

## **CITES roundtable on sustainable wildlife finance – African elephant conservation 27-28 October 2022, UNEP HQ (Gigiri, Nairobi)**

### **Meeting Summary**

The Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora (CITES) organized a roundtable on Sustainable Wildlife Finance - African Elephant Conservation, on October 27-28 in Nairobi, Kenya. The roundtable was funded by the European Union and the United Kingdom. The meeting agenda is found at the end of this report.

There were more than 50 people in attendance and 10 participated remotely. CITES management authorities from 24 African range states were represented. A small number of resource persons who are directly involved in sustainable financial mechanisms/solutions for wildlife and other natural resource conservation were also invited, as well as several potential donor countries. A list of participants is included at the end of this report.

### **Day 1 October 27, 2022**

#### **Session: Opening**

During the opening session, there were 3 speakers who welcomed the participants. Ivonne Higuero, CITES Secretary-General, opened the roundtable and thanked the participants for traveling from so many of the range states at this busy time of the year. Ms. Higuero discussed the origins of the workshop and stressed the importance of finding workable financial solutions that would help the range states address their conservation challenges. She acknowledged the EU for providing funding for the workshop. She closed by saying that the ultimate objective was to empower the management authorities to become better business partners with willing investors in wildlife conservation.

The participants were also welcomed by Lisa Farroway, Program Manager of the Global Wildlife Program, World Bank. She discussed the importance of nature-based economies and ongoing conversations at the global level about biodiversity conservation finance. She also discussed funding opportunities through GEF8, which includes a new funding priority on wildlife conservation and development.

Haruko Okusu, Chief of Projects and Outreach Unit, CITES Secretariat, was the final speaker in the opening session. She outlined the mandate of the roundtable, which are Decisions 18.4 to 18.11 Access to Funding. She then presented the objectives of the roundtable: (1) review the needs and concerns for financing conservation, (2) examine existing examples of financing solutions/initiatives in the wider environmental areas that may help African elephant conservation, and (3) discuss factors that would allow African elephant range states to become better business partners with the donor/investor community. Expected outcomes of the roundtable included increased awareness and sharing of sustainable finance initiatives, an open

dialogue about how finance mechanisms can be applied to wildlife issues, and future directions for continued work.

The participants agreed that the roundtable would be chaired by Ms. Higuero.

### **Session: Setting the stage: Overview on the study of sustainable finance for wildlife conservation**

This session consisted of an overview presentation from Randall Kramer, a consultant commissioned by the CITES Secretariat, who summarized his discussion paper entitled "[Mobilizing Sustainable Finance for Elephant Conservation](#)", which had been shared with the roundtable participants in advance. He included summaries of the main themes from the background interviews he conducted and shared a number of representative quotes. He discussed the growing recognition of the importance of Africa's wildlife economy. He also introduced key concepts from the conservation finance literature, discussed the use of five approaches to innovative finance for wildlife conservation, and how each could be applied to elephant conservation. The final part of his talk focused on the enabling conditions that could facilitate greater public and private investment in wildlife conservation.

### **Session: Needs and Concerns for Financing Wildlife Conservation**

In this session there were presentations from Namibia, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Cote d'Ivoire, and Congo. Representatives of the CITES management authorities from each country outlined their needs and priorities.

Namibia: Mr. Colgar Sikopo highlighted human-elephant conflict (HEC) and loss of habitat connectivity as Namibia's highest conservation priorities. They receive reports of HEC every day. Poaching has significantly declined in recent years. Some conservancies receive incentives to engage in conservation activities including maintenance of elephant corridors. Namibia would like to allow sustainable use of elephants, and he indicated that there is a need for more patrols, provision of watering holes, general monitoring of elephants and early warning systems. The Game Product Trust fund, which was established by the parliament from sale of game, is available for future infusions of conservation investment funds.

