

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



**Fourth African elephant meeting
Gigiri, Kenya
26-27 April 2012**

SUMMARY RECORD

Background

The CITES Secretariat convened the fourth African elephant meeting in Gigiri, Kenya from 26 to 27 April 2012. The meeting was organized by the Secretariat's programme Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) with financial support from the European Union. The meeting was attended by 60 representatives from 33 of the 38 African elephant range States (Angola, Cameroon, Guinea Bissau, Sierra Leone and Swaziland were invited but did not attend the meeting), United Nations Environment Programme – Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (UNEP/DEPI), the European Union, the Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office of IUCN (International Union for the Conservation of Nature), IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG), TRAFFIC, University of Reading, and the CITES Secretariat and its programme for Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE). The meeting was chaired by the Chief of the Biodiversity Unit at UNEP/DEPI, Mr. Neville Ash.

Opening of the meeting

The CITES Secretary-General opened the meeting via video-conferencing, and apologized for not being able to attend the meeting in person. The Secretary-General thanked the Chair for agreeing to conduct the meeting and thanked all the African elephant range States, partners and the European Union for their support of MIKE, and particularly welcomed Somalia and South Sudan, who were attending the meeting for the first time. The Secretary-General referred to the recent CITES press release about the poaching situation in Cameroon, and noted that the fourth African elephant meeting was taking place against a background of increased illegal killing, a spike which was being observed across all four subregions. With reference to the first strategic objective of the African Elephant Action Plan, he called on the meeting to put aside differences and to come together to take very bold steps towards addressing the increasing illegal killing and trade that is of concern to all CITES Parties. He noted that the African Elephant Fund had attracted close to USD 400,000 and that this was an important step towards addressing many of these issues.

The Secretary-General noted that this meeting was the last to be organized under the MIKE Phase II project, and informed the meeting that work was underway to prepare for the next phase of MIKE. He noted that the future of MIKE and ETIS was not only about external funding, but also a matter for all range States and CITES Parties to consider, particularly in the context of the revision of CITES Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15). He also referred to the agenda items on the new ETIS and African and Asian Elephant Databases, tools being provided to all Parties for enhanced decision-making.

Finally, he outlined major forthcoming international meetings, including the 62nd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in July 2012, the UN Conference on Sustainable Development (RIO +20), in June 2012, the 11th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biodiversity in

October 2012, the 5th IUCN World Conservation Congress, and the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in March 2013, coinciding with the 40th anniversary of the adoption of the Convention. He urged the meeting to consider all the important items on the agenda before it, and looked forward to the results of the deliberations.

Adoption of the agenda and working programme

The Chair introduced the agenda and working programme and invited comments and proposals for amendments. He reminded participants that simultaneous interpretation was provided for 6 hours a day only, thereby limiting the opportunities to work bilingually. A number of comments were made on the importance of receiving documents in both working languages in good time before the meeting. Comments were also made on the need to have enough time to discuss progress since the 3rd African elephant meeting on the African Elephant Fund and the implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan. Taking these comments on board, the agenda was adopted.

Address by the representative of the European Union

The representative from the European Union made introductory remarks on behalf of the Director-General for Development and Cooperation (DEVCO) of the European Commission. He focused on the issues surrounding the continuation of financial support for the MIKE project. While Phase II was extended to the end of December 2012, there was still uncertainty surrounding any further funding. He emphasized that the European Union was strongly committed to biodiversity and protected area conservation, having invested major financial resources across Africa since 1985. Regarding MIKE, the European Union had supported the MIKE Pilot Project in Central Africa, and was the main donor in Phase I and the only one in Phase II. He then went on to describe how funding decisions were made in the Commission. The Secretariat of the African, Caribbean and Pacific (ACP) Group of States had not been withheld on its priority list a proposal to support MIKE for a further three years. Funding would have come from the 10th European Development Fund, the allocations of which are jointly decided by the European Commission and ACP States. He encouraged African elephant range States to lobby within their own governments to ensure that their representatives to the ACP were aware of the importance of MIKE to sub-Saharan Africa. He emphasized the urgency of these activities to ensure that MIKE was included in the 11th cycle of the European Development Fund, likely to start in 2015. He also noted that there was the possibility of a bridging fund to allow MIKE to continue through 2013 and 2014. The Chair thanked the representative from the European Union and urged the range States to take these suggestions on board, as well as to think about how to most effectively diversify funding sources for MIKE.

Feedback from Subregional Steering Committee Meetings

Concurrent meetings of all four MIKE Subregional Steering Committees were held in Gigiri on Wednesday, 25 April 2012. The Chair of each Committee was invited to provide feedback on the outcomes of their meetings. The reports of the Subregional Steering Committee Chairs are summarized below.

