

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

---

Forty-second meeting of the Standing Committee  
Lisbon (Portugal), 28 September-1 October 1999

Issues relating to species

Elephants

MIKE SUB-GROUP REPORT

1. This document has been prepared by the CITES Secretariat on behalf of the MIKE Sub-group.
2. In relation to the MIKE system presented to the 41st meeting of the Standing Committee, the Committee agreed to “establish a subgroup of the Standing Committee (comprising Saudi Arabia [Chairman], Burkina Faso, South Africa, Thailand and United States of America) to oversee, on its behalf, the further development, refinement and implementation of MIKE, in collaboration with IUCN and the Secretariat and to report back to the next meeting of the Standing Committee”.
3. Two meetings of the Sub-group have taken place since the last Standing Committee meeting, on 27 May and 29 July 1999. The records of these meetings are attached for information (see Annex 1 and Annex 2).
4. The following actions have been progressed to further develop, refine and implement MIKE:
  - Development of a Memorandum of Understanding between the CITES Secretariat and IUCN to progress MIKE implementation
  - Establishment of a MIKE Central Co-ordination office and the appointment of staff
  - Establishment of a MIKE Pilot Phase in Central Africa
  - Visit by the CITES Secretariat to the seven countries of Central Africa to seek commitment to MIKE and to the Pilot Phase programme
  - Development of a MIKE Pilot Phase for SE Asia
  - Development of funding proposals to progress the Pilot Phases
  - Appointment of a consultant to develop a funding strategy for MIKE and to galvanize donor support for its implementation.
5. Further background on these actions is provided in the attached annexes.



**“MIKE” Sub-group  
CITES Standing Committee  
Record of the Teleconference Meeting  
27 May 1999**

**In attendance**

Dr Hany Tatwany (Chair – Saudi Arabia), Dr Schwann Tunikorn (Thailand), Mr Pieter Botha (South Africa), Mr Kenneth Stansell, Dr Sue Lieberman, Dr Richard Ruggiero (USA), Dr Jim Armstrong, Dr Mario Hernandez (Secretariat), Mr Nigel Hunter (Rapporteur), Mr Robin Sharp (CITES Senior Advisor).

**Introduction**

Dr Armstrong introduced Mr Hunter by explaining that the Chairman of the Standing Committee had offered Mr Hunter's free services for the purposes of providing rapporteur support to the Sub-group. Mr Robin Sharp was attending as the contracted CITES Advisor, to report on efforts to secure MIKE funding under agenda item 5.

**Agenda**

The agenda was accepted with the addition of “Further Meetings” and “Participation” under Any Other Business.

1. MIKE Sub-group Terms of Reference

Following discussion on the scope of work for the Sub-group, it was agreed that the Standing Committee had established the Sub-group to “Oversee, on the Standing Committee's behalf, further development, refinement and implementation of MIKE, in collaboration with IUCN and the Secretariat and to report back to the next meeting of the Standing Committee.”<sup>1</sup>

2. MIKE Pilot Phase Proposal in Central Africa

In introducing this item, Dr Armstrong stated that the Standing Committee in approving progress on the basis of Doc. SC.41.6.3 (see footnote) and authorizing a budget of CHF 140,000 from the Trust Fund, had placed an obligation for the Secretariat to come up with proposals for consideration of the Sub-group. After careful consideration, the Secretariat was recommending a “pilot phase” approach for Africa and Asia.

For Africa, the criteria for selection took into account the most technically difficult region and a desire to avoid any further marginalization. The Secretariat therefore identified Central Africa and, together with the Chairman of IUCN's African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG), organized a meeting in Libreville, Gabon, with relevant governments and NGOs in order to secure agreement on the pilot process and implementation partnerships. This meeting was particularly successful because it firstly addressed the perceived marginalization of the region in regard to the larger elephant conservation picture. Secondly it allowed the proper consideration of the the region's point of view and facilitated their input in regard to the proposal, design and implementation of MIKE. Thirdly it helped the improvement of communication between the AfESG and the range States of that region. The meeting therefore became the basis for the eight

---

<sup>1</sup> *Relevant to the above ToR, is the Standing Committee's related decision that “MIKE should be further developed and implementation started, in co-operation with IUCN and range States, on the basis of proposals in document Doc. SC.41.6.3”.*

“deliverables” included under the draft Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). Dr Armstrong went on to explain that whilst it had been agreed that the World Conservation Society (WCS) would provide the regional co-ordination for the pilot phase in Central Africa (with Dr John Hart as the elected co-ordinator), the financing of the first six months was being suggested under a single contract with IUCN. This arrangement was proposed because IUCN had been specifically identified by the Standing Committee in addition to the simpler administrative advantages for the Secretariat.

Questions asked of Dr Armstrong brought the following clarifications:

- Since the pilot phase would require 18 months in total and the current budget was only for six months, deliverable (i.e. output) No. 6 had been included in the MoU.
- Given the role of WCS and the importance of collaboration and local agreement and ownership, IUCN would move to sub-contract WCS to provide the outputs specified in the MoU for the pilot phase in Central Africa.

Following this clarification, the Sub-group agreed the following points:

- Any top-down process must be avoided and local collaboration and ownership fully promoted. Particular reference was made to the need to decentralize data management as much as possible in the MIKE process. This decentralization would be best achieved by enhancing the ability of different regions and/or sub-regions to develop methodologies in regard to data compilation, database capture, statistical modelling, data analysis and data interpretation. The challenge will be to develop such methodologies that suit country and regional needs and capacities, are useful and actionable, but maintain the ability to be harmonised and aggregated at the continental level.
- The Secretariat will provide the Sub-group with copies of the IUCN Sub-contract arrangements as well as the minutes of relevant meetings, starting with the minutes of the Libreville meeting as soon as they are ready.

Dr Armstrong concluded this item by informing the Sub-group that the Secretariat was sending its Regional Assistant for Francophone Africa (Dr Jonas Nagahuedi) on mission to Central Africa to discuss any or all relevant CITES issues, including commitment to MIKE and its planned implementation.

