



CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES

Distr: General

UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Report

Original: French

SECOND MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES TO THE
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING CONCERNING
CONSERVATION MEASURES FOR THE WEST AFRICAN
POPULATIONS OF THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT (*Loxodonta africana*)
Niamey, Niger, 20-21 June 2011

REPORT OF THE SECOND MEETING OF THE SIGNATORIES

1. The Second Meeting of the Signatories of the Memorandum of Understanding concerning Conservation Measures for the West African Populations of the African Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) was held in the conference room of Hôtel Univers in Niamey, Niger from 20-21 June 2011. The gathering was attended by MIKE Coordinator for Africa and Asia, Mr. Tom De Meulenaer; CMS Secretariat representative, Ms. Melanie Virtue; CMS/CITES consultant, Ms. Véronique Herrenschmidt; MIKE Coordinator for West Africa, Mr. Massalatchi Sani; by CMS-MoU Focal Points (Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo) as well as by representatives of partner organizations such as WAP (M. Salifou Mamadou), IUCN Niger (Mr. Moussa Assoumane), and AfESG (Ms. Diane Skinner).

Agenda item 1: Opening of the meeting

2. The opening ceremony was held on Monday, 20 June 2011, starting at 0900 hrs. It was marked by three speeches:

3. The first was given by the MIKE Coordinator for West Africa who, in his introductory remarks, indicated the order in which the different speeches would be given.

4. He was followed by Mr. Abdou Malam Issa, Head of the Directorate for Wildlife, Hunting, and Protected Areas in Niger, representing the government of the host country. He extended official words of welcome to those attending the meeting, transmitted greetings from the government authorities as well as their thanks for having chosen the country for the present meeting.

5. The last speaker, Ms. Melanie Virtue from the CMS Secretariat, thanked the government of Niger for having accepted the request to hold the meeting on their territory. She also highlighted the issues of this meeting, which was a continuation of the one held in Accra in 2009 and which would allow the results of that meeting to be examined in more detail. She added that this meeting was also an opportunity to take decisions and to put forward proposals to governments with a view to mobilizing funds for the conservation of the elephant. She expressed her pleasure at seeing the strong participation of the 13 member countries at the meeting in Niamey, saying that this was an indication of the potential to arrive at consensual conclusions to which all of the parties could commit.

Agenda item 2: Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

6. Ms. Virtue referred the participants to document UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Doc.5, regarding the provisional Rules of Procedure presented by the CMS Secretariat. The participants adopted the provisional rules of procedure without amendment which can be found as Annex I to this report.

Agenda item 3: Election of officers

7. In conformity with the procedure followed at the Accra meeting in 2009, Mr. Massalatchi suggested, with the agreement of the participants, that Niger preside over the meeting, with the following rapporteurs:

- President: Mr. Abdou Malam Issa, Head of the Directorate for Wildlife, Hunting, and Protected Areas in Niger

- Rapporteurs:
 - Mr. Yaw Boafo, MIKE Deputy Coordinator for West Africa
 - Ms. Hassane Zeinabou Ibrahim, MIKE National Coordinator for Niger
 - Ms. Edith Sawadogo, MIKE Assistant for West Africa

Agenda item 4: Adoption of the Agenda and Meeting Schedule

8. The Secretariat presented the document UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Doc.2 regarding the provisional agenda and invited the participants to comment on it. Mali asked the Secretariat to present the distributed documents so that the participants could find them again easily. In response to the proposals made Mali and Togo asked how much time was going to be accorded for each of the discussion items. The Secretariat felt that it should be up to the participants attending the meeting to judge and to decide the amount of time to dedicate to each topic in accordance with its importance. Mr. Massalatchi made a few suggestions with regard to the amount of time to spend on agenda items. After these exchanges and a reorganization of the order in which certain items would be taken, the agenda and work programme were adopted. The agenda is attached as Annex II to this report.

Agenda item 5: Report of the Secretariat

9. Ms. Virtue referred to document UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Doc.4 regarding the activities of the Secretariat since the First Meeting of the Signatories in March 2009. These included, among other things, a joint work programme between CMS and CITES. In her statement she noted that there had not been any particular coordination concerning the MoU on elephants due to the departure of key staff members at AfESG and that new coordination mechanisms would be proposed in the course of the present meeting for consideration. She also noted that 12 transboundary projects were elaborated in Accra and that follow-up actions were organized in the margins of CoP15 (CITES) in Doha; also, the focal points are currently charged with the task of finalizing the elaboration of these projects.

