and 1996-2002. A positive number indicates that

that ivory trade, as indicated by the seizures data, has been greater over the last seven-year period than it was during the first seven-year period. This helps to keep contemporary trade dynamics in focus because over time trade routes change and we are most concerned about what is happening now and not the distant past. For example, in the case of DRC and Thailand, in the most recent seven years, both countries were most active in terms of illegal trade in ivory.

On the relationship between law enforcement and domestic ivory market, the ETIS analysis shows that the most significant variables driving illegal trade in ivory are large unregulated domestic ivory markets and poor law enforcement. If a range State has that combination, it is probably frequently involved in ivory seizure either in terms of raw ivory being smuggled into their country or worked ivory products illegally leaving their country and going elsewhere. That is the single most important factor driving the illegal trade in ivory.

The Chair noted that several other variables such as corruption, looting and intelligence information which may perhaps be discussed by the parties during the coffee break.

On the current ban in place for CITES trade out of DRC, Mr Tom de Meulenaer of the CITES Secretariat, took the floor to explain that the current ban in place for CITES trade out of DRC is related to the issuance of problem issuance documents by the management authority in Kinshasa which has caused the Standing Committee to take the decision that the country needs to take certain remedial actions before those documents can be accepted by other parties. He announced that DRC has addressed these issues of concern and that the Secretariat would undertake a visit to DRC sometime in late October to verify whether the measures that have been put in place to improve its CITES documentation issuance process are implemented. The report on the progress made by DRC should be tabled at the next CoP.

3.2.6 Cameroon : Cameroon requested the CITES Secretariat for a copy of the presentation given by Mr Milliken and raised several concerns. When Cameroon is mentioned in the report as being implicated does that mean that it is the nationals of Cameroon who are implicated or that Cameroon is the origin of the ivory? How is a country's law enforcement effort and corruption index being evaluated for the purpose of analysis? Why was the time period divided into two seven-year periods when shorter periods should be used as much could change over seven years. Cameroon raised the question whether ETIS follows a protocol for validating or verifying their data? Finally, there was mention of several country reports, but Cameroon has only received one report so far. Cameroon would like clear addresses and detailed information on all the cases where it was implicated as without such information, the country would find it difficult to take remedial action.

Mr Milliken clarified that in terms of how a country's involvement in a seizure is identified. In the seizure records, countries are asked to identify the source of the ivory, the country of origin, the country of import/export/re-export and the destination country. For example, if a report is received from France where a seizure is made on a flight on Air France that originated from Yaoundé, then the country of export is listed as Cameroon. In terms of number of seizures, it becomes one for France, and in terms of number of seizures involving other countries, it becomes one for Cameroon. Out of these seizure records, a ratio between the number of seizures that have occurred in a country as opposed to the number of times that country has been identified in seizures which have occurred elsewhere can be calculated. The law enforcement effort ratio is used as one of the covariate variables for understanding ivory trade dynamics. The number of seizures that are occurring in one country as opposed to the number of times the country is implicated in seizures elsewhere is indicative of the law enforcement effort.

In terms of the Corruption Perception Index, the work of Transparency International is used as a covariate to interpret the information and significance on the statistical modelling that is being carried out.

On the ETIS Country reports, Mr Milliken requested that if these are not being received by countries, they should contact the CITES Secretariat which would endeavour to send these reports which are available in English, Spanish and French. He urged representatives from the countries who are mentioned in seizure reports in other countries to get in touch with the governments of these countries to work together on the illegal trade problems and the patterns of illegal trade route.

The year of 1989 was chosen as baseline year because that was when the Conference of the Parties decided to list all elephant populations in Appendix I. If ETIS is going to track trends over time and produce a report on this, it is important that it has a long period of time for the analysis to be meaningful.

Mr Milliken gave his assurance on the highest level of reliability of data in ETIS and reported that all seizure reports provide the source of information. If the source is not a government, the government is also asked to verify the case.