### 3. MIKE Central Co-ordination Function

Dr Armstrong highlighted the four points in this section of the MoU, including tasks (a)-(i) listed under point 3. He went on to stress the importance of getting the central co-ordination function on board and operational as soon as possible in readiness for other phases. A total of CHF 90,000 had been allocated to this component of the MoU. Subject to the Sub-group’s agreement, IUCN had headhunted two candidates for the consultant position, of which one would be used for the first two months and the second for the remaining four months. It was intended to base the central unit in Nairobi.

Questions asked of Dr Armstrong brought the following clarifications:

- During the first six month period, it would be essential to undertake a review and seek a longer term funding commitment for MIKE.
- Continued linkages between the Sub-group and the central unit would be achieved through participation in any further teleconferences/meetings, including providing progress reports, indications of the way forward, etc.

Following this clarification, the Sub-group agreed the following points:

- It was essential for the Sub-group to maintain an oversight of and inputs to the work being undertaken in regard to MoU.
- Task 3(g) should be amended to include specific references to tasks 3(d), (e) and (f). [*Amendment of MoU*].

#### 4. MIKE Pilot Proposal for SE Asia

Clearly, MIKE could not be regarded as operational globally unless Asia also had a pilot phase in place. Using similar criteria to Africa, the Secretariat suggested that a pilot phase for MIKE should be established. Potential collaborators for a pilot phase in SE Asia included WCS and FFI (UK).

Questions asked of Dr Armstrong brought the following clarifications:

- There was no Asia pilot phase in place, but given the importance of having one, the recommendation was that the next six months should be used to actively prepare for one by undertaking local meetings, seeking partners, obtaining Government commitments, preparing budgets, and defining technical issues. Furthermore the budget requirements should be in place by August, so that the essential extra funds could be actively sought.

Following this clarification, the Sub-group agreed the following points:

- It was important to have an Asian pilot phase and the Secretariat, through its contract with IUCN, should go ahead with preparing one through the necessary regional meetings, etc., as outlined in the MoU.

#### 5. Approval of the CITES/IUCN Contract (MoU)

Following the discussions in relation to agenda items 2, 3 and 4, the Chairman then asked for the Sub-group to consider approving the MoU. The Sub-group fully endorsed the MoU, subject to the amendments agreed and flagged under agenda items 2 and 3. Furthermore the Sub-group requested the Secretariat to move promptly in implementing this decision. In addition the Sub-group wanted the decision to be supported by a full record of the meeting being circulated to all members of the Sub-group.

#### 6. Funding for MIKE

Mr Sharp reported that he and the Secretary General had followed up earlier meetings with the EC, with a meeting the previous week with DGVIII and DGXI. The meeting was successful in that, whilst there was no available funding for the current financial year, the EC was very willing to receive an application for funding MIKE from 2000 onward for a six year period. If, as recommended, this application sought a 25% contribution then the EC could well provide a total of USD 3.75 million. It would therefore be very important for a full application to be submitted to the EC before October 1999. Such application should take into account any costing refinements arising from implementation experience over the next few months.

Apart from this EC initiative, the future strategy would include approaches to the World Bank and the GEF. Other donors who had indicated interest in contributing to MIKE at SC41, included the United States of America and Japan. Mr Stansell confirmed the United States of America's continuing support for funding the further development and implementation of MIKE. However he emphasized that the Fish and Wildlife Service preferred to make most or all of its contributions to the MIKE start-up process from the African and Asian Elephant Conservation Funds through organizations involved in carrying out the field work. The USFWS objective was to help build capacity in the field.

Following further discussion, the Sub-group agreed the following points:

- There was a need for a fairly detailed technical breakdown of the budget, since there would be donors willing to support some components.
- The Secretariat, utilising Mr Sharp's contract, will develop a strategy for obtaining the future long term funding security of MIKE. Furthermore this document will be made available to members of the Sub-group 2 weeks in advance of the next teleconference meeting (i.e. by 15 July 1999).

#### 7. Any Other Business

### Further meetings

Following discussion about future meetings, the Sub-group agreed the following:

- There would be a teleconference meeting on Thursday 29 July at 14h00s (Swiss time). This would tie in well with MoU implementation schedules and allow the “six weeks before SC42” requirement for document distribution to be satisfied.
- There should be an actual meeting of the Sub-group on the weekend immediately preceding SC42. The Secretariat was requested to look at organizing such a meeting, which would avoid clashing with the Strategic Plan Working Group and the Finances Working Group meetings also scheduled immediately prior to SC42.

### Participation

Dr Armstrong requested consideration of participation by the Central Co-ordinator, by Pilot Phase Co-ordinators, by ESG Chairs and by IUCN personnel. After discussion the Sub-group agreed the following:

- There needed to be a balance between proper representation and avoiding logistical problems due to increasing the size of the Sub-group. Inclusion should therefore be based on an “If need be” requirement.

### Burkina Faso

The Sub-group regretted the absence of a representative from the government of Burkina Faso. Mr Stansell very kindly offered to seek the assistance of the USA Embassy in Burkina Faso to facilitate the involvement of Burkina Faso at the next meeting of the Sub-group.

## 8. Conclusion

The Sub-group concluded the meeting by expressing their thanks to the Secretariat for moving the MIKE process forwards and facilitating the possibility of making a positive progress report to the next Standing Committee.