Zimbabwe: Ms. Patience Gandiwa reported that her country manages its elephants with an ecosystems approach using a parastatal organization (Zimbabwe Parks and Wildlife Management Authority). HEC is their biggest challenge, and they want to secure more land areas for elephant migration. They have experienced a downward trend in poaching with a lot of resources devoted to keeping boots on the ground and to motivate communities to co-exist with elephants. They seek a multi-scale, multi-faceted approach to wildlife conservation and have a need for more reliable, long term financing for elephant conservation.

Kenya: Mr. Patrick Omondi talked about a recently completed national conservation census that showed an elephant population of over 36,000 elephants, a population that has doubled since

1989. The country faces considerable HEC due to human population growth and changes in land use. They have made a large investment in enforcement, which has dramatically reduced poaching, but the demand for ivory continues. Unfortunately, recent drought is contributing to significant wildlife mortality including elephants. They are working on a new national elephant action plan that prioritizes reduction of HEC. They are seeking sustainable finance for conservation, including payments for ecosystem services, carbon credits, increased government funding, and public-private partnerships.

Côte d'Ivoire: Ms. Salimata Koné Tondossama reported that the country has a population of approximately 500 elephants, with 80% found in protected areas. HEC is their top conservation challenge, with many cases of agricultural damages as well as human injuries and deaths. Poaching has significantly declined, due in part to increased enforcement and judicial activity. They do not have good monitoring data, but they know there is cross-border wildlife movement. They face a lot of challenges with conservation funding, and do not have adequate capacity to draft funding proposals.

Congo: Mr. Jean Bosco Nganongo reported that with a large forest base they have an excellent environment for elephants and other wildlife. HEC has been growing due to human population increases. They also face challenges resulting from climate change and civil unrest. The country has developed a national elephant action plan that calls for an HEC mitigation strategy, continued efforts to reduce poaching and ivory trafficking, and efforts to promote habitat connectivity between large forest blocks. Other priorities include a national inventory of elephants, strengthening of institutional and management capacity, and enhancing cross-border cooperation on elephant conservation.

### **Session: Examples of financing solutions on wildlife conservation**

There were two speakers in this session.

#### Elisson Wright, World Bank "Wildlife Conservation Bond"

Mr. Wright began by noting that we all want to channel more money toward nature. With all the challenges, we need to grow the total amount of investment in biodiversity conservation. While grants and concessional lending are important, closing the biodiversity funding gap will require new approaches. Wildlife conservation creates a global public good, but funding for it must compete with other priorities – health, education, and infrastructure. He then discussed the development of the Wildlife Conservation Bond, which was designed to create additional funding for 2 rhino conservation sites in South Africa, which were selected from 130 potential sites. In March of this year, the bank issued a \$150 million bond. Foregone coupon payments are being used to finance rhino conservation activities, with much of the conservation funding front-loaded to the parks. Bonus payments to the investors at the end of the bond period will come from GEF funding, and the amount of bonus payments will depend on what happens to rhino populations. This feature transfers outcome risk to investors. Most buyers of the bond

were from the US and Europe. Some were impact investors and some were high wealth individuals. Monitoring and evaluation were essential for attracting bond buyers.

For this instrument to be replicated, it will be necessary to have: (1) an organization with a great conservation track record, (2) investors who are willing to lock up funds for a while, (3) an organization that can issue a bond – e.g., World Bank, another bank, or government, and (4) an entity to pay for the biodiversity outcome. Markets are not yet pricing biodiversity, so you have to have grants or government funds to pay for the biodiversity benefit.

Indekhwa Anangwe, African Wildlife Foundation, “A-PACT – Overview”

Ms. Anangwe described A-PACT (A-Pan-African Conservation Trust) as a proposed new conservation trust fund that would be an African-led financing mechanism to channel global and African financing to protected and conserved areas across the continent. The fund was developed in response to needs raised by the Africa Protected Area Directors (APAD) Forum as a means to secure sustained and sufficient financing for Africa’s 8,609 protected and conserved areas. The fund is envisioned as a hybrid fund with an endowment component, a sinking fund component, and an investment fund to leverage private capital investments. A recently completed feasibility study confirmed the hybrid model approach and recommended a governance structure now being established. Further design and fund raising is underway with a formal launch envisioned for September 2023.