3.2.7 India : India asked about the coordination between ETIS and MIKE on issues such as Law Enforcement Monitoring to ensure that they do not lead to contradictions. Is there a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) for the ETIS system, and if not, why not? India is concerned about the definition of illegal ivory trade. Ivory can be illegal under CITES, but legal under the domestic legislation. India would like to know what constitutes legal and illegal ivory, and would like to caution ETIS in their interpretation. It was also asked whether ETIS looked at other elephant products other than ivory, such as live elephants. India would like to know why ETIS does not consult all the relevant countries in terms of the methodology used in their analyses.

Mr Milliken explained that both ETIS and MIKE operate under the Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.), and fully intend to collaborate in the understanding and interpretation of data. However, as MIKE is not producing an analytical report for CoP12, such collaboration is premature at the moment. ETIS does not have a TAG, but the methodology used is fully described in the ETIS reports and it is open to the public domain. As such, he hopes it will be assessed and constructively criticized if there are issues. ETIS does look at all elephant products, but does not address illegal trade in live elephants. While ETIS acknowledges that there are different definitions of what constitutes illegal ivory trade, however, there are clear guidelines under which ETIS operates. Illegality is determined by the legislation of the country where the seizure occurs. In this manner, ETIS does not question, for example, the imposition of stricter domestic measures. ETIS strives to communicate with all countries, including India, in regard to the analytical report. The methodology used is documented in its report, but the mandate in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.) does not require the analytical framework and methodology to be part of a consultative process with countries for it would be too cumbersome and not expedient. Qualified experts have been consulted to ensure that the methodology used follows stringent scientific and statistical rigour. Countries are invited to comment on the methodology of the ETIS analysis.

The Chair suggested that the ETIS forms be reviewed to include a section on "live elephants".

3.2.8 Guinée Equatoriale : Guinée Equatoriale raised the concern that in a letter from ETIS, it was stipulated that Guinée Equatoriale has not participated in the programme and that other countries were dissatisfied with Guinée Equatoriale. They wished to know who made these statements in order to make a formal response. They suggested that when illegal ivory are

seized, it must be returned to the country of origin. They noted that political instability has resulted in illegal ivory trade, but ETIS data has shown some improvement in Guinée Equatoriale.

Mr Milliken explained that in the past, data collection was passive via the CITES Secretariat. At CoP 11, it was decided to initiate a more proactive data retrieval. He indicated that earlier in the year, a letter was sent to all range states giving a summary status of each country's participation in ETIS. It was hoped that this letter would result in the submission of relevant seizure data in preparation for an analytical report for CoP 12.

On the suggestion of the return of seized ivory to the country of origin, he noted the CITES Secretariat would address this point. Mr Milliken noted that domestic ivory markets must be regulated as stipulated in Res. Conf. 10.10 (Rev.) for it would improve the illegal trade information system under the ETIS.

3.2.9 Senegal : Senegal said that the country has a limited number of elephants in small populations, which would not interest poachers. They wondered if implication meant that ivory originated from Senegal or is Senegal just party to the activity? The need for capacity building and further training was stressed.

Mr Milliken gave his previous explanation on how seizure information are verified, and confirmed that ETIS is planning to work with individual countries on capacity building, where resources permitted such an engagement.

3.2.10 Togo : Togo raised the same issue on capacity building on the management and reports of illegal trade of ivory, and welcomed the fact that the CITES Secretariat has envisaged such training for the future.

3.2.11 Kenya : Kenya made the following comments. A query was raised whether data from the Lusaka Task Force has been incorporated in the analytical report, and noted that Kenya shared the concern raised by India that the data analysis is not perfect and that all countries need to be consulted in the analytical process, as well as in the validity of the proxy variables. In the past, Kenya has felt reluctant to send further data to ETIS since they have not been receiving feedback, but is pleased that a report has been done now. However, a better system of data access and sharing under ETIS is needed. It was suggested that a global report be made available one year before the Conference of Parties to allow countries to prepare for that event. On law enforcement efficiency, low penalties for infringements will affect efficiency and this needs to be incorporated by ETIS in the law enforcement scale. Kenya queried what China is doing about its involvement in the illegal trade? Diplomats are often involved and their exemption causes many problems. The concern was raised that the illegal ivory trade is often supported by customs agreements, such as in southern Africa, where sealed containers are allowed to move between countries. TRAFFIC should consider conducting experiments, to extrapolate seizure rates, as is common in drug law enforcement.