## **Action Items**

1. The Secretariat will provide the Sub-group with copies of the IUCN Sub-contract arrangements as well as the minutes of relevant meetings, starting with the minutes of the Libreville meeting as soon as they are ready. **[Secretariat]**
2. Task 3(g) in the MoU should be amended to include specific references to tasks 3(d), (e) and (f). **[Secretariat]**
3. Secretariat , through its contract with IUCN, should go ahead with preparing the Asian Pilot Phase through the necessary regional meetings, etc., as outlined in the MoU. **[Secretariat]**
4. Secretariat to move promptly in implementing the MoU. **[Secretariat]**
5. A full record of the meeting to be circulated to all members of the Sub-group. **[Rapporteur]**
6. Provision of a fairly detailed technical breakdown of the budget. **[Secretariat]**
7. The Secretariat, utilising Mr Sharp's contract, will provide a strategy for obtaining the future long term funding security of MIKE. Furthermore, this document will be made available 2 weeks in advance of the next Teleconference meeting (i.e. by 15 July 1999). **[Mr Sharp]**
8. There would be a teleconference meeting on Thursday 29 July at 1400hrs (Swiss time). **[Secretariat]**
9. There should be an actual meeting of the Sub-group on the weekend immediately preceding SC42. **[Secretariat]**
10. Inclusion in future meetings of the Sub-group should be based on an "If need be" requirement. **[Secretariat]**
11. Seek the assistance of the USA Embassy in Burkina Faso. **[Mr Stansell]**

## MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

This Memorandum of Understanding is concluded between the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (administered by the United Nations Environment Programme - UNEP) herein referred to as the "CITES Secretariat" and the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, herein referred to as "IUCN".

### **Background**

Resolution Conf. 10.10 details how the CITES Secretariat, in consultation with IUCN/SSC and TRAFFIC International, is to establish a system through which the impact of CITES decisions, taken at COP10, with respect to elephants and trade in elephant specimens can be measured.

This matter was discussed in detail at the 41st meeting of the CITES Standing Committee, held in Geneva in February 1999. At that meeting, the Secretariat was asked to give a very high priority to progressing MIKE (the Monitoring of Illegal Killing of Elephants project). The Standing Committee agreed to establish a new budget line in the CITES Trust Fund (namely, 'Implementing Elephant Decisions') so that the necessary funds required would be available to facilitate the project. The amount of CHF 140,000 was allocated to the project.

### **Terms of Reference**

IUCN agrees to establish a Central Co-ordination Function for MIKE and to facilitate the implementation of a Pilot Phase in Central Africa:

#### Regarding the establishment of a Central Co-ordination Function

1. Conduct preparatory meetings to establish a sub-regional pilot phase in both Asia and Africa (by 30<sup>th</sup> November, 1999).
2. Establish a base of operations to facilitate the implementation of MIKE, preferably in Asia or Africa (June, 1999).
3. Recruit a consultant to act as central co-ordinator for the further development and implementation of MIKE in both Asia and Africa (June, 1999).

#### Tasks:

- a) Initiate a pilot phase in one sub-region of Asia (by 30<sup>th</sup> November, 1999).
- b) Liaise with the CITES Elephant Co-ordinator on the preparation of funding proposals for MIKE (on-going).
- c) Liaise with and provide direction and administrative support to the two pilot phase co-ordinators in the selected Asian and African sub-regions (on-going).
- d) Co-ordinate the development of standardised data collection forms and protocols in French and English (30 November 1999).
- e) Co-ordinate the development of standardised implementation training materials in French and English (30 November 1999).
- f) Establish protocols for the centralisation of core data collected and compiled in the six sub-regions (30 November, 1999).
- g) Participate in co-ordination meetings and discussions with the CITES Secretariat and the MIKE working group of the CITES Standing Committee, particularly in the development of the protocols detailed in points 3d), 3e) and 3f) of this MOU (on-going).
- h) Liaise with the Chairs of the African and Asian Elephant Specialist Groups on matters pertaining to the implementation of MIKE (on-going).

- i) Liaise with TRAFFIC International and the CITES Secretariat on the parallel development of MIKE and ETIS (on-going).
4. Present a report on suggested follow-up steps for the continued implementation of MIKE (30 November 1999).

Regarding the Pilot Phase in Central Africa

MIKE will become operational through the initiation of an 18-month pilot phase in Central Africa (1 June, 1999 to 30 November, 2000).

IUCN will provide the following deliverables in French and English (hardcopy and disk copy) by the specified dates:

1. Selection and description of the pilot study sites (1 June, 1999)
2. Written verification of CITES/OMA official approval of pilot phase by the pilot phase countries (1 July, 1999)
3. Description of agreed methods and analysis (1 July, 1999)
4. Development of reporting forms and protocols for data collection (1 July, 1999)
5. Development of support materials for a MIKE implementation training module in the pilot sites (end of August, 1999)
6. Develop a proposal and budget for the completion of the pilot phase for the period 1 June 1999 to 31 July 2000 (by mid-July, 1999).
7. Conduct first training session/s for data collection officers in the pilot sites (September to November, 1999).
8. Provide an analysis of the capacity building initiatives and document the lessons learnt (by 30 November, 1999).

**Financial**

A maximum amount of CHF 140,000 shall be paid by the CITES Secretariat to IUCN under this agreement. Consultancy fees to the benefit of IUCN shall be payable by the CITES Secretariat for the work specified in the numbered paragraphs of this Memorandum.

The allocation of funds between the various activities will be as follows:

Central Co-ordination Function	CHF	90,000
Pilot Phase in Central Africa	CHF	<u>50,000</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>CHF</b>	<b>140,000</b>

The schedule of payments shall be as follows:

- Some 40% of the total amount will be paid upon signature of this Memorandum of Understanding by the two parties.
- Another 40% of the total amount shall be due when IUCN initiates its sub-contract for the Pilot Phase in Central Africa.

- The remaining 20% of the total amount will be paid upon completion of the numbered paragraphs of this MOU and upon the receipt of a report, satisfactory to the CITES Secretariat, detailing the completion of the project and a financial statement detailing the costs of the various activities performed and certified by an authorised official of IUCN.

At the completion of IUCN's financial period, IUCN will submit to the CITES Secretariat a copy of their audited accounts for this project.

### **Arbitration**

Any dispute arising out of or in connection with this memorandum shall, if attempts at settlement by negotiation have failed, be submitted to arbitration and limited to the United Nations Environment Programme in Nairobi by a single arbitrator agreed upon by both parties. Should the parties be unable to agree on a single arbitrator within thirty days of their request of arbitration, then each party shall proceed to appoint one arbitrator and the two arbitrators thus appointed shall agree on a third. Failing such agreement, either party may request the appointment of a third arbitrator by the President of the United Nations Administrative Tribunal. The arbitrator shall rule on the costs, which may be divided between the parties. The decision rendered in the arbitration shall constitute the final adjudication of the dispute.