### **Breakout group discussions (1): Generating revenue streams for wildlife conservation**

The day ended with the participants divided into 2 Francophone and 2 Anglophone breakout groups, supported by facilitators from UNEP and the CITES Secretariat, asked to discuss the following:

1. What are your unfunded conservation needs that would benefit from sustainable financing?
2. Considering the different financing mechanisms in Table 3<sup>1</sup> of the [study](#), what might be more feasible for your country’s conservation efforts, and why?

## **Day 2, October 28, 2022**

### **Session: Report back from the breakout group discussions**

#### **Question 1 - Conservation Challenges**

The groups reported that while each country’s situation is different, HEC is the biggest challenge, regardless of the national elephant population size. To address this, there is a strong need for effective compensation policies and for developing alternative livelihoods. Another

---

<sup>1</sup> The conservation financing mechanisms discussed were: payments for ecosystem services, carbon credits, green bonds/wildlife bonds, debt-for-nature swaps, and Conservation Trust Funds.

challenge is loss of habitat connectivity, which contributes to HEC. Addressing this is expensive in terms of measures to protect existing corridors and reestablish lost corridors. Illegal killing of elephants has gone down in many countries in eastern and southern African countries, but remains more of a challenge in other regions. The groups reported that continued diligence is needed in all range states in terms of law enforcement and strengthening of laws and regulations.

There is also a great need for more monitoring and inventories, as several range states do not have a good handle on the size and location of their elephant herds. In addition, there was recognition that capacity building in conservation agencies is needed regarding the use of new science and technology. Finally, the groups reported that climate change is making conservation more difficult, by encouraging greater elephant movement to search for food and water, which in turn impacts both humans and other species. Addressing these needs requires considerably more financial resources than currently available.

### **Question 2 – Different finance mechanisms**

The breakout groups provided a variety of comments on the different mechanisms, and it was clear that different approaches are likely more feasible in some countries than others:

Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES) – The breakout groups indicated a lot of interest in PES, perhaps because it has been around for a while and is familiar to many working in conservation. In terms of feasibility, all of the groups ranked this as #1 or #2. They reported that several range states are building this finance mechanism into their conservation programs. One concern is that most PES programs are funded by donors or governments, so they may not be sustainable.

Carbon credits were favored by 3 of the breakout groups. Given the very large amount of climate finance available globally, this approach shows promise for expanding available funds for conservation if a clear link to carbon storage can be made. One group said that all range states should use this approach to mitigate climate change and fund conservation activities.

Conservation Trust Funds (CTF) were considered feasible by three of the breakout groups, and ranked #1 by two groups. There were several comments about desirable features of this approach -- dependability and sustainability of financial flows. It was noted that one challenge with CTF is where does the trust fund investment come from? If the investment comes from donors, the CTF can create a longer-term flow of funds than the usual 5-year, donor funded project.

Debt-for-nature swaps - Three of the four breakout groups thought this was a feasible approach and should be explored further. One group mentioned this would be particularly attractive for infrastructure investments. One caveat is that a number of elephant range states are now classified by the World Bank as middle-income countries, so they are likely ineligible for debt swaps.

Wildlife Bonds - Two groups had wildlife bonds on their list of feasible approaches. Others reported that this approach to raising conservation funding was too new for them to judge if it was feasible for their countries to use.

Other mechanisms – Several other revenue raising approaches were brought up by different groups. This included tourism fees, taxes, and support for wildlife economy activities, including opportunities for communities to support themselves.