Central Africa

The Chair of the Central Africa Subregional Steering Committee (Democratic Republic of the Congo) reported that the subregional meeting was attended by Central African Republic, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon and Chad. Priorities for the subregion for the period May to December 2012 were agreed as: (a) outreach to the ACP Secretariat to encourage continued financial support to MIKE; (b) strengthening quality control of elephant carcass data, in particular determining the cause of death; (c) finalization of the Boumba Bek survey in Cameroon and production of survey report; (d) holding a meeting of the Subregional Steering Committee; and (e) continued capacity building for MIST. Finally the Steering Committee made the following recommendations for the next phase of MIKE: increase financial support to MIKE National and Site officers, including costs for site visits; provision of computer equipment for National Officers, including laptops, printers, and scanners; renewal of equipment at priority MIKE sites; expansion to

new sites; strengthening data quality control; support by Subregional Steering Committee members for MIKE; and extension of MIKE monitoring methods to all protected areas.

East Africa

The Chair of the East Africa Subregional Steering Committee (Kenya) reported that the meeting was attended by Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda. All range States provided country reports, indicating a general increase in illegal killing of elephants in the Eastern Africa subregion. They agreed that strategies were needed to address this problem.

The Subregional Steering Committee made the following recommendations: (a) The range States in the subregion recognized the importance of MIKE and supported the extension of MIKE for a further two years to enable range States to run MIKE on a sustainable basis and integrate it into national programmes; (b) Governments in the region were encouraged to exchange intelligence and take other measures to curb the ongoing upsurge in illegal killing of elephants. The current MIKE phase up to December 2012 should aim at developing mechanisms to reduce the impact of poaching, while the next MIKE phase should strengthen existing efforts to ensure sustainability of MIKE; (c) Elephant range States should integrate MIST as a way of ensuring sustainability of MIKE; (d) Further capacity building in the area of data analysis at site, national and regional levels should be among the priorities for MIKE until the end of Phase II. Enhancement of capacities through training of aerial survey observers across the entire subregion should be a major priority and could be co-funded by range States and MIKE; (e) Range States that were not member of existing regional law enforcement organs such as the Lusaka Agreement Task Force and Interpol were encouraged to join these organs to enhance cooperation on law enforcement and utilize existing expertise to fight the escalating level of illegal killing of elephants; (f) MIST should be included in the wildlife curricula at various wildlife training institutions in the subregion; (g) MIKE should provide supplementary support to elephant population surveys in Laikipia/Samburu (Kenya), Murchison Falls and Queen Elizabeth Sites (Uganda) planned in 2012; (h) The subregion supported the use of satellite collars to study elephant movements in Gash Setit in Eritrea, Kefta Shiraro and Dinder in Sudan. MIKE should consider collaring elephants in Eritrea (Gash-Setit) to monitor and understand distribution, habitat use and elephant movements between Eritrea, Ethiopia and Sudan, and levels of human elephant interactions in these areas. Funds allowing, MIKE should train the newly recruited rangers in Eritrea's MIKE site; (i) The focus of MIKE during its next phase should give priority to identifying new MIKE sites based on the existing selection criteria and focusing on transboundary populations, while appreciating and consolidating the progress of old and current MIKE sites; (j) The Committee underscored the importance of raising awareness amongst communities to understand the value of elephants as well as the drivers of poaching and the impacts associated with high levels of poaching.

Southern Africa

The Chair of the Southern Africa Subregional Steering Committee (Botswana) reported that the subregional meeting was attended by Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The Subregional Steering Committee reflected on all four years of the current phase of MIKE. They noted that southern Africa held the majority of Africa's elephants and had conducted 44 surveys in 9 MIKE sites since MIKE began ten years before, very few with MIKE funding. They noted that during Phase II, MIKE had consolidated its gains from Phase I. The Subregional Steering Committee met regularly during Phase II and MIKE had grown to monitor ecosystems, rather than just sites. Data collection had been simplified with a number of range States using MIST, Management Oriented Monitoring System (MOMS) and Cybertracker. The Chair of the Subregional Steering Committee then outlined the progress in the deployment of law enforcement monitoring databases and ranger training, and outlined some issues identified during training. Finally, the Subregional Steering Committee endorsed the inclusion of Malawi in MIKE and noted that it would continue to invite Angola to participate in SSC meetings. The Subregional Steering Committee also recommended the continuation of MIKE as it allowed range States to tap into global knowledge and best practice for the benefit of site-level management, and was an effective tool for

biodiversity management more broadly. MIKE was a key component of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) and was a cornerstone for the compromise on future trade in ivory reached at The Hague. The Subregional Steering Committee expressed concern about a possible hiatus in funding after 2012 and encouraged the African elephant meeting to come up with strategies to ensure the sustainability of MIKE, not only with donors, but within range States themselves.

West Africa

The Chair of the West Africa Subregional Steering Committee (Guinea) reported that the subregional meeting was attended by Benin, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, and Togo. The MIKE Subregional Support Officer provided an update on the implementation of MIKE from June 2011 to April 2012, including progress on building capacity at MIKE sites, preparation for the aerial survey in the WAP ecosystem, and implementation of the recommendations from the previous Subregional Steering Committee meeting. The priority for 2012 was identified as further capacity building, in particular for anti-poaching activities. The Subregional Steering Committee discussed the future of the MIKE programme following the end of MIKE Phase II in December 2012 and expressed their support for MIKE's continued funding in 2013 and beyond.

The Chair concluded this agenda item noting that the recommendations and requests emanating from the MIKE Subregional Steering Committees meetings should be considered at the African elephant meeting, and communicated within subregions.