Signed, in two copies, on behalf of

the CITES Secretariat:

IUCN:

Mr Willem Wijnstekers  
Secretary General

Maritta R. von Bieberstein Koch-Weser

Date: 20 May 1999

Date: 8 May 1999

**“MIKE” Sub-group  
CITES Standing Committee  
Record of the Teleconference Meeting  
29 July 1999**

**In attendance**

Dr Hany Tatwany (Chair – Saudi Arabia), Dr Kanjana Nitaya, Mr Charles Evans (Thailand), Mr Pieter Botha (South Africa), Dr Susan Lieberman, Dr Richard Ruggiero (United States of America), Dr Jim Armstrong (Secretariat), Mr Nigel Hunter (Rapporteur), Dr Holly Dublin (Chairman, AfESG), Mr Robin Sharp (CITES Senior Advisor). (Note: all members of the Sub-group were thus participating, except for Burkina Faso, regarding which, see below).

**Agenda**

The agenda was accepted with no items for Any Other Business.

**1. Follow-up on teleconference of 27 May 1999**

– Minutes of the Libreville meeting

Dr Armstrong confirmed that the minutes had been sent to the Sub-group, though there had been some delay in dispatching them, owing to the need to have them translated. The minutes provide useful background to the Central Africa pilot phase. Dr Armstrong also confirmed that he would continue to provide further minutes and documents arising from John Hart's co-ordination work in Central Africa.

– Modify and implement CITES/IUCN MoU

The modifications agreed by the last teleconference meeting had been incorporated, thus enabling the contract to be signed and in effect by the beginning of July.

– Report of 1<sup>st</sup> teleconference meeting

Mr Hunter had been required to provide a full record of the meeting and to circulate it to all members of the Sub-group. It was agreed that this had been done satisfactorily and the Sub-group was pleased with the speed of delivery. Dr Lieberman indicated that the United States would like to provide a supplement to accompany the record. This was welcomed, with a request that the supplement be sent to the Secretariat by e-mail to [edwige.graser@unep.ch](mailto:edwige.graser@unep.ch) as soon as possible<sup>1</sup>. Similarly this procedure was welcome in regard to the second teleconference meeting.

– Breakdown of the CITES/IUCN budget

Dr Armstrong confirmed that this had been sent to the Sub-group. However he drew attention to the fact that the breakdowns at this stage were notional, but there would eventually be an audited statement with the breakdowns.

– Sub-Group meeting at SC42

---

<sup>1</sup> This was accomplished on 30 July 1999.

The Secretariat had organized a morning session on the Sunday immediately prior to the SC42 meeting in Lisbon. It was agreed that the minutes of that meeting would be provided to the Standing Committee as an attachment to the Sub-group Chairman's presentation. Dr Armstrong also confirmed that it was unlikely that any IUCN representative would be required to attend the meeting in Lisbon.

– United States Embassy/Burkina Faso

Dr Ruggiero reported on the efforts that had been made to contact Mr Kaolo Konate through the United States Embassy. Unfortunately communication problems with Burkina Faso appear to be systematic at the country level, even in reaching the United States Embassy. The only reasonable link would appear to be the telephone link with the Embassy, and it was suggested that Mr Konate be invited to participate in future teleconferences from within the Embassy. Dr Armstrong confirmed that the Secretariat had totally failed to make contact despite repeated efforts via telephone, fax, e-mail and courier. It was agreed that the only solution would be to pursue the matter with the representative of Burkina Faso in Lisbon.

## 2. IUCN Progress Report

– Central Co-ordination Function

Dr Dublin reported that this unit had now been established at the IUCN office in Nairobi, with two of the three consultants based and functioning from that office. The third consultant, i.e. John Hart, was continually travelling as part of his responsibilities for the pilot phase in Central Africa. Dr Dublin did emphasize that the unit's location and composition was not necessarily a long-term situation or solution. She went on to point out that the three different roles of the current consultants meant that she was providing the technical and overall co-ordination with Dr Mainka (IUCN HQ) providing the administrative co-ordination back up. Dr Dublin was hopeful that a "true" co-ordinator would be provided under the next phase of MIKE's development.

– Pilot Phase in Central Africa

Dr Dublin reported that this was now moving ahead at considerable speed and that it was expected that by 31 July, the following would be delivered:

- an outline of the pilot phase structure and programme, with terms of reference;
- full drafts of the field forms required, with instructions for their use;
- a draft budget for completion of the pilot phase (up to November 2000); and
- an outline of the scheduled two-month training component.

She went on to report that the subset of MIKE sites (five to six) for the pilot phase were now agreed in Gabon, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Congo. More details can be found in the minutes of the Libreville meeting. In addition, extra funds were forthcoming from the USAID CARPE to support the Steering Group's work and from the Dutch Government to assist with the Central Africa MIKE training initiative (in Nouabalé-Ndoki, which is planned for September to November), thus facilitating additional site staff to participate. It was also intended that the Steering Group should visit the training site in order to maintain and encourage the Group's enthusiasm.

Dr Dublin continued the report by signalling the growing momentum and enthusiasm that the MIKE Central Africa pilot phase and John Hart's efforts were creating, such that MIKE was becoming a rallying point in the region. Dr Ruggiero noted that in addition to the countries already mentioned, Chad had also been very enthusiastic. He also noted that major credit should go to John Hart for this effort, while also crediting Lee White of Wildlife Conservation Society for Central Africa training efforts. The Sub-group commended the efforts of John Hart and Holly Dublin and requested Holly Dublin to send any material emanating from John

Hart to the Secretariat as and when possible, so that the progress could be well reflected in the report to SC 42. All agreed that the excellent progress in Central Africa should be highlighted in the report to SC42.