Mr Milliken explained that ETIS has been in touch with the Lusaka Task Force (LTF), but has had little feedback. However, he noted that all cases handled by LTF occur within national jurisdictions and thus should be reported by the respective governments to ETIS. However, he would flag the need for closer communication with LTF.

In terms of the methodology used for the ETIS analysis reports, he invited written submissions from any country or individual who felt that there were problems with the methodologies used in the analytical process. On the suggestion for a global report to be sent one year in advance of

the CoP, ETIS is following the mandate in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.) which calls for a report to each CoP. If changes are required in this regard, then it is up to the Parties to change the existing mandate. In addition, he noted that there are cost implications as it is costly to conduct analyses and compile such reports. At this time, ETIS is primarily self-funded and basically operates under a restricted budget.

On the ETIS data access policy, any country can request and receive any data in ETIS which relates to them. To access another country's data requires the permission of the country in question. It is each country's prerogative to share and request data from one another as information is given to ETIS on a confidential basis. Mr Milliken urged countries to get into a dialogue and share their country reports with their colleagues.

He pointed out that neither TRAFFIC or ETIS are law enforcement bodies and that it would be impossible to experiment with controlled deliveries of illegal consignments of ivory. This is something for bona fide law enforcement bodies at the government to government level to organize and conduct. He stated that diplomats are not immune from CITES restrictions and that any such smuggling is not exempted from wildlife trade laws. He also agreed that sanctions for illegal trade should be made to be an effective deterrent.

He observed that a Customs agreement is only present in South Africa involving three neighbouring landlocked countries, but he acknowledged that this issue perhaps needs some attention. Finally, he stated that they are looking at the available literature on things like the drug trade, to see how seizure data can be interpreted into absolute trade values. But he stressed that ETIS is not set up to measure absolute volumes of trade, but is structured to measure trends and changes in trends over time.

3.2.12 South Africa : South Africa presented their congratulations to Namibia for their efforts in curbing the illegal trade in ivory. They wanted to know whether there is an explanation why none of South Africa's neighbours are mentioned in the report. In a regional perspective, they need a status report on law enforcement efforts.

Mr Milliken referred to the cluster analysis to assure South Africa that each country has been reported. If countries were not mentioned, it simply means that they are far less significant in the illegal ivory trade, according to the data in ETIS.

3.2.13 Côte d'Ivoire : Côte d'Ivoire raised the concern that the analyses of the data presented are not complete, for example, Côte d'Ivoire welcomed a consultant from ETIS to assess the domestic ivory trade in their country but these data were not included in the analysis.

Mr Milliken clarified that it was TRAFFIC not ETIS that undertook a survey on domestic ivory trade in Côte d'Ivoire, but he was not aware that the consultant in question received any information on ivory seizures in Côte d'Ivoire. He encouraged Côte d'Ivoire to submit any additional information on seizures and ensured that any such information will be looked at.

The Chair thanked Mr Milliken for his comprehensive answers to the queries raised on the ETIS report. He called upon Mr John Sellar, Senior Enforcement Officer, Legislation and Compliance Unit of the CITES Secretariat, to make the general comments on the questions relating to the Secretariat.

3.2.14 CITES Secretariat : Mr Sellar commended the TRAFFIC Director for their achievements with little funding. He called upon all countries to recognise that both the ETIS and MIKE systems as excellent tools to monitor and combat the illegal trade in elephant products. These tools have

not been available to monitor trade in other species pursuant to the Convention and he would like to see the same tools being made available for other species. He called upon countries to reflect on how to use the tools rather than criticize them. MIKE and ETIS systems are information gathering exercises and their products/reports do not point fingers at individual countries.