Updates on illegal killing of elephants and illegal trade in ivory

Update on MIKE Phase II implementation

The Acting MIKE Coordinator presented an overview of the key achievements and lessons learnt during the implementation of MIKE Phase II. Significant capacity building for national institutions was achieved, with 26 African countries adopting MIKE-introduced ranger-based monitoring systems for wider biodiversity and law enforcement monitoring needs. Sixteen African elephant range States were implementing monitoring systems promoted by MIKE across their entire protected area networks, not only in MIKE sites. More than 1,000 rangers had been trained in MIKE methods, and more than 130 officers trained in MIST operation in 65 training events. MIKE site officers were routinely producing regular reports, maps and charts to meet site management needs. Data management had improved, with 37 sites routinely collecting and transmitting data to the MIKE CCU. MIKE methods and results were published in peer-reviewed scientific literature, and a deeper understanding had been gained of the dynamics of the elephant meat trade in Central Africa. MIKE had also engaged with a multi-agency consortium to develop SMART, a new monitoring tool based on MIKE methods. During Phase II, MIKE was able to deliver regular, high quality analyses of data on illegal killing to the CITES Parties, and to provide integrated reporting with ETIS, the IUCN Specialist Groups, and UNEP-WCMC. MIKE had also provided information and analyses concerning the drivers of illegal killing of elephants. MIKE monitoring was embedded in the African Elephant Action Plan and in many national and subregional elephant conservation strategies. SADC, COMIFAC and the EAC were routinely discussing MIKE findings at their regular meetings, and the Technical Advisory Group was effectively overseeing technical robustness of MIKE methods and analyses.

A number of lessons were learned from the implementation of MIKE Phase II. The culture of law enforcement and biodiversity monitoring could only be established by meeting the needs of sites and range states first, thereby also meeting international reporting obligations as a by-product. Ranger-based data collection tools empowered site managers and rangers alike to adaptively manage their protected area more effectively. Effective monitoring only succeeded with ownership, political buy-in and participation at the site and national levels. Data collection and flow from site to country, subregion and continent was only sustained when the data collected met informational needs at every step of the chain. Data standards were crucial, but flexibility to meet local needs

and ways of operating was even more important. In order to be sustainable, technologies used in ranger-based monitoring needed to be appropriate to what the sites could support independently.

A number of points were raised during the ensuing discussion. While it was noted that MIKE was a monitoring initiative, a number of ideas were discussed for ways in which MIKE could assist with site-level activities aimed at reducing poaching, including assisting with the planning and deployment of patrols. The importance of collecting comparable and credible data by utilizing consistent data collection methodologies was also emphasized. The CITES Secretariat was requested to re-circulate the mid-term evaluation of the MIKE Phase II project.

The future of the MIKE programme

The Acting MIKE Coordinator introduced the consultant contracted to assist with the preparation of project documents and funding proposals for the next phase of the MIKE programme. In July 2011, an initial draft of the MIKE Phase III project concept note was submitted to DEVCO and the ACP Secretariat, and in November 2011, the draft logical framework for MIKE III was elaborated by the MIKE SSOs, MIKE CCU, IUCN ESARO, and the IUCN SSC AfESG. When this concept was not funded under the March 2012 round of the 10th European Development Fund, a new project concept (MIKE 2.0) was developed and submitted to the EU Programme for the Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resource (ENRTP). This project, subject to funding restrictions because only a maximum of EUR 2 million was available, was reformulated with a revised and streamlined project focus.

The consultant then outlined the MIKE 2.0 draft project purpose, objectives and activities. The project purpose was described as: "Practical, field-based monitoring, analysis and reporting systems are strengthened and institutionalised to inform and drive site and national adaptive management processes as well as regional and international policy-making and action concerning conservation of elephants and other large mammals." The four objectives were: 1) Strengthening ranger-based monitoring and adaptive management in focal sites; 2) Building capacity for training in ranger-based monitoring systems in appropriate wildlife training institutions; 3) Mainstreaming biodiversity monitoring information systems in national and regional level management and policy mechanisms; and 4) Utilising MIKE-generated data at the international level to inform conservation decision making processes and to catalyse action to conserve elephants and other key large mammal populations. The consultant discussed the potential delivery mechanisms for MIKE 2.0, including the need to strengthen the partnership with IUCN, to build on existing MIKE capacity, national and regional engagement with MIKE, and to strengthen collaboration with relevant conservation agencies and supporters.

MIKE 2.0 was designed to build on the successes and institutional foundations of MIKE Phase I and II, but with a broader focus on monitoring key large mammals, and a greater emphasis on achieving long-term sustainability of MIKE systems. There was also a possibility that MIKE 2.0 could serve an important role in responding to emerging needs in elephant and other key large mammal poaching in Africa. The consultant emphasized that the project concept for MIKE 2.0 was a work in progress and would incorporate ideas from the African elephant meeting.

A number of range States noted the positive impact that MIKE has had in their countries, and urged donors to continue to support MIKE. Expressions of support were expressed for the integration of MIKE into national systems and the objective of strengthening and building on existing ranger-based monitoring systems. While some range States expressed support for the broadening of MIKE to include other species, concerns were raised about the implications of this for Resolution Conf 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) as well as the nomenclature and mandate of MIKE moving forward.