– Proposed Pilot for Asia

Dr Dublin indicated IUCN and the Asian Elephant Specialist Group support for the choice of S.E. Asia for the pilot phase, consisting of Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand and Viet Nam, as the proposed pilot region. There were difficulties with communication, particularly with Government contacts in Cambodia, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam (noting that Lao People's Democratic Republic is a non-party to CITES). The consultant employed to oversee the S.E. Asian work was Phil McGowan, who had strong regional experience. Obviously the Asian pilot was much less advanced than the pilot in Africa and the main emphasis at present was to get the region up to the "Libreville" meeting stage.

Phil McGowan will therefore be spending the next three weeks in the region, starting with the Chairman of AsESG in order to get a better overview of:

- elephant problems (e.g. human conflict may be a higher priority than ivory pressure);
- technical insights (particularly as there will be a need to adjust from the Africa forest context. In this regard Phil McGowan will have drafts of the African survey protocols so as to facilitate discussion); and
- feedback from a recent visit by AsESG colleagues to Lao People's Democratic Republic.

His visit will then proceed to Thailand (probably 2/3 August) followed by the other six relevant states. For those wishing to communicate directly with the consultant re his visits, etc., his email address is mail@iucn.unom.org attn: Phil McGowan.

In undertaking this mission, the major objective was to try and determine who were the relevant players for a Libreville-type October meeting. This mission is complicated by the fact that the agencies responsible for potential MIKE sites are often not the CITES Management Authority. Furthermore, one of the States concerned (Lao People's Democratic Republic) is not party to CITES, making any leverage less easy. The aim was to have as inclusive a model as possible for the meeting, but early indications suggested that Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia would be keen, that Lao People's Democratic Republic and Viet Nam might be less forthcoming and that Cambodia and Myanmar might be less interested. However the target was to have three to four primary movers.

Phil McGowan was in contact with FFI, WCS and WWF in order to gain their interest and support. In addition, he was requesting a supporting Secretariat mission similar to that recently undertaken in Central Africa. Consultation with Dr Armstrong had led to the request that Phil McGowan should advise whether this was best done before or after the October meeting. The consultant does keep in regular contact with and provides good feedback to Dr Dublin. She then concluded this part of her report by indicating the importance of giving consideration to the funding the Asian pilot.

Dr Armstrong responded by underlining that the funds provided to date were merely for helping with setting up the pilot and that there were no funds as yet for undertaking the pilot phase. It would therefore be important to have a proposal that could be submitted to potential donors, such as Japan and the United States. In this regard, it was important to keep in view donor financial year arrangements (e.g. for the United States, the fiscal year-end is 30 September). A proposal is needed therefore by late August. Under the MoU agreement, IUCN is required under 3(b) to liaise with the CITES Elephant Co-ordinator on the preparation of funding proposals for MIKE (ongoing). However it was recognized that drafting was not part of Phil McGowan's personal terms of reference. Nevertheless he was willing to provide as much helpful information as possible and had started a dialogue with

Robin Sharp. However, in order to facilitate the preparation of a formal proposal, the Sub-group agreed that information submitted to IUCN HQ should be copied simultaneously to Dr Armstrong. Dr Lieberman noted, however, that many donors will fund projects on a bilateral basis, and such project proposals should go directly to donors and not exclusively through the CITES Secretariat (see discussion under Funding Strategy).

– Other issues

Dr Dublin alerted the Sub-group to the important issue of data ownership at various stages (e.g. raw, processed, analysed) and various levels (e.g. national, regional and continental). She highlighted that the nations participating in the Central African pilot phase were raising the question and that there was a need to have the matter resolved before data started being collected. The Sub-group agreed that this was a very important issue and highlighted that potential donors had also raised the matter. It was also agreed that if the matter were not addressed, then the participation in and commitment to the MIKE system could be seriously jeopardized. This pertains to both ownership of the data itself, as well as interpretation of the data, at the various levels.

The Sub-group then identified the following key issues, *inter alia*:

- Who are the owners of the data
- Who needs the data and who wants the data
- Who does the sub-regional analysis
- Will national governments trust regional collation
- Do governments have retrieval rights
- What comfort levels can be provided in data interpretation
- Who will give out the data and or analysis
- What external scrutiny will be applied
- What intellectual property rights issues are involved
- What are the CITES convention implications
- Who is responsible for inputs and outputs
- Is there equity in the giving and taking process
- How will this affect national capacities, management and standardization.

The Sub-group discussed the issue extensively, and went on to agree that, notwithstanding the contribution that the MoU requirement for IUCN to produce a protocol under 3(f) by November 1999 would make, the issues were sufficiently important to merit their inclusion as an agenda item at the SC 42 pre-meeting. It was highlighted that both range countries and potential donors must be comfortable with their collective understanding of this issue.

### **3. Secretariat's mission to Central Africa**

Dr Armstrong reported that Dr Jonas Nagahuedi of the CITES Secretariat had visited each of the seven countries in Central Africa as a support process, following the Libreville meeting, in order to explain further and seek commitment to the MIKE pilot phase. Strong support and keenness to participate were noted. It was disappointing, however that many of the seven felt that they did not know much about CITES more generally, and particularly complained of lack of documentation, despite evidence that documents are dispatched and received. This message reaffirms the need for capacity development and the need to have physical follow-ups to overcome the document communication problems. Therefore the Secretariat mission was appreciated, and something similar is scheduled for S.E. Asia. Such missions, however, are not easy to put in place, as they have to come under the diplomatic process, whereby destination countries have to provide in writing to the Secretariat a willingness to welcome and to participate in the visit.

### **4. Funding Strategy**

Mr Sharp clarified that the second draft replaced the original document, and apologized for the replacement draft leaving little or no time for the Sub-group to consider it in advance of the meeting. Given that the written part was background to the three tables, Mr Sharp proposed to concentrate on the latter. He began by explaining that Table A provided the overall costs over six years broken down into annual costs and “one-off” costs. Most of the table was self-explanatory, but component A, i.e. the survey costs, had been reflected on an annual basis, notwithstanding that the surveys took place once every two years. Some of the cost figures in the table could yet be improved by feedback from the pilot phase, e.g. the training component. It was also agreed that the one-off cost for recruitment needed revisiting since it seemed to be ill defined and excessive for the Nairobi office, but no setting-up costs were provided for elsewhere.

