



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



Minutes of the MIKE Sub-regional Steering Committee meeting held on 8 February 2010 in Gaborone, Botswana.

**1. OPENING REMARKS**

The Chairperson (Dr C. Taolo) welcomed all the participants to another important meeting of the Sub-regional Steering Committee in Gaborone, Botswana. He expressed the importance of MIKE to the wildlife conservation and sustainable use in the sub-region and wished that participants do justice to the long agenda before the meeting.

**2. ATTENDANCE**

Members of Sub-regional Steering Committee or representatives and some MIKE officials from all six (6) participating range States (Botswana, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe) attended the meeting.

The three (3) non participating range States (Angola, Malawi and Swaziland) were invited as observers; only Malawi attended. Angola indicated an interest in attending but did not and Swaziland declined.

The meeting was also attended by MIKE Central Coordination Unit, TRAFFIC Eastern/Southern Africa and Southern Africa sub-Region representative member of the MIKE Technical Advisory Group (TAG).

The list of participants is attached as Annex 1.

**3. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The Committee considered the Agenda (Annex II) and adopted it as proposed.

**4. ADOPTION OF THE RECORD OF THE FEBRUARY 2009 MEETING**

The minutes of the last meeting held in February 2009 in Pretoria, South Africa were considered and adopted without corrections.

**5. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

5.1. The status on actions agreed to at the previous meeting was considered as indicated in the Table presented as Annex III. The Committee agreed to address the following outstanding actions:

5.1.1. Regional enforcement coordination to be enhanced through Interpol and bilateral arrangements such as bilateral Joint Permanent Commissions on Defence and Security as well as through trans-boundary conservation initiatives such as ZIMOZA (Zimbabwe, Mozambique and Zambia).

5.1.2. The respective range States agreed to provide results from recent surveys (Namibia, 2009; Zambia 2008; South Africa, 2009; Mozambique, 2009) and also provided schedule of planned surveys (Botswana, 2010, Zambia, 2012, and Zimbabwe 2010).

5.1.3. Measures to address lack of national and regional survey capacity were to be considered in the SADC Wildlife Protocol forum.

5.1.4. Mozambique was asked to clarify status of MIKE implementation within 2 weeks from date of meeting, i.e.:

- Provide names of MIKE Site officers;

- Provide national MIKE data;
- Provide information on latest elephant surveys;
- Provide exact boundaries of two MIKE sites; and
- Provide areas where assistance from SSU is required.

## **6. MIKE ANALYSES REPORTS FOR COP 15.**

### **6.1. MIKE Carcass Data Analysis Feedback**

The presentation made by the MIKE Data Analyst is summarized below.

- 6.1.1. The objectives of the analysis were to:
- Determine trends in levels of illegal killing of elephants
  - Investigate relationship between levels of illegal killing and covariates
- 6.1.2. Data included in the analysis:
- The first analysis (2002-June 2009) included 5,608 carcasses from 65 sites in 32 countries in Africa and Asia
  - Updated analysis (2002-2009) 6,566 carcasses from 72 sites in 38 countries in Africa and Asia
- 6.1.3. Response variable used in the analysis
- PIKE: Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants (number illegally killed/number found)
- 6.1.4. Key conclusions made from the analysis were:
- Elephant poaching declined or remained stable between 2002 and 2006, followed by a steep increase (decline in 2009 to be confirmed).
  - Effectiveness of Government and human development are important predictors of success in elephant conservation
  - Forest cover, site area and human population density are also important predictors of poaching, but far less so in countries with good governance than in countries with low governance
  - No evidence of link between CITES ivory trade decisions and poaching trends – international economic climate, national governance and socio-economic circumstances may be more important drivers

### **6.2. Assessment of MIKE implementation 2009**

- 6.2.1. The MIKE Coordinator presented results of the analysis of the questionnaire survey conducted to assess the status of the MIKE programme across its sites in Africa and Asia. The questionnaires were completed by SSOs, National and Site Officers.
- 6.2.2. The questionnaire consisted of standard questions divided into nine sections, asking respondents to rate various aspects of MIKE implementation at MIKE sites, including:
- Availability of funds and human resources for patrolling operations;
  - Levels and coverage of patrol activity;
  - Staffing;
  - Quality and level of data collection and data management;
  - Hardware and software resources (GPS, computers, power); and
  - Elephant population surveys.