Joint CITES/IUCN/TRAFFIC report to the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee

IUCN, CITES MIKE and TRAFFIC provided an update on the report on the status of elephant populations, levels of illegal killing and the trade in ivory, which was being prepared for the 62nd

meeting of the CITES Standing Committee, as mandated by Decision 14.78 (Rev. CoP15). The AfESG outlined the IUCN section of the report, which had been compiled by the African and Asian Elephant Specialist Groups. The section on the status of African elephant populations, threats and conservation actions pulled together information from the African and Asian Elephant Database, AfESG members and their networks, survey reports, and published literature. The AfESG was also working on an update of the African component of the African and Asian Elephant Database, with a focus on MIKE sites. Primary threats to elephants were identified as habitat loss and fragmentation, land use pressure, human elephant conflict, and illegal killing for meat and ivory. The AfESG had undertaken a consultation within the AfESG membership and its network to gather information on poaching trends and dynamics at the site level. The results of this consultation were in alignment with the results from MIKE and ETIS, but a worrying finding was the high number of respondents unwilling to be identified or quoted, presumably due to fear of repercussions. The IUCN section also included an update on conservation strategies and action plans. The AfESG expressed its commitment to contributing to this type of integrated reporting on behalf of elephant conservation in the CITES context.

The Acting MIKE Coordinator presented the results of the MIKE analysis included in the report. The analysis was based on information from 8,575 carcass records from 2002-2011, collected in 44 sites in 27 countries in Africa. For 2011 alone, there were 1,408 carcasses from 36 sites in 18 countries. He then presented the continental trends for PIKE (the Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants), which have been increasing since 2006, with 2011 the highest continental PIKE level on record, and representing a statistically significant increase from 2010. The subregional PIKE trends were presented, with particular attention to the fact that the increase in PIKE was now generalized across all four African subregions. In all subregions, the PIKE level was higher than 0.5, a figure which likely indicates that elephant populations are likely to be in net decline.

The Acting MIKE Coordinator then presented the results of a new technique of estimating absolute numbers of elephants illegally killed at MIKE sites. The methodology, developed by the MIKE statistical consultant and reviewed by the Technical Advisory Group (TAG), estimates the number of elephants killed at MIKE sites based on estimates of PIKE, population size and natural mortality. Utilising this methodology, despite the uncertainties, it could be inferred that the number of elephants killed in MIKE sites in Africa in 2011 probably ran into tens of thousands.

The Acting MIKE Coordinator also presented the results of an analysis of relationships between PIKE and various covariates at the site, national and global levels. He noted that, while more of the variation in PIKE was explained by spatial rather than temporal factors, the amount of variation explained by time had doubled since the previous analysis conducted in 2011. At the site level, there was a strong positive relationship between infant mortality, as a proxy for poverty, and PIKE. Larger sites tended to have comparatively lower levels of poaching than smaller sites and there was a strong negative relationship between food security, as measured by farming activity, and poaching levels. Law enforcement capacity and research and monitoring (measured using standardized Protected Area Management Effectiveness methodologies) were also significantly correlated with PIKE. At the national level, governance was again the most important correlate of poaching levels. Finally, at the global level, the annual percent growth in consumer spending in China (as a proxy for demand for ivory) was very strongly associated with PIKE trends, whereas this relationship did not emerge for other ivory consuming nations. He concluded that the current poaching trend was a cause for serious concern and many populations were likely to be in decline. Levels of poaching had been steadily increasing since 2006 and there was no evidence of any direct link, positive or negative, between the 2008 one-off sale and the escalating trend.

The ETIS Director presented the results of the ETIS analysis included in the report. First, he called on all range States to submit data to ETIS, noting particularly that ETIS was in an update cycle for the comprehensive trends analysis for the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in 2013. He summarized the current status of the ETIS database, which had about 18,000 seizure records, with an average of about 1,000 cases per year. He noted that 3 of the top 5 years were 2009, 2010, and 2011, indicating a worrying increase. The report to the Standing Committee was not a comprehensive report, but focused on large-scale ivory seizures, which were getting more

frequent, with 14 in 2011. When the data were viewed in 3-year moving windows, there was an escalation in the most recent period, mirroring the temporal trend from MIKE. He drew attention to the continued and deepening entrenchment of organized crime and corruption in the ivory trade on the African continent.

He then overviewed the source and destinations of the large-scale ivory seizures from 2009-2011 (28 seizures representing 53,400 kg of ivory). While Asia was three times more likely than Africa to intercept these shipments, it was clear that the destination of most of the shipments was either Thailand or China. A major point raised by the ETIS Director was the country of origin or export, which in 15 out of 22 seizures for which information was available was either Tanzania or Kenya. He noted that this represented a shift away from West and Central Africa, with East Africa emerging as the primary exit point for ivory leaving the continent today, despite Kenya making a significant number of seizures.