Mr Sharp went on to explain that potential donors had reacted by suggesting that funding for the survey element was likely to be achieved in a way different from the other components. Table B, therefore, refers to the three components likely to get central donor support, and indeed identified three such donors, who had already indicated possible contributions within the percentage ceilings provided in the table. Whereas Table C concentrates on the Survey element. This latter table recognized that some funding was possible by national departments’ own “in-house” contributions ranging between 10 and 55%, thus leaving a net requirement. The table also recognized the greater opportunity for bilateral donors and NGOs to support the survey activities, and this was reflected in the possible contributors’ section of the table. Mr Sharp concluded by summarizing that the strategy was essentially a two-pronged approach, split into a central thrust and a country-by-country thrust. However more information was needed before the document could be produced to donors without any reservations.

Subsequent discussion of the presentation lead to the following conclusions:

- Dr Lieberman and Dr Ruggiero noted that not all funding would be provided directly to IUCN by donors, including the United States. Rather, significant funding would indeed be provided by donors on a bilateral basis. Given that MIKE and MIKE-related projects will be funded in several different ways, it was important to have a central recognition process and clearinghouse, with a proper mechanism for attributing and acknowledging contributions. Done properly, a table indicating who was supporting which element would encourage others to contribute. This mechanism was suggested to be particularly important for NGO contributions.
- Dr Lieberman also noted that since there should be many other donors, the “other” column should be expanded. Donors will support individual bilateral projects, and some recognition should be made of their contributions to the effort. Furthermore, NGOs doing work in the field will be making significant in-kind contributions that necessitate some recognition. She also requested that specific outreach be made to the government of Japan, as it has a unique role vis-à-vis the ivory trade and therefore a unique obligation to support this effort
- The United States also raised concerns about splitting the United States contribution into USFWS and USAID, and asked that they be combined. Mr Sharp clarified that USAID had been distinguished from USFWS, because USAID was restricted to bilateral and regional approaches. Nevertheless it was recognized that the United States was free to have its own internal discussions on the United States Government contributions and allocations.
- Dr Lieberman and Dr Ruggiero went on to raise concerns about the columns in the finance strategy that referred to potential contributions from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; the figures were premature and misrepresented the nature of United States commitments and potential commitments<sup>1</sup>. In particular, FWS made it clear that it had not made any final decisions on the funding of specific components such as the MIKE central office. For

---

<sup>1</sup> *In a subsequent memorandum, the United States asked that the finance strategy not be circulated further, since the document does currently contain erroneous information.*

example, the Fish and Wildlife Service, through its African Elephant and Asian Elephant Conservation Funds, preferred to make most or all of their contributions to the MIKE start-up period in collaboration with the organizations that are carrying out the field work. FWS preference therefore was to support field work bilaterally under the MIKE programme, through the African and Asian Elephant Conservation Funds, given the existing assistance already provided to AfESG, the African Elephant database and other core activities that are supportive of the MIKE initiative. FWS would therefore be having its own further internal discussions about their contributions before it could agree that levels could be formally indicated in any CITES documents.

- Given that training is fundamental to capacity building and that donors see such capacity development as the local ability to provide solutions to problems as part of the “bigger picture”, then this component was also likely to attract contributions from sources other than the three identified so far. It would be important therefore to decide whether the strategic approach should be to define training as a component specifically dealing with MIKE modules or as a component that deals generally with techniques, etc. that have a wider application than the needs of MIKE. It would also be important to explore the opportunity for such training at a sub-regional level to be undertaken through training college curriculum and modules. The Central African pilot experience should help convince donors that it was a serious capacity-building exercise.
- Negotiations by countries with their own bilateral donors was to be encouraged, and could start whenever appropriate, bearing in mind the need to confirm sites and benefit from figure revisions arising from the pilot process. It would be useful however to keep the Secretariat informed on such negotiations, in order to avoid duplication and to maintain an overall picture. It was further clarified that the GEF was not a potential bilateral donor for those countries that were not Parties to the CBD.
- Dr Dublin raised a concern about the timing of getting funds in relation to the Central Co-ordination Unit, whose funds from the CITES Trust Fund run out in November. Dr Armstrong suggested that dependency on volunteer work should be avoided and the Sub-group should recommend to the Standing Committee that bridging funds should be made available from the Trust Fund. The Sub-group agreed that the issue could be raised at the Standing Committee. The Chairman, however, stressed the importance of being able to underpin any such recommendation with some guarantee that further funds were forthcoming.
- On the question of forthcoming funds, Mr Sharp confirmed that EC funds would not be available until 2000. He agreed that some fundamental work was still required with the World Bank and GEF. Other country donors, such as Japan, need now to be actively approached, as do several NGOs. The Sub-group agreed, in light of the information provided by Dr Dublin regarding other global initiatives (e.g. World Heritage), that an approach to the Turner Foundation should be revisited. However any such approach should come from the Chairman of the Standing Committee, using the pilot phase as a concrete example. It was also suggested by Dr Dublin, and agreed, that private donors, such as Microsoft, should be seriously considered.

## 5. Sub-group report to SC42

Dr Armstrong introduced document Doc. SC.42.10.2.2 , by explaining that the document provides a background, highlighted developments, but relied on providing the detailed information in a series of annexes. The annexes did not yet include the Funding Strategy, as it had not undergone any Sub-group scrutiny. It was agreed<sup>1</sup> that the document should be attached as an annex to the report, but that Annex 1 of the paper should not be included. Otherwise it was agreed that document Doc. SC42.10.2.2 should be the basis of the report of the Sub-group.

---

<sup>1</sup> *The United States have subsequently requested that the annex should not include any erroneous information re contribution figures and percentages in the tables.*

More generally, the Chairman expressed his wish that the report should include as much information as possible. This was fully supported and led to a discussion on how MIKE information could be fed into the public domain, as this was the key to preventing any potential misinformation or wrongly-applied criticism. Dr Armstrong informed the Sub-group of the decision to put all documents on the CITES Web-site, and this was welcomed. In addition, it was agreed that the Sub-group, since it reported to the Standing Committee, should seek SC support for putting the MIKE information into the public domain as much as possible. This should be accompanied by a Notification to the Parties letting them know such information was available by request or through the Web-site.