### **Session: Examples of Financing Solutions in Other Areas Relevant for Environmental Sustainability**

Zhengzheng Qu, UNEP, “Climate finance and Biodiversity”

Ms. Qu started by talking about finding common solutions to address multiple challenges – food, climate, land degradation and biodiversity. We should consider similarities and co-benefits of climate and biodiversity projects. This requires integrated planning and programming and pursuing different sources of funding. She then presented 4 example projects based on her experience with the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

1. Bhutan for Life: This project is a good example of using long-term climate finance (from the GCF) to provide both carbon storage benefits and biodiversity protection in a country where 51% of its territory is in protected areas. The project also addresses community livelihood needs and human-wildlife conflict (tigers and leopards).
2. Inclusive Green Financing Initiative in the Great Green Wall: This project covers 13 African nations and focuses on fostering climate resilient, low emission, small holder agriculture. It works through green finance – concessional loans (lower interest rates, and longer-term loans) to local banks, which then provide loans to local farmers. A major aim of the project is to build greater coherence and complementarity of climate action in Africa.
3. Global Fund for Coral Reefs Investment Window: This project creates a private equity fund to encourage investments in the blue economy of 17 countries in Africa, the Asia-Pacific, Latin America and the Caribbean. It focuses on ecotourism and reducing overfishing and sewage pollution. It makes use of concessional finance from GCF to bring in other investors.
4. Coral Reef / Mangrove Insurance: This project provides insurance to communities for climate related damage to coral reefs. When there is damage, funds are released to communities to fix the damage and to avoid future damage. Could a similar approach be developed for the damages from human-wildlife conflict?

Juan Jose Dada, FMO - Dutch Development Bank, “Role of the Development Banks”

Mr. Dada began his presentation with an overview of FMO, a private sector-oriented bank that focuses on innovation. Their activities are done in alignment with the SDGs, and they recognize

that they need to consider nature in their work. FMO focuses on empowering local entrepreneurs in 3 sectors: agriculture, energy, and banking. These three sectors are key to economic, environmental and social progress. FMO works in emerging markets in 85 countries to support job creation and income generation.

The bank staff like to facilitate market creation. They help small businesses scale up by making them investible. To do this they use blended finance - philanthropic and public funds to catalyze private sector investment. The basic unit of activity is a single business, for example an ecotourism business that wants to grow by using sustainable practices. FMO helps them access a loan through a local bank.

FMO also works with green bonds, sustainability bonds and green guarantees. In addition, FMO manages several public funds including the Dutch Fund for Climate and Development, which partners with other organizations to finance climate adaptation and mitigation projects in developing countries.

### **Session: Innovative Finance for Wildlife Conservation**

#### Walid Al Saqqaf, Rebalance Earth, "Creating Markets for Biodiversity"

Mr. Al Saqqaf began his presentation with a discussion of interconnected problems that our society faces: climate change, biodiversity loss, poverty, and extinction of species. Rebalance Earth has proposed a holistic approach to these problems. They are focusing on keystone species, starting with forest elephants, which support ecosystem services. For carbon, the elephants do this through disturbance, browsing preferences and seed dispersal.

Rebalance Earth is creating a platform to allow investors to buy these ecosystem services, enrich biodiversity and support local communities. How? Buyers (corporations, households and others) pay for the credits at a rate of \$40 per day. If sensors report the presence of an elephant and then again 2 months later, the platform produces a carbon credit for 2 months and offers it for sale. The proceeds go to rangers, village support and a micro investment fund for women creating their own businesses. This is all tracked on a blockchain platform for traceability and transparency. A buyer sees a dashboard where they can buy the credits. Rebalance Earth creates tokens that show how the payments are supporting park ranger salaries, school supplies, micro-credit funds, etc. Their approach requires approval and cooperation with government, as well as underlying science. They plan to launch a pilot next year to show that corporations will buy the credits and then there is corresponding action on the ground.

#### Gaurav Gupta, UNEP, "Financing Wildlife Conservation and Recovery"

Unlocking financing for nature to address the biodiversity and climate crises, as well as improve the socioeconomic well-being of local communities, is one of the fundamental global challenges that needs to be addressed, according to Mr. Gupta. To meet biodiversity goals, we need

private sector financing because there is not enough public financing. Impact investing is fine at the project level, but for landscape level conservation, we need something else. The type of large-scale financing depends on several factors. A sovereign bond will work in a country like India, but not in countries with high debt. The latter requires a different type of bond.