10. Concerning the MoU for Central Africa she indicated that an analysis of the insufficiencies of existing instruments was currently being carried out for further processing by

the Secretariat. Ms. Virtue paid tribute to the German and Swiss governments for the financial support they provided for the organization of this meeting. She informed the meeting that between now and July 2011 the Secretariat would receive the support of a staff member from Finland who would help give more impetus to the African elephant programme. Ms. Virtue noted that she had been the Agreement Officer at the Secretariat for only one month and thanked Mr. Massalatchi for his assistance in organizing this meeting.

11. The representative of the Secretariat invited those countries that had effected changes at the focal point level to provide letters of nomination to the Secretariat.

12. The Secretariat underscored that the national focal points of the MoU would need to provide national reports and that a draft report outline had been prepared for consideration in the course of this meeting.

13. Two proposals emerged concerning the MoU, a joint MoU on West Africa and Central Africa, or, alternatively, a MoU for each of these two subregions. Ms. Herrenschmidt underscored that if the MoU on West Africa were modified to take Central Africa into account, it would have to go through the entire ratification process. Ms. Diane Skinner suggested that CMS review the entire process in order to try to understand why the protocols did not work in Central Africa even though considerable resources had been injected into the region compared with West Africa. After discussing this matter the countries agreed that it would be preferable for each of the two subregions to have its own MoU, but they asked that there be synergy between the Parties to the MoU in the two subregions. Also, Central Africa could use the MoU of West Africa as a basis for elaborating its own. The Secretariat supported the latter proposal, underscoring that the administrative procedures for elaborating a joint MoU were long and onerous. It stated its desire that the gap analysis of instruments and the situation of elephants be completed prior to the Conference of the Parties to the CMS scheduled to take place in November 2011.

14. Mr. Tom De Meulenaer referred to paragraph 6 regarding the joint work programme and asked for clarifications on the new programme between CMS and CITES. Ms. Herrenschmidt highlighted the need to rationalize taxonomy and species lists in the CMS and CITES annexes with a view to ensuring uniformity.

Agenda item 6: MoU Coordination

15. With regard to coordination of the MoU, the Secretariat informed the participants that the departure of key personnel from AfESG after the signing of the agreements with IUCN had hampered implementation. The Secretariat submitted a proposal to CITES-MIKE aimed at ensuring coordination of the MoU and asked MIKE to provide a response to this proposal. Prior to that Ms. Diane Skinner had underscored that IUCN-AfESG was committed to coordination, saying that a great deal of time had been devoted to this effort but a lack of financial support for the Secretariat had stood in the way of things moving in the right direction. She also noted that IUCN and MIKE were partners in the implementation of certain conservation activities. For the MIKE coordinator, CMS and MIKE had a number of shared interests that were a motivation for them to work together. He added that phase II of the MIKE programme would end a year from now and noted the involvement of IUCN in phase III. He underscored that MIKE had the necessary competence at the subregional level to support CMS in the implementation of the MoU, but noted that conditions needed to be put in place for the mobilization of funds by CMS. It was

suggested that MIKE West Africa should guarantee coordination while waiting for a coordinator to be appointed. Some countries expressed concern that the MIKE programme would probably end in April 2012 (nine months from now). The Secretariat asked the countries to accept coordination of the MoU by MIKE West Africa for the next nine months while waiting for the Secretariat to find a solution that would avoid an impasse.

16. The countries accepted the proposal that MIKE coordinate the programme for the next nine months. However, the countries did not accept the mobilization of funds and asked CMS to make an extra effort to see to it that the MoU was implemented.

17. The Secretariat accepted this and would sign a nine-month contract with IUCN and MIKE. On the other hand, recognizing that efforts would be made to mobilize funds, the Secretariat was not sure it would be able to hire a full-time coordinator.

18. The countries suggested that this question be placed on the agenda and debated at the next COP. The Secretariat supported this proposal.