## **6. Next meeting**

Dr Armstrong reported that invitations to attend the next meeting on Sunday 26 September in Portugal would be sent out. It was noted that the agenda would include an item on data handling and ownership, but other agenda items were welcome. The Rapporteur would make a report of the meeting available the following Monday. Finally Dr Dublin, given that IUCN was unlikely to be represented, was requested to help with the submission of a written text a week before the meeting.

## **7. Conclusion**

The Chairman concluded the meeting by expressing his thanks to all those involved and committed to progressing MIKE and that he was still confident of making a really positive progress report to the next Standing Committee. The Deputy Secretary General endorsed these words.

## **Action Items**

1. The Secretariat will continue to provide the Sub-group with minutes of relevant meetings and documents, etc. **[Secretariat]**
2. The United States would send comments on the summary record of the meeting of 27 May 1999 to the Secretariat as soon as possible. **[Dr Lieberman]**
3. The Secretariat will liaise with the Burkina Faso representative in Lisbon over the communication issue. **[Dr Armstrong]**
4. Dr Dublin to send any material developed by Dr John Hart to the Secretariat as and when possible. **[Dr Dublin]**
5. Phil McGowan to advise, based on his discussions with governments in Asia, whether Secretariat support mission should be done before or after the October meeting. **[P. McGowan/Dr Dublin]**
6. Budget and other information should be submitted to the Secretariat simultaneously to that submitted to IUCN HQ. This is particularly important re the preparation of a funding proposal for the Asian pilot phase. **[IUCN/Secretariat]**
7. Data handling (ownership, interpretation, etc.) to be included on the agenda of the next Sub-group meeting. **[Secretariat]**
8. Revisit the "recruitment costs". **[Secretariat/IUCN]**
9. Adopt a wider and more flexible approach to the training component under the funding strategy. **[Secretariat/IUCN]**
10. Recommend to the Standing Committee a bridging arrangement from the Trust fund for the Central Co-ordinating Unit. **[Chairman, Sub-group]**
11. Develop and maintain a central recognition process and clearinghouse, with a proper mechanism for attributing and acknowledging contributions to all MIKE and MIKE-related projects. **[Secretariat]**
12. Accelerate and expand the seeking of funds for MIKE and MIKE-related projects. **[Secretariat/Standing Committee/Parties]**
13. Seek SC support for putting the MIKE information into the public domain. **[Chairman, Sub-group]**
14. Send invitations to attend the next meeting on Sunday 26 September in Portugal. **[Secretariat]**
15. Dr Dublin to help with the submission of a written text a week before the meeting. **[Dr Dublin]**



## **MONITORING THE ILLEGAL KILLING OF ELEPHANTS (MIKE)**

### **FUNDING STRATEGY**

#### Introduction

1. This paper takes account of a number of valuable clarifications on the financial aspects of MIKE which have recently been obtained through the MIKE Co-ordinator consultants working in Nairobi. These enable the annual costs of the various components of MIKE to be set out with less uncertainty, though important questions remain about some areas. With a clearer picture of the costs it is possible to indicate more schematically the requirement from donors and the likelihood of their support for different aspects of the project.

#### Costs of MIKE

2. The main clarification now obtained is that the table of survey costs in Annex 5 of the MIKE document shows the full costs of each site survey (as estimated by the consultants, TACK) which is to take place once every two years. These are not, therefore, annual costs, as previously thought. For budgeting and management purposes we are assuming that half the surveys would occur in any one year. The other clarifications relate to the cost and methodology for aerial total and sample surveys and different costings for professional (i.e. bought-in) surveys and those in which wildlife department staff play a role. The costs of aerial surveys have been reworked on this basis and estimated contributions from wildlife departments shown separately. The cost and sampling intensity of forest surveys has still to be established.
3. Subject to these points, Table A, annexed, shows the current estimate of costs for each of the main components of MIKE year by year for the first 6 years, an estimated requirement of USD 11,379,000. Costs vary considerably from year to year.

#### Targetting donors for different components of MIKE

4. A number of valuable meetings have already been held with key donors such as the GEF, the EC, USFWS and USAID. These have indicated the possible levels of support and the elements in which these donors are interested, as well as the procedures to be followed. As a result of the discussions it seems best to consider MIKE in two main parts from a donor perspective. These are:
  - a) the Central Unit, sub-regional and site co-ordinators and the capacity building/training effort that will link these elements together: appropriate for big international donors such as the GEF, EC and significant bilateral donors;
  - b) the in-country surveys: appropriate for the local delegations of EC, USAID, other bilateral donors and NGOs, who may give support 'in kind' (NB. These donors may also support capacity building efforts).
5. Accordingly Tables B and C, annexed, break down the costs into these two elements and show possible donor contributions from the sources identified, against these costs.
6. Commenting first on Table B, the central and staff/capacity building elements, we have a good assurance from the EC desk officer concerned in DGVIII that an application in the appropriate format, submitted by 31 October, will be favourably received and could cover 25% of total costs. In Table B I we suggest that the EC might meet 30% of these central costs, while allocating 20%

of Table C costs to them, thus approximating to 25% overall. The 15% of central costs allocated to bilateral donors produces figures which range from USD170,000 to 250,000 per year, which it should be possible to find. We understand that USFWS, for example, is committed to supporting MIKE; provided other donors do likewise.

7. The 55% allocated to the World Bank/GEF is well within the percentage they require for co-funding and, apart from year 1, the cash figures are somewhat lower than previously envisaged. However, we do not yet have any 'moral' commitment from the Bank at desk or higher level, only an indication that MIKE might just about get over the various technical hurdles which GEF funding presents. Since MIKE will not work without a significant contribution from the Bank/GEF, engaging successfully with this constituency in Washington is the most important challenge we face. Subject to being able to produce a soundly costed revised MIKE document, it is proposed that formal approaches/submissions to these key donors be made in October 1999.