The Tiger Recovery Bond is under development through conversations with governments and other organizations in Thailand, Malaysia, and Cambodia. The approach is to bring together stakeholders to identify threats and prepare a business plan for the cost of interventions (tourism, law enforcement, human-wildlife conflict management, forest management, etc.) and discuss how to get the verified carbon credits and biodiversity credits to generate needed revenue to cover those costs. Once the implementation of activities begins, the program sells credits and pays the revenue to the investors. One must start with donor funds like GEF or GCF for proof of concept and then attract other investors. The benefit of including multiple countries in a single bond is that if one country does not perform well, this is offset by performance of other countries. The anticipated potential tiger bond investment is \$750 million. There will be at least 4 tiger source sites and 9 million or more hectares of ecosystems protected and benefiting people and the economy. Potential institutional investors are pension funds, insurance funds and investment banks. Corporate interest may align with the forthcoming Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) framework.

Richard Diggle, WWF Namibia, “Namibia Wildlife Credits”

Mr. Diggle explained that Wildlife Credits is a program developed in partnership with the Namibian Association of Community Based Natural Resource Management Support Organizations (NACSO), the Ministry of Environment and Tourism, and local communities. It was developed as a means for paying wildlife stewards for verifiable biodiversity results. It is a mechanism that recognizes wildlife stewards for protecting biodiversity, a global public good. By paying for performance, it is a more efficient way of achieving conservation because it pays for the result, not the effort. This approach requires products, institutional structure, a business model, markets and technology. We are employing a blended finance approach that uses philanthropic and development funding to mobilize other investors.

Namibia’s conservancies have set aside 4 million hectares for conservation. If we can prove that the area is intact and wildlife is there, people will pay for that, but we need rigor in the product. For pricing there is a base payment to conservancies plus a bonus payment. We are using a proxy value for wildlife. For landscapes, this is hectareage and a biodiversity index and presence that can be used to calculate the bonus payment. The intuitional arrangement is essential – without legislation giving wildlife rights to conservancies, Wildlife Credits would not work. Technology also plays an important role including satellite images and camera traps to monitor conservation performance. SMART app is used to determine the level of management and patrolling on the ground. We are working with Deloitte Germany, which is designing an artificial intelligence (AI), performance dashboard for the wildlife products. We are also working with a company called *wadappt* to introduce biodiversity certificates, which are the next level of trusted reporting.



We began by piloting six wildlife sightings projects and one wildlife corridor. Over the past 5 years, we have paid out US\$30,000 per annum on average. We are now developing additional projects, the most significant one being Wildlife Landscapes, which could include securing the afore mentioned 4 million hectares of conservation areas. In summary, the Wildlife Credits vision is to change conservation financing so that it works for wildlife stewards and wildlife.

### **Breakout group discussions (2): how to become better business partners**

In the second breakout group session, the four groups were asked to discuss the following:

1. How would you rank the different conditions<sup>2</sup> discussed in section 6 of the [study](#) – which ones are more feasible and which are more challenging?
2. Are there any other conditions that you think would make wildlife conservation in your country more attractive to donors or the private sector?

### **Report back from breakout group discussions**

After discussing the different enabling conditions, each breakout group reported back. All had used a voting process to rank the conditions from most feasible to most challenging.

Increase awareness was viewed as very feasible by 3 of the four groups.

Involve local communities was seen as both feasible and very important. One group commented that local communities must be involved in order to have effective conservation.

Improve intersectoral coordination was reported to be either somewhat challenging or very challenging by 3 groups. It was also acknowledged to be very important. In the discussion, it was noted that difficulty of coordination can arise from siloed interests, competing concerns and differing cultures across sectors.

Change policies and regulations to accelerate private sector investments had a range of responses from easy to challenging. One group noted it takes a long time to change policy.

Enhance monitoring systems was seen as quite challenging by all the groups, but understood to be necessary to attract carbon finance and other outside finance.

Take advantage of catalytic international organizations was seen as quite challenging by 3 of the groups. One group said it depends on government policy.