Agenda item 7: National Reports

19. The representatives of the signatory states presented summaries of their national reports on implementation of the MoU and the strategy pursued since the Accra meeting in 2009 in the following order:

Ghana

20. The representative noted that Ghana had between 1,500 and 2,000 elephants spread out over 11 areas across the country, in both savannah and forest. In the framework of the implementation of the MoU, activities had been carried out including law enforcement, education of the local population, as well as management of conflicts that arose between human and elephant populations. Every police officer was on patrol duty 15 days a month. Thanks to the effectiveness of the law enforcement strategy it was noted for the first time that elephants (15) went from Fazaou to Kyabobo National Park in Togo, and that elephants from Kaboré Tambi National Park in Burkina Faso moved in the direction of the Red Volta ecosystems in Ghana. These movements of elephant populations needed to be managed jointly by the countries in question. All of these activities were complemented by continuous education and public awareness campaigns, and every protected area had a team trained with this objective in mind. The elephant populations in Bia and Ankassa had expanded slightly, as had the territory they occupy. Human-elephant conflicts continued to occur, but the use of elephant-proof mixtures of hot pepper and fat were able to resolve them. The MIKE programme had been implemented in Ghana and major efforts had been made to collect data and assign personnel to the task of implementing the programme. Also, law enforcement had become stricter towards shops selling ivory products.

Benin

21. According to the delegate of this country, a number of activities were carried out in Benin between 2009 and 2010 in connection with implementing the strategy and the MoU: surveillance activities together with the collection and processing of data relating to elephants, an evaluation of the elephant conservation strategy at the halfway point within a defined time frame (2006-2016), the project of growing hot pepper for the purpose of keeping elephants away from the Pendjari

biosphere reserve, made possible with financing from FFEM, an update of the national strategy for wildlife conservation reserves, the application of law enforcement legislation to wildlife management, study of the management of human-elephant conflicts in the W transboundary biosphere reserve (TBR/W), training in dealing with human-elephant conflicts around the TBR/W and the Pendjari biosphere reserve, the identification and marking of elephant routes and awareness training for human populations living along rivers in protected areas. Documents relating to these various activities were currently being written and would be shared with other countries when they had been finalized. Benin also noted that it was important to mobilize new resources to ensure implementation of the MoU, the strategy, and the work programme. The CMS Secretariat would need to take measures to ensure regional coordination of MoU implementation.

Burkina Faso

22. In her presentation the delegate of Burkina Faso noted that at the national level her country had taken a number of measures aimed at raising public awareness, providing conflict training for the human population, and offering compensation to victims of damage caused by elephants. These measures included: providing environmental education at schools, raising awareness of the importance of safeguarding elephant populations at all levels of society, the training of 50 law enforcement officials, 30 of whom were in the Nazinga zone and 20 in W, and compensation measures for victims of damage caused by elephants. The country had also developed initiatives for cross-border interconnection and interconnection between sites in the same bloc. This had made it possible to create two corridors in the PONASI bloc. There were ongoing talks between the authorities of Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, and Burkina Faso in the southwest with regard to the creation of suitable corridors, and consultations on more effective coordination of the overall management of this transboundary ecosystem. However, the constraints connected with wildlife conservation remain many, in particular those connected with human-elephant conflicts and strong anthropogenic pressures resulting in loss of forest areas and modification of plant life in the environment.

Côte d'Ivoire

23. The representative of Côte d'Ivoire noted that a number of activities were carried out in connection with implementing the strategy for the protection of elephants: the development of methods in the framework of environmental monitoring in Taï National Park; population counts carried out in Taï and Marahoué parks by the Wild Chimpanzee Foundation; habitat and illegal activity surveillance programmes; implementation of ivory marking and identification systems; training law enforcement officials in the use of surveillance systems, the granting of wildlife management scholarships (one of which per year was awarded to a law enforcement official); illegal activities were on the increase in Comoé and surveillance there needed to be made permanent; a ban imposed on the use of land and resources in national parks had been realized by creating revenue-generating activities; around fifty revenue-generating activities had been created to that end; the creation of mobile brigades in the framework of the fight against poaching; the creation of magazines on the protected areas in connection with the effort to provide information and raise public awareness. However, despite all these activities and the measures taken, the need remained to improve cooperation with neighbouring countries with a view to consolidating the results achieved. Also, in light of the succession of socio-political crises in Ivory Coast (Côte d'Ivoire) in recent years, there was a need to gather precise information on population dynamics, trends, transboundary movements, etc. with a view to achieving better management of elephant populations.