During the discussion, a number of issues were raised. There was discussion of the governance covariate utilized in the MIKE analysis, with some States concerned that site level governance may differ from national level governance or perceptions of corruption. There was some concern that MIKE and ETIS had not been able to draw conclusions about the impacts of the one-off sales after many years of investment. There was discussion of the mixed signal given by the one-off sale, which effectively represented both a trade and trade ban (because of the moratorium) at the same time as a legal sale. Some range States advocated for further consolidation of the relationship between MIKE and the African Elephant Action Plan. There were a number of queries about forensic analysis and actions undertaken to arrest perpetrators. The ETIS Director responded that while law enforcement actions could be improved, there was an opportunity to entrench the requirement for forensic analysis into the revision of Resolution Conf 10.10 (Rev. CoP15). A number of range States expressed concern that the same information was presented at meeting after meeting, and that immediate action was required, in particular implementation of the provisions in Decision 13.26 (Rev. CoP15). Furthermore, climate change and armed conflict were raised as additional threats to elephants in Africa.

The range States requested copies of the MIKE and ETIS presentations, which were provided before the end of the meeting. The Acting MIKE Coordinator agreed to provide the MIKE section of the report to the range States once the TAG inputs had been incorporated.

Discussion on the current elephant poaching situation

The Chair introduced the item. He proposed to establish two parallel working groups to consider possible responses to the current elephant poaching situation. He asked range States to consider what was already in place at the site, national, subregional and continental levels, citing a number of examples. The Chair then reminded the range States about the first strategic objective of the African Elephant Action Plan (namely, Reduce Illegal Killing of Elephants and Illegal Trade in Elephant Products) and asked the participants what actions needed to be taken in the short term (in the next 12 months) to address the emerging elephant poaching situation, and who should take the lead in delivering these actions. Finally, he asked them to consider how the MIKE Programme's institutional networks and information systems could be leveraged to support emergency actions.

The results of the two working groups are attached in the annex to this document. A number of activities were highlighted as important in the short-term, to be implemented by range States and partners. One suggested strategy was a mechanism to transfer the value of assets seized or fines levied in the course of illegal ivory law enforcement actions to the African Elephant Fund.

Valid CITES Decisions and Resolutions concerning elephants

Revision of Resolution Conf 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) on *Trade in elephant specimens*

The Chair of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup (Uganda) introduced a document outlining the proposed revisions of the MIKE-ETIS sections of Resolution Conf 10.10 (Rev. CoP15), which had been

previously circulated to African and Asian elephant range States, and which was distributed in hard copy at the meeting. Uganda then invited the Acting MIKE Coordinator and the ETIS Director to describe the proposed revisions in detail. The Chair informed delegates that any comments on the document needed to be sent in writing to the USA CITES Management Authority by 6 May 2012.

The Acting MIKE Coordinator outlined in detail the proposed changes to the sections of the Resolution concerning MIKE. The ETIS Director outlined in detail the changes to Annex 1 of the Resolution. A number of range States indicated that they would prefer the language to be consistent with regards to 'illegal killing' rather than 'hunting'. Likewise, in the French version, the term '*chasse*' was deemed incorrect and '*abattage*' was felt to be more appropriate. It was suggested that the Lusaka Agreement Task Force should be included as one of the credible law enforcement, professional resource management and scientific bodies in the opening section, and that the African Elephant Action Plan should also be recognized in this section. The ETIS Director clarified that ETIS country reports would be available at any time under the new online system for ETIS and that 'law enforcement effort' had been captured through a variety of information and was a key and ongoing feature of the ETIS database.

There was a brief discussion regarding instituting a mechanism for peer review and clarity on the roles and responsibilities of the range States, the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup of the Standing Committee, TRAFFIC, the CITES Secretariat and the TAG, as well as a need for clarity on the types of capacity-building to be provided. The Chair clarified that it should be expected that reduced funding would be available in future, and that the role of range States elaborated in the revision encompassed the data collection activities that range States were already undertaking.

There were also comments regarding the potential fundamental changes to the MIKE programme in its next phase and the implications of these changes could have for the revised Resolution. Some requested for an independent evaluation or analysis of MIKE to establish whether it was fit for its purpose. The Chair reminded delegates that there would be a full final evaluation of the MIKE Phase II project, which would be of use in these deliberations. Finally, the Chair reminded delegates that there would be additional opportunities to comment on the revisions to the Resolution at SC62 and COP16.

The Acting MIKE Coordinator agreed to send a summary of the discussion on the Revision of Resolution Conf 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) to the USA Management Authority. The Chair closed the discussion by reminding range States to send their comments in writing to the USA CITES Management Authority by the agreed deadline.

African Elephant Action Plan and African Elephant Fund

The Chair invited the Chair of the African Elephant Fund Steering Committee (AEFSC) to outline progress on the establishment of the African Elephant Fund and implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan (AEAP) since the 3rd African elephant meeting.

The Chair of the AEFSC, South Africa, focused her remarks on the first AEFSC meeting. After the 3rd African elephant meeting, where the draft terms of reference for the AEFSC were discussed, the Fund was established and contributions were made by the donor States. In August 2011, in the margins of SC61, some of the members of the AEFSC took the opportunity to meet (Botswana, France, Germany, Kenya, the Netherlands, Nigeria, South Africa, and the CITES Secretariat). Germany at that time highlighted that their contribution of Euro 80,000 need to be allocated as it would expire at the end of 2011. The members present agreed to organise the 1st meeting of the AEFSC. At that meeting, pilot projects of approximately 20,000 Euros each, to be proposed by the four subregions, would be considered. These pilot projects would follow a draft format agreed to by the AEFSC and focus on the first three objectives of the AEAP.