Finally, increasing domestic finance was seen as very challenging by all the groups. Two groups said that governments generally assign a low priority to conservation. Protected areas are underfunded and underappreciated (so this requires sensitization).

---

<sup>2</sup> Briefly, the enabling conditions discussed in the study were: increase awareness of economic returns to conservation investment, involve local communities in project planning and implementation, improve intersectoral coordination, change policies and regulations to accelerate private investment, enhance monitoring systems for conservation and carbon, use catalytic international organizations, and increase domestic finance for conservation.

The groups did not have much time to discuss other enabling conditions, but two were mentioned: (1) involving more stakeholders in the awareness raising and pursuit of financing, and (2) greater use of public-private partnerships. Both were seen as feasible and important for facilitating greater investment in wildlife conservation.

### **Final Session: Way Forward and Closing**

In the final session, Mr. Kramer summarized and made some reflections on the two days of discussion. He said it was clear that there were many commonalities in the challenges faced by the different range states, although there was variation across states seemingly related to their elephant population size, amount of tourism, and geography. However, HEC emerged as the number one concern across the board. Communities are bearing much of the cost of elephant conservation and sharing few of the benefits. Other conservation challenges include maintaining and restoring habitat connectivity, continued attention to enforcement against illegal killing of elephants, strengthening of laws and regulations, capacity building of agencies, improved monitoring, storage of ivory stocks, and climate change. All of these challenges come with a sizable price tag, and cannot be fully addressed with existing budgets and periodic donor projects.

There was considerable interest in the different conservation finance mechanisms discussed at the meeting, especially payments for ecosystem services, carbon payments, and conservation trust funds. There was interest as well in wildlife bonds and debt-for-nature swaps, but these are likely to be less uniformly applicable across the range states.

There was some discussion during the meeting about other financial mechanisms beyond the 5 that were highlighted. One was impact investing, which is defined as investments made with the intention to generate positive social and environmental returns along with a financial return. For example, we heard about impact investing to grow the wildlife economy with private investments in ecotourism or other wildlife-based businesses. Another example mentioned about impact investing was development bank investment in agricultural enterprises near protected areas with requirements that they meet environmental and social conditions that contribute to the SDGs. There was also discussion about the use of biodiversity-relevant taxes, including a recent change in South Africa's income tax laws to incentivize private conservation areas.

During open comments at the end of the meeting several observations and suggestions were made by roundtable participants:

- We should bring in people from finance ministries to future meetings and discussions like this.
- It would be very helpful to cultivate high level attention to biodiversity finance among our leaders (as is already the case for climate finance).
- Working together across the multilateral environment agreements (MEAs) on biodiversity finance should be explored.

- Range states need technical support and a framework for implementing what we have discussed at this meeting. Coordination across agencies and with UNDP is important as well.
- Climate finance is now integrated into the planning processes in many countries. We need to do the same for biodiversity finance.

In her closing remarks, Ms. Higuero said she was impressed by, and expressed her gratitude for so many participants who joined the meeting in person and online. Once the Secretariat is given a solid mandate by the Conference of the Parties, her hope is to continue this work during the intersessional period, including the consideration for some projects to address urgent needs and long-term work on several finance approaches. She would like to see more funding go directly to countries and communities, and her hope is that some of the approaches discussed during the roundtable can help this and speed up the flow. Ms. Higuero stressed that we need to address the biodiversity conservation funding gap by broadening the funding base overall, and that we need to talk more with those in the world of finance about the financial importance of nature, and remind them that there are local costs with global benefits.