Guinea-Bissau

24. According to its representative, Guinea-Bissau was committed to protecting elephants, whence its signature of a number of international conventions. Its elephant population numbers 35 migratory elephants which moved between Guinea-Bissau and Guinea Conakry. A strategy had been implemented since 2009 for the protection of this population, and protected areas had been created at emigration sites. The country was currently in search of the funding it needed to carry out multiple activities: new wildlife and forestry legislation, awareness-raising campaigns, training sessions for customs officials and forest rangers aimed at aiding the fight against illegal trafficking in elephant parts, as well as the creation of networks for enforcement of the law on elephants. Furthermore, the country was developing working relationships with NGOs with a view to looking for alternative solutions and encouraging the implementation of development projects in rural areas. There had been awareness-raising activities in decision-making bodies and support had been forthcoming for the elephant populations in cases where certain decisions taken by the authorities were not approved. Park rangers had also been trained in the use of the Internet. Despite all the efforts undertaken thus far, there was still a problem with Internet connections that hampered the flow of information between conservationists. Recommendations for CMS: included partners in the implementation of the conventions and encouraging initiatives aimed at improving the protection of elephants.

Liberia

25. The delegate of Liberia indicated that there were currently two protected areas in Liberia: Sapo National Park and Nimba East Nature Reserve. Three other protected areas were in the process of being created: in the case of Lake Piso it was already official, the Gola and Weningsi forest regions had yet to be declared protected areas. He reported that a number of activities had been carried out in the framework of the MoU since the Accra meeting in 2009, including a count of the elephant population in Sapo in collaboration with the MIKE programme. The country was working to develop transboundary cooperation with neighbouring countries Sierra Leone and Côte d'Ivoire. Liberia and Guinea were actively opening and had a genuine desire to open a corridor for the migration of elephants. A number of elephants that had gone to Guinea were in the process of returning. Unfortunately, after the war, concessions were granted to private interests, affecting the elephant corridor, leading to the human-elephant conflicts. He also noted that since 2009 ten elephants had been killed, not for their ivory or meat, but rather in retribution for having destroyed crops. Certain limitations with regard to activities were a result of a shortage of funds. Liberia derived most of its revenues from the sale of wood and a law needed to be passed to transfer revenues from these sales to the public treasury so that these funds would be available to help conserve the elephant population. Looking ahead to the future, it would be necessary to pursue the process of creating new protected areas, to produce a draft plan for resolving human-elephant conflicts for approval and implementation, to train and equip personnel, and to count elephant populations at the national level. The government needed to take a firm stance and have the political will to protect elephants. A framework act on the protection of elephants was currently in the legislative pipeline.

Niger

26. The representative mentioned that Niger had two MIKE sites, Baban Rafi National Park and W National Park, the populations of which were shared with Burkina Faso and Benin. There was a tripartite surveillance system that rotated annually. At the present time coordination was organized by Burkina Faso. A strategy for the conservation of the protected areas was currently being elaborated. The activities that had been carried out for the conservation of elephants in these parks were: a database currently being created for W National Park; she noted in this

connection that they had hoped the population count for the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) complex would be carried out this year; the Sahelo Saharan Antelopes (SSA) project was able to finance a count taken on foot, the results of which were due to be made available soon; raising awareness in local populations and at schools and the creation of structures for this purpose; the creation of green schools for the purpose of raising awareness levels; two law enforcement officials attended a training course offered by CITES in Cameroon and then planned projects that were now awaiting financing for their implementation. Two elephants were killed by poachers this year and information would soon be available on the results of the investigations. The principal poacher managed to get away but the tusks were found. It would be interesting to put in place a regional intervention unit that would be able to bring back elephants that stray away from their usual habitat. For the time being these two areas had not registered any cases of human-elephant conflicts.

Senegal

27. According to the representative of Senegal, the country was not very active in the framework of the MIKE programme for a period of five years, but now its activity was picking up again. The population in Niokolo Koba National Park numbered fewer than ten elephants, but the listing of this area as a world heritage site had made it possible to attract the attention of the government, which provided F CFA 1 billion for the purpose of strengthening capabilities and improving infrastructures. The president of Senegal had instructed two ministers to devote particular attention to Niokolo Koba. This site also received support from IUCN-PAPACO in the form of four mobile brigades which provided around-the-clock surveillance of the park with an average travelling time of 12 hours per day. This had made it possible to greatly strengthen surveillance of the park. Awareness-raising activities had resulted in former poachers working as park rangers and police informers. The people that lived in the surrounding area were strongly in favour of elephant conservation. However, the elephant population living there was not viable and it would be important to relocate them so that the site could be repopulated.