The first AEFSC meeting was hosted by South Africa from 12-14 December 2011 and financial support was provided by Germany and South Africa. South Africa was elected Chair and Botswana as alternate Chair. It was agreed that South Africa would serve as Chair for a period of three years

to facilitate the first phase of implementation of the projects funded through the Fund. The terms of reference were adopted, including additional provisions relating to the role of UNEP and the CITES Secretariat. In this regard, UNEP as the host of the Fund was required to provide regular financial reports. It was also agreed that UNEP would be the appropriate institution to provide secretariat support to the AEFSC, and an official request for this support has been submitted to UNEP. The Chair of the African elephant meeting confirmed that UNEP had received and was considering this request. The role of the CITES Secretariat was agreed to be liaison with CITES Parties on matters related to the Fund, the AEFSC, and the AEAP. The AEFSC developed and adopted Rules of Procedure for the Committee. It was agreed that meetings would be annual and linked to regular meetings of CITES. The working languages were agreed to be English and French, although the costs of translation were acknowledged as a challenge. It was agreed that a quorum would be 8 representatives of the 4 subregional members of the AEFSC, either in attendance or with a transferred vote and one donor member in attendance. It was agreed that decisions would be made by consensus, although a provision was made for voting with a two-thirds majority. A number of communication procedures were agreed, in particular with regard to regular and emergency proposals. A template for project proposals was prepared, although certain requirements needed to be simplified and clarified, including budgeting and reporting. It was agreed that proposals must be submitted through the relevant authority in the country, and that the criteria for evaluation of proposals would include: 1) sustainability; 2) transparency (and stakeholder involvement); 3) quality; 4) uniqueness, innovation and potential to replicate; and 5) good governance. It was agreed that funds that were not earmarked would be divided into a regional (70%) and discretionary (30%) account, and this ratio would only be adjusted by consensus of all the African elephant range States. The regional account would be divided into four equal parts for each subregion, while the discretionary account would be used for any subregion and for emergency funding.

The AEFSC considered a number of proposals for funding. USD 28,000 was allocated to each subregion, with USD 48,106 available in the discretionary account for urgent proposals. A total of 13 proposals were received, of which 6 were funded. Written comments with recommendations for improvement were provided to the others.

The Chair of the AEFSC indicated that the major challenges were secretariat services and translation, both of which needed funding or a sponsor. The Chair of the AEFSC also encouraged donor States and other organizations to contribute to the Fund, as the range States were ready to submit and implement proposals in the context of the AEAP.

The CITES Secretariat informed that the Fund held USD 400,000 from France, Germany, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom, with a pledge from South Africa. A Notification to the Parties had been issued in March 2012 to announce the establishment of the Fund and urge Parties to contribute to the Fund.

The Chair thanked the Chair of the AEFSC and invited comments from the range States. Thanks were expressed by many range States for the work of the Chair of the AEFSC, Germany, and the CITES Secretariat. A number of range States emphasized the importance of translation and urged UNEP to explore the possibility for a bilingual Secretariat.

During the ensuing discussion, a number of suggestions, queries and clarifications were provided. It was suggested that range States should liaise with NGOs and the AfESG to help prepare high-quality proposals. It was also suggested that the AEFSC could have a committee of experts to assist with proposal review, as provided for in the rules of procedure. Regarding financial reporting, it was agreed that a financial report from UNEP was required before every meeting of the AEFSC. Deadlines for proposals were to be communicated to all range States in good time.

It was agreed that range States should approach their subregional representatives to be clear on how they were represented and to get information about the activities of the AEFSC intersessionally. Range States had a responsibility to maintain their own institutional memory, and

new national focal points for elephants and CITES issues should be fully briefed on the AEFSC and the Fund.

It would be important to communicate the impact and activities of the Fund very proactively in order to encourage donors to contribute to it. Many range States expressed gratitude to the donors to the Fund, and noted that it was urgent that additional funding be provided to implement the AEAP, particularly in the face of the increased pressures from illegal killing of elephants and illegal trade in ivory.

New monitoring tools relevant to African elephant conservation

The new African and Asian Elephant Database web application

The AfESG presented the new web application for the African and Asian Elephant Database (AAED) available at <http://elephantdatabase.org>. The new multi-species structure was built entirely using open source tools, making it more sustainable. New features included: public, online submission process; immediate publishing of survey reports depending on data provider's licensing decision; ability to capture data at the stratum level; ability to undertake more frequent updates to pooled estimates; ability to calculate pooled estimates at different scales; and the ability to undertake alternative ways of calculating pooled estimates. She provided a brief live demonstration of the website, running through a number of the new features. She updated the meeting on the progress towards updating the African elephant component of the AAED. A new Database Officer had started work in March 2012, entering the backlog of surveys. Analysis had started, with a focus on MIKE sites. Pooled estimates for 2011 would be published in 2012. It was hoped that the new web interface would help in communicating information more effectively. She requested the range States to review the list of surveys and to communicate with the AfESG if any were missing. She reminded the range States that the AAED was the official repository of MIKE survey data from Africa, and that the AfESG was always willing to help review surveys at any stage, from planning through analysis and reporting. A query was made regarding the authorship of any reports to be written utilizing the data from the database. It was confirmed that any synthesis of the information by the AfESG Data Review Working Group would be credited to those individuals, while all data providers would be acknowledged in any such publication.