He agreed that verification of data is important, but it is also time consuming and the process would become locked if every case has to be verified and countries be consulted on all aspects, particularly when it comes to a case of smuggling where non-detection is the aim of the perpetrators.

If individual countries were not mentioned in the presentation, it does not mean that they are not involved. He commended Congo-Brazzaville for their honesty in admitting this fact. The presentation only focussed on the more important involvements in the trade.

ETIS is not a law enforcement body; it is there to monitor trends in illegal trade. He expects that the issues on law enforcement would be discussed again in the African Asian Range States meeting.

On the comment that seized ivory should be returned to the country of origin. It is often not clear what the exact origin of ivory is. The financial costs of returning such ivory are often enormous, and it is unclear who would pay for such returns.

On the review of the ETIS methodology, the Standing committee in Geneva was given detailed explanation on the methodology, he urged the parties not to attempt to go back and reinvent the wheel.

When a country's Law Enforcement Score is low, it is their privilege to improve that score. For example, by increasing their reporting rate, they will reduce your score.

The Secretariat agrees with the ETIS Report that countries have to implement and enforce measures to control internal ivory markets. If not, it becomes an end destination for illegal ivory.

The role of diplomats being involved in illegal trade remains a problem. Diplomats, however, are not immune to illegal activities, although some countries might offer immunity to prosecution. If countries experience difficulties with diplomats and illegal trade, Mr Sellar urged countries to please inform the CITES Secretariat as it can follow-up with the ambassadors of governments in Geneva.

As a last comment; the ETIS report is good. It could be fine-tuned and improved, however, he urged countries to reflect that they have a good tool at their disposal which they should use to their advantage.

4. IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG)

4.1 Presentation on “Assistance to Range States by the AfESG” by AfESG Chair, Dr Holly Dublin and Programme Officer, Mr Leo Niskanen

The copy of the presentation ‘*Assistance to Range States by the AfESG*’ is attached to this report in Annex IV.

Dr Dublin presented the mission, objectives and background of the AfESG, one of IUCN Species Survival Commissions taxonomic Specialist Groups, which comprises a group of technical experts focusing on the conservation and management of African elephants.

The following summary topics were covered in the presentation by Dr Dublin and Mr Leo Niskanen (Programme Officer) :

- i. Group/Staff Structure
- ii. Assistance to Range States
 - Strategic Planning
 - Technical Assistance in :
 - Human-Elephant Conflicts (HEC)
 - Elephant translocation & guidelines
 - Illegal Killing, Trade and Law Enforcement
 - Elephant taxonomy
 - IUCN Red List
 - Building Capacity
 - Small Grant Fund
 - Compiling, synthesizing and disseminating information
 - African Elephant Database
 - African Elephant Library
 - Pachyderm journal
 - AfESG Website

Fourth Chair of the meeting : Mr Maiwada M. Omar, Department of Environmental Conservation in Nigeria

4.2 Questions and Answers for AfESG

The following questions and comments were taken by the Chair and Dr Dublin from the floor :

4.2.1 Senegal : Senegal raised the query of the basis of selection of the specialist team which undertook the recent feasibility study mission to Senegal of a proposed elephant translocation exercise in the Niokolo Koba. He noted that the mission consisted of two Europeans and one Kenyan and he wished to know why the team did not include more African experts.

Dr Dublin clarified that the AfESG facilitated the feasibility study mission to Senegal by drawing up the terms of reference for the technical specialists. Of the three technical specialists, one was a non-member of the AfESG and vice-chairman of IUCN SSC Veterinary Specialist group. For

many years he was also the veterinarian for the Kenya Wildlife Service and is highly experienced in elephant translocation. The second specialist is from the Netherlands who has been working for many years with the Government of Zambia in charge of their law enforcement and ecological monitoring. The third member of the mission is a member of the Kenya Wildlife Service who is actively involved in translocation work in Kenya. Their report on the proposed translocation exercise in the Niokolo Koba is currently being finalized and should be submitted to the Governments of Senegal and Burkina Faso soon.