Mali

28. The delegate noted that 2010 had been a difficult year for Mali: the drought that took place exerted strong pressure on the water situation. Rivers and streams dried up and it reached the point where it became necessary to dig waterholes to try to reduce this pressure somewhat. Sadly, this situation caused the loss of 25 elephants. The tusks of only five of them were found. He reported that elephants had immigrated to Mali from Côte d'Ivoire and Guinea, and that human-elephant conflicts had been recorded. It was noted that there were elephant products in circulation in the country. In May 2010 elephant products were seized at the airport which were in the possession of Chinese nationals and the investigation was still ongoing. There were new laws that were stricter with regard to the management of forest resources. Activities had been undertaken to strengthen capacities and assistance to human populations. The delegate thanked financial backers and partners in the world of conservation (World Bank, Born Free Foundation, CMS, etc.) for their support and also thanked CITES-MIKE for support in the form of equipment.

Sierra Leone

29. The representative of this country noted that in the framework of efforts undertaken to implement the MoU the country had been able to address key questions relating to existing legislation. Laws had been revised to ensure the protection of migratory species and the country was trying to harmonize its policies with those of neighbouring countries (Mano River countries). An initial set of laws was now available and in the process of finalization. Activities were currently ongoing aimed at creating elephant corridors and there was cooperation between Sierra

Leone and Guinea in this area. The difficulty with this activity was that there were human populations living on the corridors and it would be necessary to move them and to find a system of compensation for them. Three new national parks were being created in forest reserves. At the same time, negotiations were being conducted with the people who had been brought in to settle here and help redefine the borders of the parks. Regarding the elephant population, the representative affirmed that a precise figure was not known, but that it was estimated to be between 200 and 300 elephants, and that the country was in search of the funding it would need to carry out a population count that would make it possible to evaluate the number of elephants as well as their viability. He added that category C classification of Sierra Leone legislation did not play in favour of conservation efforts.

Togo

30. The focal point of the MoU for Togo stressed that elephant conservation remained a priority for the government of his country. A plan of action had been formulated to this end and strategies put in place: the government was currently offering 291,000 ha of land for the conservation of elephants; Togo recently adopted a natural resources conservation programme which emphasized the importance of elephants; the country had conducted studies and carried out public awareness campaigns. It expressed its gratitude to Ghana for having confirmed the movement of elephants from the Fazao reserve in Togo to Kyabobo National Park in Ghana and vice-versa. It noted that GEF financed programmes in the amount of F CFA 2 billion to improve the effectiveness of protected area management. The country was looking for funding to finance an elephant population count as well as various activities aimed at strengthening capacities. It highlighted questions connected with compensation for persons whose farm crops had been destroyed by elephants. In conclusion, it mentioned that the conservation of elephants was a long-term activity that required the involvement of all players and that it would be important to improve the management of transboundary populations shared with Benin, Burkina Faso and Ghana.

31. The conflict between humans and elephants was an issue that was raised in a general sense by almost all of the countries involved. They underscored the importance of involving the river communities in the management of protected areas. Activities aimed at promoting public awareness, communication, and protection had been carried out. During the discussions Mr. Massalatchi pointed out that all biodiversity conservation activities carried out by the various partners and other players should be mentioned in the reports. He noted that a number of countries did not take advantage of the various training sessions conducted by the MIKE programme on their site during the period under review.

32. The coordinator of the project “Enhancing the effectiveness and catalyzing the sustainability of the W-Arly-Pendjari (WAP) Protected Area System”, Mr. Salifou Mamadou, presented the aforementioned project which straddled three countries: Burkina Faso, Benin, and Niger. The project helped enable the governments of these countries to fight against the threats that the protected areas faced. One of the important activities of this project was the small grant part of a budget of US\$200,000 destined for local projects and support of activities connected with the conservation of biodiversity. In addition, the project supported activities aimed at promoting public awareness, training and protected area management. The WAP project was ready to participate financially in joint conservation activities with the MIKE programme and other partners, and was also disposed to exchange experience and information on species, human-elephant conflicts, climate change, and other pertinent information.

33. The representative of the Secretariat, Ms. Virtue, invited the participants to comment on UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Doc.6 regarding the format of national reports. She noted that efforts had been made to simplify the format and facilitate the task of filling out the report by the countries. She expressed regret that the working group created to finalize the format had not been able to achieve this objective.

34. The floor was then given to the participants for their suggestions as to the procedure to be followed in amending the format. Togo proposed that the countries be regrouped according to language (French-speaking and English-speaking) for the purpose of discussing this matter. Benin proposed that the document be examined page by page in plenary session. Ghana's proposal was that the document be adopted and used in its current form, and that the difficulties the countries encounter in filling it out be reported at the next CMS meeting. Mali asked if the changes introduced at the Accra meeting had been taken into account in the current version. In response Ms. Virtue indicated that the discussions in Accra on this matter had not led to concrete proposals for amending the document.