**CITES roundtable on sustainable wildlife finance – African elephant conservation**  
**27-28 October 2022, UNEP HQ (Gigiri), Conference Room 9**  
 Draft provisional agenda

**Day 1, 27 October 2022**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>
10:00-10:30	<b>Opening</b> Opening remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Ivonne Higuero, CITES Secretary-General</li> <li>- Lisa Farroway, Program Manager Global Wildlife Program, World Bank</li> </ul> Introduction to the roundtable: background, purpose, expected outcomes
10:30-11:30	<b>Setting the stage: Overview on the study of sustainable finance for wildlife conservation</b> Presentation by the CITES Secretariat followed by Q&A
11:30-11:45	Coffee break
11:45-13:00	<b>Needs and concerns for financing wildlife conservation</b> Presentations followed by Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Côte d'Ivoire</li> <li>- Congo</li> <li>- Kenya</li> <li>- Namibia</li> <li>- Zimbabwe</li> </ul>
13:00-15:00	Lunch break
15:00-16:15	<b>Examples of financing solutions on wildlife conservation</b> Presentations followed by Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elisson Wright, World Bank (Wildlife Conservation Bond)</li> <li>- Indekhwa Anangwe, African Wildlife Foundation (A-PACT Trust Fund)</li> </ul>
16:15-16:30	Coffee break
16:30-18:00	<b>Breakout group discussions (1):</b> Generating revenue streams for wildlife conservation

**Day 2, 28 October 2022**

<b>Time</b>	<b>Agenda item</b>
10:00-10:30	<b>Report back from the breakout group discussions</b>
10:30-11:30	<b>Examples of financing solutions in other areas relevant for environmental sustainability</b> Presentations followed by Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zhengzheng Qu, UNEP (Climate finance – biodiversity link)</li> <li>- Juan Jose Dada, FMO Dutch Development Bank (Role of the Development Banks)</li> </ul>
11:30-11:45	Coffee break
11:45-13:00	<b>Innovative finance for wildlife conservation</b> Presentations followed by Q&A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Richard Diggle, WWF Namibia (Namibia Wildlife Credits)</li> <li>- Walid Al Saqqaf, Rebalance Earth (Creating markets for biodiversity)</li> <li>- Gaurav Gupta, UNEP (Designing suitable biodiversity investments)</li> </ul>
13:00-15:00	Lunch break
15:00- 16:15	<b>Breakout group discussions (2):</b> how to become better business partners
16:15-16:30	Coffee break
16:30-17:00	<b>Report back from the breakout group discussions</b>
17:00-18:00	Discussion on the way forward and Closing by the CITES Secretary-General

**CITES roundtable on sustainable wildlife finance – African elephant conservation**  
**27-28 October 2022, UNEP HQ (Gigiri)**  
Participants list<sup>3</sup>

Country/Organisation	Designation (Ministry/Department)	Name
<b>African elephant range state Parties</b>		
Angola	Ministry of Environment, National Directorate of Biodiversity	Albertina NZUZI *
Benin	Ministère du cadre de Vie et du Développement Durable, Direction Générale des Eaux, Forêts et des Chasse	Amandine Gnido ASSOGBA* Josue KPETERE
Burkina Faso	Ministère de l'Environnement et des Ressources Halieutiques, Direction de la Faune et des Chasses	Idrissa OUEDRAOGO
Cameroon	Ministère des Forêts et de la Faune	Maha NGALIE Liliane Léonie Nadia NHIOMOG
Chad	Ministère de l'Environnement et de la Pêche, Direction de la Conservation de la Faune et des Aires Protégées	Theophile YAMTIBAYE Etienne BEMADJIM NGAKOUTOU
Congo	Ministère de l'Economie Forestière et du Développement Durable, Direction Générale de l'Economie Forestière (DGEF)	Jean Bosco NGANONGO Joseph MOUMBOUILOU
Côte d'Ivoire	Ministère des eaux et forêts, Direction de la faune et des ressources cynégétiques	Salimata KONE TONDOSSAMA Alex Romaric BAYE TEMOMIN
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Organe de Gestion CITES, Institut Congolais pour la Conservation de la Nature (ICCN)	Augustin NGUMBI AMURI
Equatorial Guinea	Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería, Bosques y Medio Ambiente	Francisca ENEME * Saturnino MENGA *
Ethiopia	Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority	Kumara WAKJIRA Arega Mekonnen ALI
Ghana	Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission	Bernard ASAMOAH-BOATENG Ali MAHAMA
Guinea	Direction Nationale des Forêts et de la Faune – DNFF	Nana KOULIBALY
Kenya	Kenya Wildlife Research and Training Institute  Kenya Wildlife Service  Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife	Patrick ODUOR OMONDI Shadrack NGENE* Solomon KYALO Idza DZILLA* Darius KAYAGO* Edwin WANYONYI* Monicah NJOGU*
Liberia	Conservation Department, Forestry Development Authority	Blamah Sando GOLL*
Mozambique	National Administration of the Conservation Areas / ANAC	Cornélio COELHO MIGUEL Emilio ZAVA
Namibia	Scientific Services, Ministry of Environment and Tourism	Elly HAMUNJELA Colgar SIKOPO