4.2.2 Côte d'Ivoire : Côte d'Ivoire requested to know what the IUCN Red List consists of.

Dr Dublin explained that the IUCN Red List is a technical publication compiled by the IUCN and the Species Survival Commission which lists the species threatened with extinction based on a number of criterias such as population size, trends, habitat etc. Red List listing is carried out at the national level, sub-regional or global level. The purpose of the Red List is to inform decision-makers, scientists and wildlife managers of the level of threat against individual species and what the threats might be in order that mitigation can occur. The Red List is being used extensively at the national level particularly with regard to the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Many countries themselves are coming up with their own national red lists.

4.2.3 Mali : Mali expressed support for the work that is carried on by the AfESG and pointed out that range States can assist the specialist group in raising funds to implement its national elephant management strategy in their respective countries. He highlighted the fact that human-elephant conflicts arising from the conflicting usage of water sources is increasingly becoming a critical problem in Mali. He wished to know what form of assistance and capacity building a specific range State may seek from the AfESG.

Dr Dublin expressed her appreciation to Mali for their support on funding for the specialist group. Fundraising is always an ongoing event and a requisite in the terms of reference for the staff at AfESG. The traditional donors for the specialist group are the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the EU. The next year should see the AfESG staff being involved in fund-raising activities.

She acknowledged that HEC issues are an overriding challenge for the specialist group, which has officially set up a five-member Human-Elephant Conflict Working Group (HECWG) whose role is essentially one of 'technical facilitation' to provide technical advice and expertise to range State governments and other conservation support agencies on the management of HEC.

Following the recent report on the Gourma population work undertaken by Mr Douglas-Hamilton, Dr Dublin warned that Mali could face worsening HEC issues as a result of a large agricultural development project being proposed and funded by the World Bank. For the AfESG to assist Mali in forming the strategy and policy to deal with its HEC issues, the first step would be to write to the AfESG Programme Officer in Ouagadougou. In terms of support for capacity building, proposals could be sent to the AfESG Small Grant's programme for consideration.

4.2.4 Benin : Benin requested copies of the presentation and recommendations taken at this meeting to be circulated to the participants. He highlighted that Benin faces many HEC issues as well despite its small elephant densities. He requested to know what mitigation actions are available and what procedural steps are needed for cooperation with the specialist group. Following Togo and Burkina Faso, Benin also announced the launch of their national elephant conservation strategy. He informed that the budget has been prepared and the Government has released its counterpart contributions.

Dr Dublin confirmed that copies of AfESG's presentations would be circulated by the MIKE Secretariat. The specialist group meets approximately every 18 months to review status and trends of elephant populations and to discuss progress in specific areas related to conservation of the species. She welcomed any specific issues which range States may wish to refer to the specialist group at this meeting.

She deferred on the question on the procedure for working with the specialist group as the parties would have to agree on the way forward on each issue as necessary.

On the range of mitigation actions to tackle the HEC situation in Benin, there can be no general guidelines because each HEC situation is site-specific and requires unique solutions. Since its inception, the HECWG has focused its efforts in identifying priority topics in HEC reviews and case-studies, developing "tools" such as a decision support system for managing HEC aimed at wildlife authorities and conservation agencies. Benin should work on a program for mitigating HEC and contact the AfESG for the required technical assistance.

4.2.5 Cameroon : Cameroon wished to know if a decision on the number of elephant species would be made at the CoP 12 in Santiago. He highlighted the difficulties faced by range States in Central Africa in managing their own elephant conservation strategy. Central Africa is overrun by conservation organizations and there is a chronic lack of staff to fight the illegal trade. He requested to know the criterias for the AfESG Small Grant.

Dr Dublin noted that the CITES Secretariat would answer the query on the species number. The AfESG is able to help with networking and to facilitate the fund raising for elephant conservation. On the criteria for AfESG Small Grants, there are 3 or 4 grants awarded per quarter by a competitive process. Proposals for elephant surveys are encouraged, however, priority would go to those areas for which no knowledge is available on elephant range.