35. Initially the participants accepted the proposal to revise the document by dividing up into two groups, francophone and Anglophone. However, because of the time constraints, it was then decided that the document should be examined in a plenary session with the French version projected on the screen while the Anglophones followed along on their printed copy. Amendments were then proposed, but given the slow pace of the process of examining the document, the Secretariat put forward a proposal that was then accepted by the participants: the countries that had amendments were to submit them to the CMS Secretariat by 21 June 2011 at the latest. Also, an exchange of views on the document could be conducted by email by those who wished to do so.*

Agenda item 8: Implementation of the Medium Term International Work Programme

36. The résumé of the deliberations of the first day were presented by Ms. Hassane Zeinabou Ibrahim (National Coordinator MIKE Niger). The meeting proposed that the order of presentation of the items in the work résumé be reviewed. Mali presided over the debates that followed. The CMS Secretariat informed the meeting that just one country had sent its observations on the subject of national reports.

37. There were discussions on document UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Doc.8 relating to the medium term international work programme presented by the Secretariat for revision. This item provoked numerous discussions between the countries and the CMS Secretariat. Some countries asked the Secretariat to give the status of programme implementation since the Accra meeting in 2009. On the other hand, the countries that had carried out programme activities suggested that they be permitted to report what had been done and to highlight the difficulties encountered. Diane Skinner noted that the countries had carried out many activities but that the information they collected was not suitable for evaluating the present work programme; she suggested that the plan could be evaluated in terms of past achievements and future challenges. According to the Secretariat, activities had certainly been carried out, but the lack of a coordinator had made it impossible to take stock of the situation up to the present day. Some countries proposed that national priorities be taken into account, and others proposed just the opposite. Some suggested that the twelve transboundary projects be integrated into the medium-term plan.

* Secretariat Note: However, the Secretariat received no comments or suggested amendments from Signatories. Therefore, the draft presented (UNEP/CMS/WAE2/Doc.6) remains the default reporting format until the next MOS.

38. However, the countries recognized that it would be important to put in place transboundary programmes, given the fact that the majority of elephant populations were fragmented. The countries with transboundary populations were encouraged to pool their efforts to save the elephants.

39. The Secretariat suggested that the programme be examined in groups and that the priorities of each country be attached in an annex. This is what the countries then proceeded to do. Nigeria recommended to the working groups that they examine the document as an international framework from which national actions could be drawn.

40. As proposed by Mr. Massalatchi, three working groups were constituted for the purpose of amending the work programme:

Group 1: Ghana, Liberia, and Sierra Leone

Group 2: Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Senegal, Mali, and Côte d'Ivoire

Group 3: Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger, and Togo

41. Each group put forward items for consideration:

Group 1: items 1 to 3

Group 2: items 4 to 6

Group 3: items 7 to 10

42. The results of the work of each group were presented in plenary session. The results of the work done by group 1 were presented by Sierra Leone, those of group 2 by Mali, and those of group 3 by Benin. Amendments were proposed during the debates, followed by presentations. Togo suggested the need to have indicators, but Sierra Leone noted that the addition of indicators would make it necessary to add a column for the results. The amendments were approved. The Secretariat was asked to integrate these amendments into the document for finalization. This was subsequently done and the completed, revised version is annexed to the present report.

Agenda item 9: Further development on Trans-boundary Projects

43. Ms. Herrenschmidt was asked to provide a summary report on the transboundary projects approved in Accra in 2009. According to Ms. Herrenschmidt, the projects were in the process of development and their status would be examined at the joint meeting of the CMS and MIKE focal points on day three. She noted that the idea of the transboundary projects emanated from the Secretariat and had been developed in a consensual manner at the Accra meeting. She added that the absence of coordination for a total of twelve months since 2009 and the lack of sufficient financing had affected the advancement of work on these projects, despite the considerable effort expended by the representatives of the countries. The projects were turned over to the countries so that they could prepare for the meeting the next day which was to be devoted in large part to an examination of the projects.

Agenda item 10: Miscellaneous issues

44. Togo asked the Secretariat if new projects could be added at this stage. Ms. Herrenschmidt suggested that the countries stick to the twelve projects now in existence and move forward with their development. Senegal requested opinions on the question of relocating elephants. The MIKE

coordinator noted that the translocation of elephants needed to follow certain CITES rules and could not be carried out for commercial purposes. Ms. Skinner agreed with this, saying that IUCN had directives regarding the translocation of elephants and that she could provide information on the subject.

