

**Minutes of the 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Sub regional Steering Committee for  
MIKE East Africa  
19-20<sup>th</sup> July 2007,  
Paraa Lodge, Murchison Falls Conservation Area, Uganda**

**1. Welcome speech by the Chair [Commissioner, Wildlife, MTTI, Uganda]**

Mr. Justus Tindigarukayo called the meeting to order at 8.30am and welcomed everybody to the meeting. He then suggested including adoption of the agenda as an item while Kenya proposed the inclusion of the MIKE/ETIS Subgroup on discussion items for day 2. The agenda was adopted with the suggested amendments.

Delegates from Eritrea and Tanzania gave apologies on behalf of Mr. Tekleab Misghena and Mr. Emmanuel Severre respectively who could not make it for the meeting due to other government commitments.

In his opening remarks, the Chair reflected on the importance of the meeting and highlighted some of the expectations to be realized as follows:

- Rationally linking MIKE to National Programmes so that information produced by parties could serve a two-way purpose for decision making;
- Linking experiences with the challenges of parties as well as;
- Using the MIKE experience to address management and conservation of other species.

**2. MIKE Programme Update [MIKE Coordinator]**

Mr. Tom De-Meulenaer, the MIKE Coordinator then provided an update on the Global MIKE programme. The update included, among others:

- Overview of MIKE, highlighting the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> phases, new funding;
- The new institutional structure of MIKE;
- Reviewed and gave an update on relevant issues agreed at the CoP 14 and
- General implementation issues for MIKE

**3. Progress report by Sub regional Support Officer**

Mr. Edison Nuwamanya, the Sub regional Support Officer for East Africa then took the flow to discuss progress of MIKE implementation in East Africa. The presentation reflected on the issues agreed on at previous steering committee meetings and went in details to cover the following:

- MIKE data collection process;
- Strong points of the MIKE Programme in East Africa;
- Results obtained so far;
- Performance of individual MIKE sites;
- What countries need to do to succeed in implementing MIKE;

- Examples of data and results from specific sites so far and
- Challenges faced in implementing MIKE

Some of the key challenges highlighted by the Sub regional Support Officer in implementing MIKE included: The high rate of staff turnover, Communication problems, Data flow challenges, Lack of good will and enthusiasm from certain MIKE officers as well as I.T related challenges.

#### **4. MIKE Baseline Report [MIKE Data Analyst]**

This presentation was done by Mr. Julian Blanc, the new Data Analyst for MIKE programme. His report consisted of a simplified and easy to understand version of the MIKE baseline report presented and adopted at the Standing Committee of CITES No. 55 (SC 55) in The Hague in June 2007. The presentation discussed the following:

- What baselines are and why they are important for any monitoring programme;
- The definition of the MIKE baseline;
- MIKE baseline in East Africa;
- Site by site description of baseline parameters
- A description of influencing factors as used in the baseline analysis;
- The analytical approach to the MIKE baseline and
- Refinements for the future.

#### **Issues and matters arising from presentations by the MIKE team**

Kenya raised a concern on why Tsavo was eliminated from the MIKE baseline and yet this was the Country's number one priority site and also why influencing factors used for the MIKE baseline were done by external people.

This was clarified by the MIKE team by reassuring Kenya that Tsavo was actually never removed from the baseline and referred Kenya to pages 5, 15, 18, 23, 25 and 34 of the MIKE baseline report document SC 55 Doc.10.2 (Rev.1). The issue of influencing factors was clarified that these were compiled by Sub regional Support Officers in consultation with site and National Officers from the Range states.

#### **5. Country Reports [30 minutes each] [ER, KE, RW, TZ, UG]**

- a. Eritrea
- b. Kenya
- c. Rwanda
- d. Tanzania
- e. Uganda

Each country gave a presentation on the progress of implementation of MIKE for each of its sites, the status of personnel, population surveys and challenges

faced in implementing MIKE. Details of needs and issues raised in country reports are included in annex 1 of the minutes.

## **6. Reactions and Review of Country Reports**

The Chair summarized some of the major issues arising from the country reports as follows:

- Compatibility of data and databases
- Extending MIKE training beyond sites
- Staff Turnover
- Cross border issues

On compatibility of data and databases, Kenya agreed that this was a weak point on their side and requested MIKE programme to work with Kenya Wildlife Services in identifying what works and what doesn't. Modification of Law Enforcement Monitoring forms would be important initial measure towards achieving success.