4.2.6 Tanzania : Tanzania wished to know why it was not among the AfESG's list of countries which have launched national strategies for conservation and management.

Dr Dublin clarified that Tanzania is not on this list because the AfESG did not assist in the elaboration of its national strategy.

4.3 Presentation on 'African Elephant Database' by AfESG AED Manager, Mr Julian Blanc

The presentation on the '*African Elephant Database*' is attached to this report in Annex IV. The following summary of topics on the African Elephant Database were covered by Mr Julian Blanc :

- i. What is the AED?
- ii. How can the AED assist Elephant Range States and the MIKE Process
- iii. AED Inputs and Outputs
- iv. Categorizing Elephant numbers
 - AED 1998 Summary
 - African Elephant Status Report 2002

4.3.1 Congo : Congo mentioned that as in the case of MIKE, there should be data use protocols for the AED as well. In the Central Africa sub-region, data collection is difficult. He queried what were the dispositions taken by the AfESG to enhance its database.

Mr Blanc acknowledged the difficulties in the amount of data that can be obtained in Central Africa range. The last AfESG meeting dealt with the issue of capacity building in Central Africa. As population estimates will come from dung surveys, one of the things being planned is to create a 'cookbook' on dung-counting techniques. To teach Central Africans to undertake dung surveys for themselves would be very important for capacity building in Central Africa. As far as improving the range in central Africa, the AfESG is expanding its network of contacts for data and range. Traditionally, the AED relied primarily on its members, it is now greatly expanding that network by contacting other conservation NGOs, range States as well as others who might not necessarily have anything to do with elephant, for example, the UN peacekeepers in Eritrea and the veterinary associations.

The MIKE Director added that this is a very good example where MIKE and AfESG collaborate on the initiatives being developed to help Central Africa on population surveys. It is also the reason why he sought the agreement of range States for the information collected under the MIKE process to be shared with the AED. The efforts being made in one initiative can add value and benefits to the others while minimizing extra costs and overheads. This is an example of the type of collaboration which possible under the MIKE process.

5. Cooperation between MIKE and World Heritage Convention

5.1 Presentation on 'The Cooperation between CITES MIKE and the World Heritage Convention – Opportunity for Biodiversity Conservation' by Mr Guy Debonnet, Programme Specialist, Natural Heritage Section, World Heritage Centre

The presentation *The Cooperation between CITES MIKE and the World Heritage Convention – Opportunity for Biodiversity Conservation* by Mr Debonnet is attached to this report in Annex V.

The Convention was established in 1972 and managed by a Committee of 21 member states elected by the General Assembly. The Secretariat is based in UNESCO in Paris assisted by two advisory bodies : IUCN for natural heritage and ICOMOS for cultural heritage.

The evaluation criteria for nomination as "natural heritage" are (i) outstanding universal value, (ii) legal protection of the site (iii) integrity of the site and (iv) management of the site.

The tools available to the Convention are (i) periodic reporting on state of conservation (ii) danger listing/de-listing (iii) World Heritage Fund and (iv) international cooperation. The WH Fund has approximately US\$4 million per year to cover preparatory assistance, technical assistance, training and emergency assistance.

The global strategy of the Convention is now aiming at a higher representativity of the list to include biodiversity in ecosystems. New interesting mechanisms to nominate sites on an ecosystem basis is the possibility to nominate "cluster sites", comprising several sites in the same ecosystem, and transboundary sites, comprising adjacent sites in the same ecosystem in different countries. New partnerships for Biodiversity Conservation are being established to promote the Convention as a tool for biodiversity conservation. In this regards, joint projects are set up with conservation NGOs such as Conservation International and World Wildlife Fund, and

the UNFoundation which support and promote the management and conservation of UN Natural World Heritage sites through leveraging increased funding for biodiversity initiatives. There is also increased cooperation with other environmental conventions such as CBD, Ramsar, CITES and CMS.