<sup>3</sup> "\*" denotes virtual participation. Attendance of some virtual participants are unconfirmed due to technical reasons.

Niger	Ministère de l'Environnement et du Développement Durable	Mahaman Sani MASSALATCHI * Hamidine SALEY *
Nigeria	Federal Department of Forestry	Timothy Daniel JOHN Nkeiruka Tessy IMOIE
Senegal	Direction des eaux, forêts, chasses et de la conservation des sols	Doudou SOW Gorgui SENE
South Africa	Department of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment  SANBI SANParks	Mpho Joel TJANE Olga KUMALO Jeanetta SELIER Dumisani DLAMINI * Luthando DZIBA * Candice EB * Sam FERREIRA *
Tanzania	Wildlife Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism	Fredrick LIGATE
Togo	Ministère de l'Environnement, du Développement Durable et de la Protection de la Nature	Kossi AGBODJI Akondo TCHEDRE
Uganda	Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife and Antiquities	Stephen OKIROR Rwetsiba AGGREY
Zimbabwe	Parks and Wildlife Management Authority	Patience GANDIWA Nobesuthu Adelaide NGWENYA
<b>Developed country Parties</b>		
Belgium	Directorate General Environment Service Multilateral and Strategic Affairs, Federal Public Service Health, Food Chain Safety and Environment	Miet VAN LOOY *
China	Wildlife Conservation Department of National Forestry and Grassland Administration	Ji Wei *
European Union	Directorate-General Environment	Agatha SOBIECH *
Germany	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection	Rudolf SPECHT *
Spain	Dirección General de Biodiversidad, Bosques y Desertificación	Jaime MUNOZ-IGUALADA *
United Kingdom	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra)	Elizabeth BIOTT * Dornford RUGG *
United States of America	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	Matthew LUIZZA *
<b>Speakers</b>		
African Wildlife Foundation		Philip MURUTHI Indekhwa ANANGWE Shawn ANDERSEN
World Bank	Environment, Natural Resources and Blue Economy Global Practice	Lisa FARROWAY * Elisson WRIGHT *
World Wildlife Fund Namibia		Richard DIGGLE Ingelore KATJINGISUA *
FMO Dutch Development Bank	Impact and ESG Department	Juan Jose DADA *
Rebalance Earth		Walid AL SAQQAF*
UNEP	Climate Finance Unit	Zhengzheng QU Gaurav GUPTA*

<b>Observers</b>		
UNEP	Ecosystems Division	Doreen ROBINSON Julian BLANC Johannes REFISCH
UNEP	Law Division (African Elephant Fund Secretariat)	Tita KORVENOJA Joyce RIUNGU
University of Antananarivo	School of Forestry	Sarobidy RAKATANARIVO *
University of Botswana	Okavango Research Institute	Moseki Ronald MOTSHOLAPHEKO
University of Cape Town	Department of Economics	Edwin MUCHAPONDWA *
African Leadership University	School of Wildlife Conservation	Sue SNYMAN *
<b>Organisers</b>		
CITES Secretariat		Ivonne HIGUERO Thea CARROLL Haruko OKUSU
	MIKE Secretariat	Tanya MCGREGOR Constant NDJASSI
Consultant for the CITES Secretariat	Duke University	Randall KRAMER