On Extending MIKE beyond sites, Uganda suggested that this could be achieved through Institutionalizing MIKE programme to help better planning and management of resources. By doing this, staff turnover would no longer be an issue. Uganda also encouraged collaboration and data sharing in cross border sites e.g. Queen Elizabeth/ Virunga/ Mgahinga. The MIKE data analyst suggested training of trainers as part of the National programmes.

On Staff turnover, Kenya reported that they were considering the use of Research Scientists who are transferred less often, and would encourage cross transfer within MIKE sites where such transfers were inevitable. Uganda encouraged the application of MIKE training across the board so that any transfers have no effect on the sustainability and functioning of the MIKE site in question.

Regarding cross-border issues, Rwanda informed members that it was possible for governments to work together through multilateral agreements and sited a model that is already in use for gorillas in Rwanda/Uganda and Democratic Republic of Congo.

## **7. Brief Report by the Representative of the EC**

Mr. Alexandre SERRES, the delegate from the European Commission reported that he was pleased to attend the Sub regional Steering Committee meeting and thanked the hosting country, Uganda. The delegate reaffirmed that the presence of governments at this meeting was a manifestation of their commitment to MIKE programme which is line with the priorities of the Commission which included

- Biodiversity
- Climate Change

- Environmental issues

The delegate further reported that the EC closely monitors activities of MIKE and that he was happy with the dynamics of the meeting so far.

#### **8. MIKE issues of sub-regional concern - identification, discussion and solutions [all]**

The CITES MIKE secretariat suggested that they constitute a team that would sift through all country reports and compile emerging issues that would be presented in a discussion paper the next morning.

This was supported by all members and Kenya suggested that secretariat takes note of the issues raised earlier in their presentation regarding selection of sites, explaining the analytical process to sites and also to think about the hardware and software of sites in order to enhance analytical capacity.

Having gone through individual country presentations, the secretariat identified a number of issues that were categorized into three clusters as follows:

- Capacity and Human resource issues
- Logistical and Technical issues
- Sustainability and political will issues and

The identified issues within each cluster were then formulated into goals to be achieved and the recommended actions to ensure achievement of the goals.

The document was presented to the plenary and discussed by all members. For purposes of this meeting's minutes, this document is provided as annex 1.

#### **9. Future and sustainability of the MIKE programme [all]**

The MIKE Coordinator explained how the 10 Million Euros would be spent under the second EC grant and members requested to know allocations available for each activity or intervention. In response, Uganda requested to know the fate of countries currently not engaged in MIKE activities e.g. Sudan and Ethiopia. Kenya emphasized the need to include Sudan and Ethiopia into the MIKE programme and also to operationalize the Mkomazi part of the Tsavo/Mkomazi MIKE site, which is shared between Tanzania and Kenya under the ecosystem approach to site selection.

#### **10. Other issues relevant to CITES and elephant conservation [all]**

[Tom to add text]

#### **11. Explanation of ToRs for SSC Chair**

The MIKE coordinator presented draft Terms of Reference (ToRs) for the Steering Committees and informed members that this was only a working draft for members to look. As a start, the MIKE Coordinator suggested the following to be included in the Term of Reference for Steering Committee meetings.

[Tom to provide text here]

**12. Introduction of the MIKE sub group**

The MIKE coordinator explained to the meeting the structure and composition of the MIKE sub group. Prior to SC 55 and CoP 14, the MIKE Subgroup consisted of Kenya, Cameroon, Zambia, Australia, China, Malaysia, and Germany. The MIKE coordinator explained that the tenure of Malaysia, Cameroun and Germany had ended at CoP 14 and new Standing Committee members had been elected to fill up the void left by the three countries. *The new members of the Standing Committee are: Japan, United Kingdom, Egypt and Democratic republic of Congo [Tom to edit this section and add recommendations for who would suit inclusion on the MIKE/ETIS sub group]*

**13. Next Venue of the SSC meeting**

Both Rwanda and Eritrea expressed interest in hosting and chairing the next Steering Committee meeting. The chair requested the two countries to try and reach a consensus upon which Eritrea agreed to give Rwanda the chance. The next venue and Chair of the meeting was therefore agreed as Rwanda by consensus.