New ranger-based monitoring tools for law enforcement

The Acting MIKE Coordinator provided an overview of the status of various ranger-based monitoring tools for law enforcement. He overviewed the existing law enforcement monitoring (LEM) tools, including MIST, Cybertracker, MStripes, and the MIKE Phase I database. While these systems provided standardized data management and user-friendly integrated systems at the local level, they suffered a number of drawbacks: the software platforms were outdated; analytical features were outdated or insufficient; there was an over-reliance on a single developer, resulting in development bottlenecks; they were not open source, limiting collaborative software development; they did not have long-term plans for sustainability or support; and were in general difficult to translate into local languages. The current version of MIST (2.3) had been placed on long-term support, which would mean there would be no new features added and non-critical bugs would not be fixed. A completely re-written, open source version of MIST had been announced, but there was no clarity on the business and support model or the provision of training materials.

Because of these uncertainties, discussions were started in 2010 to create a new platform in a collaborative framework. This platform, SMART (Spatial Monitoring and Reporting Tool), was being designed to be user-friendly and specifically to build site-level capacity. It incorporated standardized data collection protocols and was designed for easy transition from MIST, Cybertracker, and MIKE. By utilizing a collaborative user-led approach, and robust extensible platform which was fully open source and free, it was hoped that SMART would be more sustainable and applicable to a wide variety of site contexts. The system would be supported by training materials and technical support. New features that SMART would provide included: linking intelligence information to patrolling; facilitating evaluation and planning of patrols; improving analysis and interpretation of

data; improved training materials and support; fewer bugs; more flexibility; availability in regional languages; compatibility with GPS and later PDA and smartphone. It was hoped that SMART would be able to motivate rangers in their day-to-day work because it would provide tools to capture and visualize data they collect and to use those data to demonstrate the value of their efforts. Likewise, SMART could empower protected area managers and contribute to improved accountability and good governance. Development started in October 2011 and by December 2012 the first version would be released. From December 2012 to 2013, the SMART community would develop the business plan and long-term governance structures. The founding organizations were: Wildlife Conservation Society, WWF, Frankfurt Zoological Society, North Carolina Zoo, Zoological Society of London, and CITES MIKE.

The Acting MIKE Coordinator closed his presentation by outlining the way forward for MIKE. MIKE was to continue to deploy MIST 2 in MIKE sites, and once SMART launches, the MIKE CCU will undertake an evaluation of SMART, and MIST 3.0, and provide a set of recommendations to the range States and support in the case of any transition.

The ensuing discussion provided the opportunity for a number of clarifications. SMART was being designed for use with a variety of back-end databases, including Oracle, and there was a plan to develop integration with the paper-based MOMS. A number of range States expressed concern about the need to change systems again especially when it takes so long to integrate a new system. The Acting MIKE Coordinator assured range States that SMART was being designed for an easy transition from legacy systems, but the MIKE CCU would only suggest the deployment of a new system after a thorough evaluation, and specifically noted that MIKE would not impose any system, and continue to support MIST 2.0 as long as it functions.

The new ETIS system

The ETIS Director, with colleagues from the University of Reading, presented the new ETIS system, which had been developed under the project "Enhancing the Elephant Trade Information System to Guide CITES policy," funded by the UK Government's Darwin Initiative. This project has updated the ETIS system, following a successful 10 years in operation and aimed to make ETIS data more accessible to Parties in order to enhance elephant conservation and assist in decision and policy making. ETIS Phase II has been supported in various ways by the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup, the CITES Secretariat and the TAG.

ETIS Phase II had four components: designing and building the new database, including online data entry and access for all CITES Management Authorities; developing an analytical framework, including validation of methodology by publication in scientific journals; revising the ETIS standard operating procedures; and providing training materials for using the new system. The new database was hosted on a secure server, and approved data providers (i.e. CITES Management Authorities) would be able to enter data on their seizure records directly, and access their data online and for download. The ETIS team clarified that the CITES Secretariat was responsible for managing the approval of data providers, in collaboration with the relevant Management Authority for each country. The final version would likely be launched at SC62 in July 2012. The representative from the University of Reading provided a brief demonstration of the system, including registration, data entry (by the form and by uploading an Excel file of seizures), seizure record management, and country reports.

There were a number of queries regarding whether ETIS engaged in law enforcement activities or kept information on offenders. The ETIS Director clarified that ETIS was a monitoring system and not a law enforcement institution. Therefore ETIS passed any relevant information onto the relevant authorities and to the CITES Secretariat, but did not keep names of individuals within the database. There were also a number of queries on who had access to the system. The ETIS Director clarified that CITES Management Authorities would be responsible for designating who would have access, and that this process would be managed by the CITES Secretariat.