Agenda Item 11: Date and venue of the next meeting of the Signatories

45. As regards the date and place of the next meeting, it was decided at the meeting of the Steering Committee in Abidjan in 2010 that MIKE and CMS meetings would henceforth be held jointly. The MIKE coordinator for West Africa suggested that the place be decided at the meeting of the MIKE Steering Committee. The Secretariat noted that the periodicity of CMS-MoU focal point meetings would depend on the availability of funds.

Agenda Item 12: Closure of the Meeting

46. In conclusion, the president thanked the participants, the interpreters for their patience, as well as the CMS Secretariat and MIKE programme representatives for their good work. He asked the rapporteurs to send a summary of the results to the participants for comment and approval. With this the president closed the Second Meeting of the CMS MoU Focal Points. The list of participants can be found as Annex VI to this report and the List of designated national contact points is attached as Annex VII to this report.

**Medium Term International Work Programme
concerning Conservation Measures for the West African Populations of the African Elephant
(*Loxodonta africana*)**

2012-2014

Objectives	Activity	Priorities ¹	Partners
1.0 Information necessary for management			Note: to the extent possible, all information collection activities should involve key stakeholders particularly communities and local government
1.1 Undertake inventories of elephants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Choose the method 2. Plan the areas to undergo an inventory (e.g.: trans-boundary areas) 3. Implementation (seek financing, choose experts etc.) 	VH	CMS, MIKE, USFWS IUCN, WWF, AWF, other partners
1.2 Study seasonal movements of trans-boundary elephants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify study areas 2. Identify the institutions/experts 3. Choose the methodology 4. Planning and implementation 	VH	Local communities, CMS, MIKE, IUCN, WWF, AWF, other partners
1.3 Undertake genetic studies to determine the taxonomic status of forest and savannah elephants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Report on studies undertaken 2. Identify priority areas 3. Build capacity for sample analysis with the sub-region. 4. Implementation (choose experts, seek financing) 	M	CMS, scientific experts, other partners
1.4 Evaluate the socio-economic value of elephants	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Elaborate tools to evaluate sources of revenue 2. Implement those tools 		Academic institutions, NGOs, experts

¹ VH = Very High; H = High; M = Medium.

Objectives	Activity	Priorities ₁	Partners
	3. Evaluate the service provided by elephants to traditional medicine and to cultural activities and other associated beliefs		
1.5 Evaluate and improve the cost/benefit ratio	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the essential needs of the local people in order for them to cohabit with elephants 2. Ascertain the cost/benefit ratio 3. Monitor the evolution of the cost/benefit ratio 	H	Academic institutions. NGOs, experts Universities
2.0 Enhanced capacity for management			
2.1 Organise training courses at a site-specific and sub-regional level	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify training needs (on-site agents, guards, community contact points, NGOs) 2. Develop training topics 3. Implementation (choose the trainers etc.) 	H	Local communities, CMS, MIKE, IUCN, WWF, AWF, other partners
2.2 Supply equipment needed to the relevant personnel and field stations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluate requirements 2. Seek necessary funding 3. Distribute the equipment and provide training on its use 	H	Local communities, CMS, MIKE, IUCN, WWF, AWF, other partners
3.0 Reduction of the rate of loss of elephant habitat			
3.1 Evaluate elephant habitats	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare a status report on elephant habitat (distribution, water/food/salt resources etc.) 2. Monitor the possible threats and improvements 	VH	Local communities, CMS, IUCN, WWF, AWF, other partners
3.2 Develop and/or revise management plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prepare management plans by site; incorporating a review of the distribution, creation and management of corridors, water sources, fire management, the number of humans/elephants, reintroduction if necessary etc. 	H	Local communities, CMS, IUCN, WWF, AWF, other partners
3.3 Implement management plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementation of the plans prepared 		