Some MIKE sites are World Heritage sites or proposed sites, for example in West Africa : Niokolo-Koba, Tai, Comoe, Parc W (Niger) and Pendjari. East Africa : Selous. Central Africa : Kahuzi-Biega, Garamba, Virunga and Okapi.

The current cooperation between the Convention and CITES MIKE in DRC encompasses (i) the development of a harmonized LEM system based on existing site systems (ii) the production of base maps for sites (iii) the execution of base line biodiversity surveys and (iv) the development of a geo-referenced monitoring database for all sites.

In its newly launched Central African World Heritage Forest Initiative, the Convention will be working in partnership with WWF, WCS, CI, JGI and ECOFAC to improve the conservation in three transboundary protected area clusters. These represent some of the best forest ecosystems in the Congo Basin and potential World Heritage sites. Quite a number of MIKE sites situated in these ecosystems are already World Heritage sites, for example Boumba Bek, Djanha-Sangha, Nouabalé-Ndoki and Minkebe (Gabon, Cameroon, CAR and Congo).

Discussions are also underway with the MIKE Director for the possibility of developing a joint training program to increase monitoring and data gathering capabilities in sites and management authorities which would be partly funded by the World Heritage Fund. The identification of potential World Heritage sites in Africa and in Asia which are important for elephant conservation and would present further opportunity for cooperation with MIKE.

5.2 Questions and Answers for Mr Debonnet

The Chair expressed his support for synergistic cooperation between conventions that are related. The cooperation between MIKE and the World Heritage Convention is a clear and good example of synergy among conventions. He is sure that most range States would encourage and support any presentation arising out of such synergistic relationship at the CoP 12.

5.2.1 Nigeria : Nigeria wished to know if a site could be chosen on a single endemic species.

Mr Debonnet explained that this is a difficult issue to answer because an endemic species are an important issue and argument for a site. A site which has an endemic species coupled with an intact ecosystem can be a World Heritage site, however the Convention has emphasized that the sites have to be large enough to be sustainable over the long term. Size is an element of the Convention and this is the reason why "cluster sites" have been considered as in the case of Madagascar where some of the unit forests have endemic lemur species but were too small on their own. However, with connectors or corridors between sites they can be clustered as a World Heritage Site.

5.2.2 Senegal : Senegal raised the question on the practicality of cooperation between the two conventions CITES and World Heritage Convention, particularly in view of the fact that not all MIKE sites are World Heritage sites, and furthermore, MIKE has very specific objectives while the World Heritage is focusing on ecosystem biodiversity issues.

Mr Debonnet clarified that the MIKE process which can be extended to other species in the MIKE sites presents the same goal for biodiversity in the World Heritage sites.

The MIKE Director added that cooperation between the two conventions is important. Range States themselves have expressed that MIKE needs to explore better collaboration and resources. This is sharing with the range States one opportunity for cooperation in the MIKE /World Heritage sites and it does not mean the end of opportunities for other sites. Whilst the World Heritage Convention has a broader remit, part of their assistance is to facilitate monitoring which they call 'bio-monitoring' while MIKE calls it population survey work. These objectives overlap and it would be important to work together and start the process not only in Central and West Africa but also in East Africa, for example Selous, designated as MIKE and World Heritage site, the cooperation between the two conventions may go in some way to address the concerns on lack of resources raised by Tanzania. The next steps would be for both the MIKE Director and Mr Debonnet to start the process of working with the wildlife agencies on their initiatives to see if the best value can be obtained from this cooperation.

The Chair noted that the Director of Senegal would see the complementarity between the activities of the two conventions. He urged range States to give their support to this initiative.

5.2.3 Senegal : Senegal would like to know what happens to a site if it has been selected on a criteria which later disappears. What would be the grounds for de-listing as a World Heritage site?

Mr Debonnet assured that a site does not lose its value overnight, but that it is a process. The committee has in place a mechanism to review and make recommendations to sites that are in difficulties. Should conditions at the site continue to deteriorate so as to become endangered, de-listing could be a possibility.