**14. AOB**

Uganda expressed gratitude and thanked members for having attended the meeting. The EC representative also thanked delegates and reaffirmed the EC's commitment in funding MIKE programme. On its part, Kenya thanked the MIKE Coordinator for organizing the meeting while the Sub regional Support Officer expressed honor and gratitude to the Support given by range states and to the MIKE team for providing all the necessary Support to ensure the meeting was a success. The MIKE Coordinator that he was convinced and encouraged by the range states support for the programme and promised to continue collaboration with the range states in order to achieve a successful MIKE programme within the Regional and at Intercontinental levels.

**15. Closing remarks [Chair]**

The Chair concluded the meeting and thanked members for the fruitful discussions held during the two days meeting and hoped that what was agreed would be put in place to make CITES MIKE Programme a tool that can help range states make effective management decisions not only for elephants but also other species in general

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS**  
**MIKE SUBREGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING, EAST AFRICA**  
**19-20<sup>th</sup> July 2007, Murchison Falls Conservation Area, Uganda.**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <p><b>KENYA</b></p> <p>1. Dr. Samuel <b>KASIKI</b>,<br/>Ag. Deputy Director,<br/>Biodiversity, Research &amp; Monitoring,<br/>Kenya Wildlife Service,<br/>PO Box 40241<br/>NAIROBI, KENYA<br/>Tel : + 254 20 600800<br/>Fax : + 254 20 603792<br/>Mobile : + 254 (0)734 810423<br/>E : Mail : <a href="mailto:Skasiki@kws.org">Skasiki@kws.org</a></p> <p>2. Patrick <b>OMONDI</b><br/>Out going MIKE National Officer<br/>Head, Species Conservation and<br/>Management<br/>Kenya Wildlife Service<br/>PO Box 40241<br/>NAIROBI, KENYA<br/><br/>Tel : + 254 20 608072<br/>Fax : + 254 20 603792<br/>E-mail : <a href="mailto:Po蒙ondi@kws.org">Po蒙ondi@kws.org</a></p> <p>3. Moses <b>LITOROH</b><br/>Elephant Programme Coordinator, KWS<br/>MIKE National Officer,<br/>Kenya Wildlife Service<br/>PO Box 40241<br/>NAIROBI, KENYA<br/><br/>Tel : + 254 20 608072<br/>Fax : + 254 20 603792<br/>E-mail : <a href="mailto:Mlitoroh@kws.org">Mlitoroh@kws.org</a>.</p> | <p><b>ERITREA</b></p> <p>1. Yacob <b>YOHANNES</b><br/>MIKE National Officer<br/>Department of Regulatory services<br/>Ministry of Agriculture<br/>P. O. Box 1048<br/>Asmara, ERITREA<br/>Tel. + 291 1 120388/120395<br/>Fax. + 291 1 127508</p> <p><b>RWANDA</b></p> <p>1. Patrick Buda <b>KUKIYE</b><br/>MIKE Site Officer, Akagera N. Park<br/>C/O B. P. 905<br/>Kigali RWANDA<br/>Tel : 250 576715<br/>Fax : 250 576714<br/>Mobile : 250 08490013<br/>Email: <a href="mailto:bkukiye@yahoo.fr">bkukiye@yahoo.fr</a></p> <p>2. Antoine <b>MUDAKIKWA</b><br/>Senior Vet Officer, ORTPN<br/>Rwanda Office of Tourism &amp; National<br/>Parks<br/>B. P. 905<br/>Kigali RWANDA<br/>Tel : 250 576715<br/>Fax : 250 576714<br/>Mobile : 250 0830 6918<br/>Email: <a href="mailto:saveagorilla@rwandatourism.com">saveagorilla@rwandatourism.com</a></p> |
|---|--|

**UGANDA:**

1. Justus **TINDIGARUKAYO**,  
Steering Committee Member,  
Commissioner Wildlife,  
Ministry of Tourism, Trade and  
Industry.

P. O. Box 4241

Kampala

UGANDA

Tel : 256 41 343947

Fax : 256 41 341247

E-mail : [jtindigarukayo@mtti.go.ug](mailto:jtindigarukayo@mtti.go.ug)

2. Moses **MAPESA**,  
Executive Director,  
Uganda Wildlife Authority,  
PO Box 3530

KAMPALA, UGANDA.

Tel : + 256 (41) 346287/8

Fax : + 256 (41) 346291

E-mail : [moses.mapesa@uwa.or.ug](mailto:moses.mapesa@uwa.or.ug)

3. Samuel **MWANDHA**  
Director, Field Operations,  
Uganda Wildlife Authority '  
PO Box 3530

KAMPALA, UGANDA.