Objectives	Activity	Priorities ¹	Partners
4.0 Reduction of conflict between humans and elephants			
4.1 Report on sites where there are conflicts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Investigation and mapping 2. Evaluation of type and extent of conflict and trends over time 	VH	Local communities, CMS, IUCN, WWF, AWF, MIKE, WAP Project, International NGOs, other partners
4.2 Contribute to the resolution of conflicts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Analysis of the causes of the conflicts 2. Implementation of solutions 3. Identify the essential needs of the local people in order for them to cohabit with the elephants 4. Ascertain the cost/benefit ratio, and if necessary, suggest mechanisms to reduce the negative impacts and to increase the benefits 	VH	Local communities, CMS, IUCN, WWF, AWF, MIKE, WAP Project, International NGOs, other partners
4.3 Build capacities for personnel dealing with conflicts	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Promote and distribute information on interactions between humans and elephants 2. Training sessions with people involved locally (managers, organisations working in and around conservation areas, local populations etc.) 3. Equipment 4. Experience sharing 	VH	Local communities, CMS, IUCN, WWF, AWF, MIKE, WAP Project, International NGOs, other partners
5.0 Implementation of CITES			International NGOs
5.1 Conduct studies into ivory trade in those countries identified by ETIS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Coordinate the implementation of activities among Range States 	VH	Experts, ETIS, TRAFFIC, CITES, WWF, MIKE, International NGOs, IUCN, other partners
5.2 Initiate policies on the control of ivory trade at the level of ECOWAS	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. State of play 2. Conduct a study on the harmonization of legislation, if necessary 3. Strengthening of laws and policies in the sub-region 	VH	Experts, ETIS, TRAFFIC, CITES, ECOWAS, other partners

Objectives	Activity	Priorities ¹	Partners
5.3 Strengthen capacities of individuals and institutions involved in controlling the trade in ivory	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organisation of training sessions for defence and security forces (police, customs, forestry commission, etc.) 2. Development of an intergovernmental information network on illegal trafficking 	M	ETIS, TRAFFIC, CITES, MIKE, International NGOs
6.0 Illegal killing of elephants contained			
6.1 Strengthen control policies	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Status report 2. Harmonisation of legislation 3. Organization of monitoring patrols 4. Joint missions to encourage opinion sharing 	VH	ECOWAS, CITES, MIKE, IUCN, International NGOs
6.2 Strengthen capacities of individuals and institutions involved in the fight against poaching	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Organisation of training sessions (communities, field officers, guards) 2. Development of a framework of inter-governmental information on illegal poaching 3. Provide agents with the necessary equipment 	VH	MIKE, IUCN, WWF, AWF, CITES, ECOWAS, International NGOs
6.3 Supply necessary equipment to the agencies concerned	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluate equipment requirements 2. Distribute and provide necessary training 	VH	MIKE, IUCN, WWF, AWF
7.0 Better understanding of Elephant conservation issues at all levels			
7.1 Organise information, education and communication (IEC) campaigns	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify Campaign requirements (target groups, topics) 2. Create and promote the IEC tools 3. Lobby for the mobilization of financial resources 4. Distribute information on interactions between humans/elephants through the media and other communication channels 5. Distribute and make accessible legislative and regulatory texts on the conservation of 	H	Local communities, ECOWAS, CMS, IUCN, WWF, AWF

Objectives	Activity	Priorities ¹	Partners
	elephants (status, habitat, management, killing and illegal trade)		
8.0 Strengthened cooperation between Range States			
8.1 Create a technical consultation network for the management of each trans-boundary area	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Develop and implement technical agreements between Range States in the fields of legislation; research; management; anti-poaching and the fight against illegal trade; education; public information, etc) 2. Organise regular meetings 3. Create an information-sharing mechanism to improve the monitoring of transboundary movements of elephants 	H	ECOWAS, CMS, IUCN, local authorities, local NGOs, MIKE, WWF, AWF
9.0 Mobilization of financial, material and human resources			
9.1 Establish networks of competencies at national and sub-regional levels	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify and mobilize existing competence 2. Define the networks' missions 3. Establish the networks 4. Build capacities of the members of the networks 5. Recruit other complementary competencies if necessary 	H	Agencies and other institutions Experts and Consultants NGOs Institutions Universities
9.2 Mobilize financial resources	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify potential sources of finance 2. Develop national and sub-regional projects 3. Submit projects to potential funders 4. Support the implementation of an African Elephant Fund 	VH	Experts and consultants NGOs Institutions Universities
10. Monitoring and evaluation			
10.1 Monitor the implementation of the MoU	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish indicators for each objective and activity 	H	IUCN, WWF, AWF Governments Universities

Objectives	Activity	Priorities ₁	Partners
	2. Seek synergies with other MoUs or other instruments 3. Consolidate the results 4. Prepare monitoring reports		
10.2 Evaluate the work programme	1. Evaluate the performance of the programme 2. Update the programme	M	IUCN, WWF, AWF Experts Universities