5.2.4 Niger : Niger noted that one of their sites was first listed as a World Heritage site before it became a MIKE site. The cooperation between the two conventions presents a sustainable approach in giving assistance to range States. He would like to see this cooperation as an opportunity to fund the logistics needed for the information gathering under the MIKE system.

6. Concluding Remarks and Closure

The MIKE Director thanked the range States, the national officers and site officers for their collaboration in getting the MIKE system up and running. He expressed his appreciation to the delegates from the Asian elephant range States and noted that it was the first time the two continents had met for a pure elephant meeting. He extended his gratitude to the four Chairs of each sub-region for chairing the regional meeting in an equitable and democratic manner. Special thanks was also extended to Mr Richard Ruggiero of the USFWS as a key donor, the African Elephant Specialist Group and the World Heritage Convention who have contributed to this meeting, as well as the MIKE staff who have assisted in organizing this meeting.

The meeting was closed by the Secretary-General Mr Willem Wijnstekers on behalf of the CITES Secretariat. Mr Wijnstekers noted that the two days of meeting has clearly shown that MIKE, following a difficult and insecure start, has developed into a healthy programme and which has been adopted by the range States. He praised the level of participation and enthusiasm from all the African range States as well as the Asian range States in this regional meeting. It is hoped that the donor community seeing that the countries with African and Asian elephants have now

fully embraced MIKE and its implementation would take this as a clear signal to ensure that MIKE can continue to develop.

The struggle for funding is a major problem not only for MIKE but CITES as well. At the next CoP, QTES would be presenting a budget based on a zero growth but which would still require a 10% increase in contributions from the parties. Without this 10% increase in contributions, the Secretariat would face a serious situation where instead of zero growth, it would have less to spend on implementation. Mr Wijnstekers noted that the number of parties to the Convention has increased to 160 with two new entrants. The 161st party would be announcing their decision to ratify the Convention at the CoP 12. This means that a total of 8 countries have become party to the Convention since the last CoP in Nairobi two and half years ago. At the last World Summit on Sustainable Development in Johannesburg, one of the issues to be discussed should have been the funding for international environmental and governmental development. This issue was dropped from discussions and it would seem that the NGO community would have to share a smaller slice of the fund size from donors and countries. It is hoped that instead of competing for the same fund size, MIKE would be able to create its own funding as it is an excellent example of a continental programme instead of a multi-country project. Asia is becoming more important in the context of MIKE and it is becoming more important for the donors to realize the scope and potential of a programme such as MIKE. In particular, the Secretary General noted that it is an important vehicle not just for elephants but for nature conservation in general through capacity building, training and new techniques. MIKE is also a vehicle for collaboration with other programmes to create wider funding. The regional meeting has seen that it interacts widely with IUCN specialist groups, such as the African Elephant Specialist Group, as well as the World Heritage Convention. These synergies and inter-linkages are important and enables cross-fertilization between initiatives and organizations.

Mr Wijnstekers applauded the presentation by Tom Milliken on ETIS report to the CoP 12. The investment in ETIS has led to an impressive level of data and information to be used by range States in the development of their management and conservation policies and their implementation on a day-to-day basis. It is envisaged that MIKE would soon produce that same level and quality of information for range States.

The fact that MIKE is being implemented in the field is an important aspect of CITES. The regional meeting has addressed practical issues ranging from elephant management strategy to the needs in the fields such as GPS, batteries and transmitters. It is hoped that more countries will realize that MIKE and ETIS systems will collectively be invaluable in furthering the common goal to stamp out illegal killing of elephants and illegal trade in elephant products respectively.

Finally, Mr Wijnstekers extended his congratulations to the MIKE Director. The implementation of MIKE would not have been possible without the efforts of Mr Hunter who has left a highly-paid job in the UK to take up the implementation and further growth of MIKE. He extended his gratitude to all range States participants, the observers, the MIKE staff, the interpreters and technicians for their contributions to the success of this regional meeting.