Tel : + 256 (41) 346287/8

Fax : + 256 (41) 346291

E-mail : [sam.mwandha@uwa.or.ug](mailto:sam.mwandha@uwa.or.ug)

**TANZANIA**

1. Benjamin **ANDULEGE**  
Wildlife Division,  
Ministry of Natural Resources and  
Tourism,

P.O Box 1994,

Dar es salaam.

UNITED RREPUBLIC OF TANZANIA.

Tel. + 255 22 2866375/408

Mob. + 255 754 471223

E: Mail: [director@wildlife.go.tz](mailto:director@wildlife.go.tz)

**EUROPEAN COMMISSION**

1. Alexandre **SERRES**  
Programme Manager,  
Europe Aid, Co-operation office,  
European Commission.  
Tel. +32 (2) 295.96.24  
Fax. +32 (2) 299.49.47  
E: Mail: [alexandre.serres@ec.europa.eu](mailto:alexandre.serres@ec.europa.eu)

**ABSENT WITH APOLOGIES****RWANDA**

Fidele **RUZIGANDEKWE**  
Executive Director/RWA  
B.P. 905, Kigali.  
Tel. +250 576512/14  
Mob. +250 08 306910  
E: Mail: [fruziga@rwandatourism.com](mailto:fruziga@rwandatourism.com)

**TANZANIA**

Emmanuel SEVERRE  
Director of Wildlife,  
Wildlife Division,  
P.O Box 1994,  
Dar es salaam,  
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA  
Tel. +255 22 2866408  
E: Mail: [director@wildlife.go.tz](mailto:director@wildlife.go.tz)

**ERITREA**

Tekleab Misgena  
Department of Regulatory Services,  
Min. of Agriculture,  
P.O Box 1048,  
Asmara, ERITREA.  
Tel. +291 1 120388  
E: Mail: [mtekleab@eol.com.er](mailto:mtekleab@eol.com.er)

**CITES MIKE PROGRAMME**

1. Tom **De-MEULENAER**  
Coordinator,  
CITES MIKE Programme  
Division of Environmental Law and  
Conventions, UNEP,  
P. O. Box  
Nairobi, KENYA  
Tel : +254 20 7625175  
Email : [Tom.De-Meulenaer@unep.org](mailto:Tom.De-Meulenaer@unep.org)

2. Edison **NUWAMANYA**

Sub-regional Support Officer (E. Africa)  
CITES MIKE Programme  
P. O. Box 68200 00200  
Nairobi  
KENYA  
Tel : +254 20 3876838  
Fax : +254 20 3870385  
Email :  
[edisonnuwamanya@citesmike.org](mailto:edisonnuwamanya@citesmike.org)

3. Julian **BLANC**

Data Coordinator,  
CITES MIKE Programme  
Division of Environmental Law and  
Conventions, UNEP,  
P. O. Box  
Nairobi  
KENYA  
Tel : +254 20 7625174  
E : Mail : [Julian.Blanc@unep.org](mailto:Julian.Blanc@unep.org)

4. Claire **MORWABE**

CITES MIKE Programme,  
East Africa Sub regional Support Unit,  
Tel. +254 20 3870522  
Cell: +254 720 702315  
**E Mail:** [cnyamke@yahoo.com](mailto:cnyamke@yahoo.com)



## Annex 1. MIKE Needs and Issues emerging from Country presentations

| Cluster                | Goal  | Intervention   |
|------------------------|---|--|
| Capacity and HR issues | Minimizing the impact of staff turnover                                     | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and provide self-training materials (MIKE<sup>1</sup>)</li> <li>• Institutionalizing MIKE training through integration of MIKE modules into national ranger training curricula (RS<sup>2</sup>)</li> <li>• Ensuring longer-term positions (RS)</li> <li>• Recognizing value of MIKE officers within HR mechanisms (RS)</li> <li>• Consult with RS authorities on issues of staff turnover and need for sustainability of capacity building efforts (MIKE/RS)</li> </ul> |
| Capacity and HR issues | Ensuring MIKE officers are interested/motivated                             | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a system to allocate travel &amp; communication funds for MSO and MNO<sup>3</sup> travel (RS/MIKE)</li> <li>• Provide honest feedback to RS on performance (MIKE)</li> <li>• Take that feedback into consideration (RS)</li> <li>• Ensure the right people are appointed to MSO<sup>4</sup> posts (RS)</li> <li>• Improve planning of human resource management (RS)</li> <li>• Develop and adopt professional incentive systems (RS/MIKE)</li> </ul>                   |
| Capacity and HR issues | Building capacity to understand/undertake site- and national-level analysis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disseminate an explanatory document on the baseline to MIKE sites (MIKE)</li> <li>• Develop training tools to build site and national level analytical capacity (MIKE)</li> <li>• Ensure these tools are effectively used (RS)</li> <li>• Promote the adoption of MIKE monitoring methods and training</li> </ul>   |