#### Funding the surveys

8. With reference to the surveys in Table C, all the indications are that support is likely to be offered and agreed at the country level. However, the 'central' donors will want to be informed about the costs, as well as local commitments and contributions, so engaging with the range States on these matters cannot be delayed until later. USFWS, USAID and the EC have expressed their readiness to consider local applications for funding from range States and there is evidence of existing funds in the hands of donor delegations which are not being exploited to the full. The MIKE central unit or the consultants will need to work with range States on the costing and framing of these in-country applications.
9. It will be important to secure and show as much 'in kind' involvement of wildlife departments as possible. The estimated contributions in Table C assume that as a minimum 10% of the cost would be met in this way, moving up to a maximum of 55% where a department can provide pilots as well as researchers etc. for its surveys. In addition to the donors mentioned, other bilateral donors such as Japan (who have already made a commitment to funding), Canada, Germany and France should be encouraged to target their support on surveys in particular African and Asian countries. A specific pledge of USD20,000 has recently been made by a private body from Japan. Among NGO's the Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) is already supporting MIKE substantially on the two pilot projects, while the Dutch National Committee of IUCN is granting USD10,000 for the capacity building element of the Central African pilot project. Other international NGO's such as WWF, Conservation International, African Wildlife Foundation and Fauna and Flora international should similarly be invited to support survey work, mainly through seconding key personnel, once range States are apprised about potential sites in their territory.

#### Next steps

10. A revised MIKE document, which is clear about the interaction of its various parts and whose costings are soundly based, defensible and adaptable to fresh information is essential for formal submissions to the large international donors. It is not possible to await the outcome of the pilot phases in Central African and South East Asia, if submissions are to be made by October, but useful information from them should be incorporated as soon as it becomes available.
11. The range States with selected sites need to become involved in MIKE, at least in a preliminary way, if firmer information is to be obtained about the feasibility, cost of and local contributions to the in-country surveys. A first approach should come from the Secretariat. Following that the consultants/co-ordinators will have to follow-up.

**TABLE A****MIKE TOTAL COSTS BY YEAR AND MAIN COMPONENT**  
(in thousands of USD)

<b>Component</b>	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>	<b>Year 6</b>	<b>Total</b>
A. 1. Surveys	337	337	354	354	372	372	2126
2. Equipment	219	219	107	107	107	107	866
Total surveys	556	556	461	461	479	479	2992
B. Central Unit	306	321	337	354	372	390	2080
C. Site/sub-regional staff	438	613	644	676	710	746	3827
D. Capacity/Training	207	217	228	239	251	264	1406
<b>Total annual costs</b>	<b>1507</b>	<b>1707</b>	<b>1670</b>	<b>1730</b>	<b>1812</b>	<b>1879</b>	<b>10305</b>
One-off costs:							
Office eqpt	608		167	167			942
Recruitment	132						132
<b>Total costs</b>	<b>2247</b>	<b>1707</b>	<b>1837</b>	<b>1897</b>	<b>1812</b>	<b>1879</b>	<b>11379</b>

Note: See Tables B & C for explanations, reservations, etc.

**TABLE B**

**MIKE CONTINENTAL AND SUB-REGIONAL STAFF AND OFFICE COSTS  
AND POSSIBLE DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS**  
(in thousands of USD)

<b>COSTS</b>						<b>POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS</b>		
<b>Year</b>	<b>Central Unit</b>	<b>Site/sub-reg. Staff</b>	<b>Capacity/training</b>	<b>One-off Eqpt</b>	<b>Total costs</b>	<b>GEF 55%</b>	<b>EC 30%</b>	<b>Bilateral donors 15%</b>
1	306	438	207	740	1691	930	507	254
2	321	613	217	–	1151	633	345	173
3	337	644	228	167	1376	757	413	206
4	354	676	239	167	1436	790	431	215
5	372	710	251		1333	733	400	200
6	390	746	264		1400	770	420	210

## Notes:

1. Capacity building/training assumes one session for each site every two years, related to surveys.
2. Percentage contributions from 3 main international donors, taken with survey contributions in Table C, respect percentage or ceiling figures indicated in informal discussions to date.
3. One-off costs include recruiting central unit team, equipping office, computers for all sub-regional and site co-ordinators (including replacing/updating in years 3 & 4) and motorscooters for Asian field survey teams.
4. Assumed that not all 60 site-co-ordinators will be recruited for whole of year 1; costs are 75%.

**TABLE C**

**MIKE ELEPHANT IN-COUNTRY SURVEYS:  
COSTS AND POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS**  
(in thousands of USD)

<b>COSTS</b>				<b>POSSIBLE CONTRIBUTIONS</b>				
<b>Year</b>	<b>Total cost</b>	<b>In-house Contrib.</b>	<b>Net reqt</b>	<b>EC Del. 20%</b>	<b>USFWS 20%</b>	<b>USAID 15%</b>	<b>Other don. 25%</b>	<b>NGOs 20%</b>
1	556	73	483	97	97	72	120	97
2	556	73	483	97	97	72	120	97
3	461	77	384	77	77	58	95	77
4	461	77	384	77	77	58	95	77
5	479	81	398	80	80	60	98	80
6	479	81	398	80	80	60	98	80

**Notes:**

1. Surveys, to take place every 2 years, are spread evenly over each 2 year period.
2. Costs include equipment, whose purchase is concentrated in years 1 and 2.
3. In-house contributions represent estimated difference between full professional cost of surveys and cost where institutional staff might be involved as pilots, researchers, trackers, etc.
4. Components of aerial surveys of savannah sites are now costed robustly, but intensity of and threshold for sample surveys needs determination. Cost and methodology for surveying forest sites needs confirmation.
5. Most donor contributions will have to be negotiated at country level (e.g. from EC, USAID and other donor delegations) with full involvement of wildlife management authority. NGO contributions may often be 'in kind', e.g. personnel.