The Chair closed these three sections by inviting range States to continue to provide feedback to the relevant institutions on the three systems presented.

Meeting results, conclusions and recommendations

The Chair concluded the meeting by summarizing the main conclusions and recommendations from the meeting. The poaching situation was serious and increasing, across all African subregions, and the illegal ivory trade continued to escalate, with increasing frequency of large-scale seizures. An urgent, escalated response was required, at all scales and resources from within and outside of African elephant range States should be mobilized to support this response. Finally, it was noted that the MIKE programme was of considerable value to elephant range States and CITES Parties, and should receive strong support for its continuation. The meeting agreed with these conclusions, and emphasized that the escalating levels of illegal killing of elephants were exceeding the limits of sustainability and that support to the implementation of African Elephant Action Plan, of which MIKE is part, was urgently needed. The Chair closed the meeting by thanking the CITES Secretariat, European Union, IUCN, TRAFFIC and the University of Reading for their contributions to the meeting. He also thanked the range States for their hard work and encouraged them to take these actions forward in their individual countries and collectively.

Fourth African Elephant Meeting: Working Group Reports

Bilingual Working Group

Chair: Botswana

Rapporteur: Namibia

Participants: Benin, Botswana, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of Congo, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Namibia, Niger, Nigeria, Republic of Congo, South Africa, Rwanda, MIKE Secretariat, IUCN.

What Actions need to be implemented over the next 12 months period to address the emerging elephant poaching problem?

Overall

- a) The ideal approach would be to consider the proposals that have already been approved for funding under the African Elephant Fund. Those projects would have identified priority activities to be undertaken. UNEP should release the funds held under the African Elephant Fund to enable those activities to take off immediately without further delay.
- b) Sub regional presentations on the 26th should also be brought on board to guide identification of priorities for immediate action.

Site level

- c) Ranger training / site level capacity building.
- d) Provide necessary equipment for site staff.
- e) Increase site level ground staff/eco guards (in many cases site staff are far less than the responsibilities placed upon them).
- f) Increase enforcement staff at poaching hotspots.
- g) Site level training in data analysis and presentation.

National Level

- h) Mobilize logistics; support towards increased flying time of patrol aircrafts to improve ground coverage.
- i) Prioritize Human Elephant conflicts (HEC). (Note: Cote d'Ivoire was invited to identify specific issues that can be considered for support under the African Elephant Fund).

Subregional level

- j) Reinforce communication means of rangers; establish hotlines within and between range States.
- k) Draft common anti-poaching strategies for transboundary conservation areas (e.g. gorilla strategy in Rwanda).
- l) Joint patrols with other range states.
- m) Fit elephants with radio collars. Although there are some risks associated with this activity, e.g. mortalities due to immobilization of animals and aggressive behavior of some of the wilder populations towards humans, the benefits outweigh the disadvantages if precautions are taken. Collaring is particularly useful in areas of political conflict where elephants cannot be physically tracked in order to be monitored; collars allow for remote tracking and also could prevent double counting between range States.

International level

- n) States not already members are encouraged to join the Lusaka Agreement Task Force; which is not limited to SADC countries but open to any State. Membership could reinforce synergy among range States especially regarding joint activities in transboundary areas.
- o) Consider exchange of operational expertise between range States vs waiting for formal training since this would take longer to achieve.
- p) All four subregions need to lobby ACP with regard to funding for MIKE phase III

English Working Group

Chair: Namibia

Repertoire: South Sudan

Participants: Botswana, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, South Africa, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda

	What is in Place	What is needed	By whom
Site	Management plans Law enforcement Different designation Levels of support	Review site-based plans Develop plans where it is done Review status of PAs Shift of thoughts Raise awareness: communities, authorities, stakeholders	Wildlife Authorities MIKE tech Support
National	Elephant mgmt. plans Institutional Capacity Legislation	40% in place Develop, review, implement management plans Raise security capacity Human capital, finance Revise laws to be deterrent Community awareness	Wildlife authorities MIKE Tech support
Subregional	- Subregional elephant strategies: Some countries have - CMS, West African Elephant MoU, EAC, SADC, ECOWAS, CEEAC	- Formalize the cross-border collaboration, sharing of information - Harmonization of policies - Joint law enforcement efforts - Raise awareness	- Wildlife Authorities, foreign affairs, defense & security committees - Wildlife Authority - MIKE Tech support
International	African Elephant Action Plan: in place Lusaka Agreement Task Force: Exists	Harmonization of policies & strengthening laws, capacity building; prioritize proposals for anti-poaching in Elephant fund. Mobilize government agencies commitment in national budget Urge countries to join and ratify the agreement	Range States, wildlife Authorities MIKE Sec. Tech. Support Range State, this meeting's

	<p>MEAs (CITES, CBD, CMS, WHC): in place</p>	<p>Urge range State to fully implement the agreements.</p> <p>Penalize consumer countries and use the fund to improve law enforcement in the origin countries.</p> <p>Proceeds from seizures to go to Elephant Fund.</p>	<p>outcome. MIKE Secretariat to facilitate and coordinate</p> <p>Range States</p>
--	--	--	---