<sup>1</sup> MIKE: Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants

<sup>2</sup> RS: Range states

<sup>3</sup> MNO: MIKE National Officer

<sup>4</sup> MSO: MIKE Site Officer

| Cluster                | Goal  | Intervention   |
|------------------------|---|--|
|                        |   | tools in regular curricula at wildlife management training institutions (e.g. Mweka) (RS/MIKE)   |
| Capacity and HR issues | Addressing training needs/wishes within budgetary constraints | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conduct an assessment of training needs (MIKE/RS/WM<sup>5</sup> Institutes)</li> <li>• Provide training packages using innovative tools (self-training, online training etc) (MIKE)</li> <li>• Explore options for training trainers (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Verification of training effectiveness (RS/MIKE)</li> </ul>   |
| Capacity and HR issues | Harmonizing levels of MIKE implementation between RS          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide targeted training (MIKE)</li> <li>• Identify bottlenecks in existing reporting systems and information low and work towards ensuring that MIKE data protocols are used correctly (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Act upon established weaknesses (RS)</li> <li>• Ensure ongoing quality control of data at all levels (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Devise a minimum set of standards of performance for MIKE sites and ensure they're met by all sites within 4 years (MIKE/RS)</li> </ul> |

---

<sup>5</sup> WM: Wildlife Monitoring

| Cluster                       | Goal   | Intervention  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Logistical & technical issues | Improving data flow  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Simplify MIKE reporting procedures (e.g. forms and database data entry (MIKE))</li> <li>• Integrate MIKE data flow into routine wildlife reporting mechanisms (RS)</li> <li>• Enhance site capacity to collect and pass on information (RS/MIKE)</li> </ul>  |
| Logistical & technical issues | Ensuring/enhancing sustainability of IT infrastructure / equipment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve robustness of hardware &amp; data vis a vis practical issues like power supply, viruses, backups, etc (MIKE)</li> <li>• Look for cost-effective and sustainable hardware/software options (MIKE)</li> <li>• Explore and highlight emerging opportunities for equipment/software procurement (RS/MIKE)</li> <li>• Set up mechanisms for routine reporting of computer problems and maintenance schedules (MIKE)</li> <li>• Identify ways of making hardware/software maintenance cost effective (MIKE)</li> <li>• Identify opportunities for upgrading hardware (MIKE)</li> <li>• Use existing equipment &amp; expertise at National level to maintain MIKE computers (RS)</li> </ul> |
| Logistical & technical issues | Reducing Logistics /communication challenges for remote sites      | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assist in implementing systems for automated remote data transfer (eg radio, GPRS<sup>6</sup>) (MIKE)</li> <li>• Simplify and rationalize data transfer systems (eg transfer data from nearest town rather than physically to HQ).</li> </ul>  |

---

<sup>6</sup> GPRS: General Packet Radio Service

| Cluster                       | Goal   | Intervention  |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
| Logistical & technical issues | Eliminating potential for bias/subjectivity in current influencing factor system | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a suite of objective, quantitative influencing factors in consultation with TAG<sup>7</sup> and RS (MIKE)</li> <li>• Ensure statistical validity of interpretation of results (MIKE/TAG/RS)</li> <li>• Develop a mechanism to provide feedback between TAG and SSC</li> <li>• Foster communication between sub regional TAG members and their respective sub regions (MIKE/TAG/RS)</li> </ul>  |
| Logistical & technical issues | Ensuring sustainability of population surveys                                    | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide training and tools to conduct standardized surveys (MIKE)</li> <li>• Assist in conducting high priority surveys &amp; ensuring optimal resource allocation in such assistance (MIKE)</li> <li>• Foster cross border cooperation for conducting surveys in trans-boundary MIKE sites (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Anticipate/allocate budgets to conduct surveys of MIKE sites on a regular (3 year) cycle (RS)</li> <li>• Explore possibilities for setting up joint sub regional capacity/survey teams (RS)</li> <li>• Facilitate securing external funding where it remains necessary (MIKE)</li> <li>• Advocate importance of regular surveys to relevant national decision makers (RS)</li> <li>• Develop a system for prioritizing MIKE support to population surveys and communicate results to RS (MIKE)</li> </ul> |

---

<sup>7</sup> TAG: Technical Advisory Group

| <b>Cluster</b>                           | <b>Goal</b>  | <b>Intervention</b>  |
|--|--|--|
| Logistical & technical issues            | Ensuring population surveys meet MIKE standards        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Disseminate &amp; promote MIKE survey standards at MIKE sites and beyond (including those carried out by external organizations) (MIKE/RS/MNO)</li> <li>• Prior to any surveys, liaise with CCU on planned methodology and standards (RS/MIKE)</li> <li>• Build institutional capacity for RS to conduct surveys in accordance with MIKE standards (MIKE)</li> </ul>  |
| Logistical & technical issues            | Integration of existing management information systems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop "plug-ins" to make existing computerized information systems compatible with MIKE (MIKE/RS)</li> </ul>  |
| Sustainability and political will issues | Enhancing political commitment to implement MIKE       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communicate importance of MIKE monitoring to higher levels of decision makers (RS/MIKE)</li> <li>• Work with appropriate regional agreements/ conventions for enhancing MIKE implementation (for example COMESA, EAC, LATF<sup>8</sup>, SADC<sup>9</sup>)– (RS/MIKE)</li> <li>• Liaise with other organizations (IUCN, FAO<sup>10</sup>, etc)</li> <li>• Continue high level representation by RS at Steering Committee meetings (RS)</li> <li>• Ensure quality information from MIKE is easily available to decision makers at national, sub regional, continental levels</li> </ul> |

<sup>8</sup> LATF: Lusaka Agreement Task Force

<sup>9</sup> SADC: Southern Africa Development Countries

<sup>10</sup> FAO: Food and Agriculture Organization

| Cluster                                  | Goal  | Intervention  |
|--|---|---|
|  |   | (MIKE) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Demonstrate value of MIKE information/approach for elephant management decision making (MIKE/RS)</li> </ul>   |
| Sustainability and political will        | Ensuring a harmonized common system is in place and appropriately used in elephant management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Apply MIKE protocols and standards (RS)</li> <li>• Identify difficulties experienced by each country in complying with MIKE standards (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Discuss and agree on ways to ensure compliance, and bring unresolved issues to the attention of sub regions/region (MIKE/RS).</li> </ul>  |
| Sustainability and political will issues | Expanding site sample beyond statistically representative set of sites                        | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Make available MIKE support packages for deployment in additional/new sites (MIKE)</li> <li>• Validate current site sample in consultation with TAG &amp; Sub region (MIKE)</li> <li>• Set up a standard reporting framework to which data from sites must conform (MIKE)</li> <li>• Collect and transfer data from additional sites along normal MIKE data flow routes and procedures (RS)</li> </ul> |

| <b>Cluster</b>                           | <b>Goal</b>  | <b>Intervention</b>   |
|--|--|---|
| Sustainability and political will issues | Facilitating elephant management actions beyond the scope of MIKE monitoring | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Convene regular regional meetings where management issues are discussed (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Facilitate communication between sites/countries and potential partners (MIKE)</li> <li>• Clearly articulate needs – e.g. in the form of project proposals (RS)</li> </ul>  |
| Sustainability and political will issues | Ensuring the implementation of a common LE monitoring system                 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess existing monitoring information systems (e.g. Uganda’s MIST) (MIKE)</li> <li>• Develop and deploy a standardized software system to meet wider wildlife monitoring needs (for countries with no systems already in place) and harmonize MIKE database with existing systems (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Foster institutionalization of MIKE training and protocols (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Share lessons/experiences (RS/MIKE)</li> <li>• Provide tools to ensure interoperability between existing systems and MIKE (MIKE/RS)</li> </ul> |
| Sustainability and political will issues | Enhancing data sharing and interaction among RS                              | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify different data management systems in use and assess interoperability with MIKE (MIKE/RS)</li> <li>• Promote and encourage bi and multilateral sharing of experiences</li> <li>• Facilitate publication of results and sharing of information across sites at all levels - national, regional, sub regional levels where appropriate (MIKE)</li> </ul>   |