This tool is to provide:

- capacity building and resource needs of each site;
  - annual progress in MIKE implementation by MIKE CCU, SSUs and Site;
  - proxy for level of protection effort at each site for MIKE analysis.
- 6.2.3. The findings are as presented in paragraphs i-v.
- i) Availability of resources for operations
- more than 50% of sites need substantial additional funds for basic, essential operations;
  - less than 10% of sites have adequate funding;

- more than 50% of sites rely on donors for essential operations;
- Central and West Africa most donor-dependent in Africa;
- Asian sites rely more heavily on national budgets; but Southeast Asia more donor-dependent than South Asia

ii) Patrolling

- Almost 50% of sites in Asia are patrolled once a month or less while only 15% are patrolled daily.
- 90% of African sites are patrolled daily (particularly Eastern and Southern Africa) while elsewhere weekly or monthly patrols (Central and West Africa) are conducted.
- Almost 50% of sites in Africa and Asia have patrol coverage of 50% or less of the site area per year.

iii) Staffing levels

- Africa & Asia: less than 20% of rangers in both Africa and Asia are trained in data collection methods
- Training in MIKE methodology is lowest in Central Africa, Southern Africa, South Asia and Southeast Asia
- Almost 50% of sites have had site officers in post for two years or less

iv) Elephant surveys

- 80% of sites are surveyed every 5 years or less frequently (90% would want higher frequency)

v) Data collection and management

- Mike data from more than 70% of sites in Africa, and 50% in Asia are only transferred when SSO visits personally.
- National Officers are hardly ever involved in data quality control or in providing feedback to their sites.
- In most sites, data are computerized irregularly if at all; paper forms not archived.
- Most sites are characterized by unreliable power supply; no internet connectivity; poor computer maintenance (out of order, viruses and malware)

6.2.3 From the above results, the major challenges (which were also agreed to by the Committee) in MIKE implementation included

- donor-dependency;
- insufficient funding for basic patrolling and law enforcement;
- low patrol coverage in time and space;
- complexity of the MIKE data recording routines;
- high staff turnover;
- low engagement by National and Site MIKE staff;
- training and involving new staff in implementing MIKE;
- ensuring that reliable MIKE information is recorded, stored, transferred and analysed for feedback to and application by data providers, site managers, governments and CITES.

6.2.4 Suggested measures to address the challenges include the measures listed below. It was noted that some of the measures were being implemented or were planned for implementation by MIKE (TAG,CCU and SSUs) and Range State

- Simplification of MIKE data collection and reporting routines;
- Broaden scope: monitor additional activities and species; analysis at site and national levels;
- Deployment of MIST;
- Capacity building (training, research and equipment support, ToT, self-learning packages);
- Long-term support and assistance on the ground;
- Strong central and sub-regional coordination with stable funding;
- Evolve MIKE programme (Res. 10.10);
- Partnerships with NGOs and others operating in MIKE sites;
- Long-term commitments from range States to MIKE methods;
- More national financial and staff resources (recurrent budgets funding strategies);
- Maintain an adequate cadre of MIKE trained and equipped rangers and staff in each site;

- Ensure that data of sufficient quality and quantity are collected for meaningful analysis,
- Apply MIKE data in effective management and decision making

## **7. ETIS ANALYSIS REPORT.**

7.1. The paragraphs (i-iii) present a summary of the presentation by the Director of TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa on the assessment of ETIS data done for CoP 15.

i) Objectives of the analysis were to:

- determine levels and trends in illegal trade in ivory;
- assess whether and to what extent the observed trends are related to CITES decisions;

ii) Key results

- There are almost no ivory seizures being made in the West or Central African regions.
- The performance in East and Southern Africa is much better although some countries (Angola, Mozambique, Somalia) need to exert more effort.
- There is an increase in large scale ivory seizures most probably attributed to the following factors:
  - Better planning, organization and intelligence
  - Greater levels of finance
  - Investment in facilities and equipment for storage and shipping purposes
  - Ability to exploit trading links and networks between source countries in Africa and end-use markets in Asia.
  - corruption, collusion between private sector and government regulatory agencies
  - The Emergence of Organized Crime Operations

## **8. OTHER COP 15 ISSUES AND GENERAL DISCUSSION**

### **8.1. Elephants at CoP15**

8.1.1. Range states were advised on other elephant issues and how they were likely to be discussed during CoP 15 (13-25 March 2010, Doha, Qatar). Discussions on elephants will be done in both Committees.

8.1.2 Committee II (Tuesday, 16 March 2010) will discuss:

- Proposed mandate to amend to Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) between CoP15 and CoP16 (CoP15 Doc. 18 Annex 7)
- Proposed changes to CoP14 elephant Decisions incl. those on *African Elephant action plan* and African Elephant Fund (CoP15 Doc. 19)

8.1.3 Committee I (Monday, 22 March 2010) will discuss:

- Key findings of ETIS (CoP15 Doc. 44.1)
- Key findings of MIKE (CoP15 Doc. 44.2)
- Possible Dialogue meeting and Communiqué about three elephant proposals
- If no previous compromise: 3 proposals discussed in sequence (Tanzania, Zambia and Kenya *et.al.*).

8.1.3 Other important agenda items that were identified to be important for the range states to note were

- Budget proposals.
- Members of the permanent Committees
- Introduction from the sea
- Fish proposals
- Tiger conservation

### **8.2 General discussion-Issues directed to the Directors of Wildlife Sector**

8.2.1 The actions directed to the Directors meeting were that:

- Mozambique was largely failing to implement MIKE;
- Mozambique was identified by ETIS as highly problematic regarding illegal trade in ivory and lack of meaningful enforcement;
- Angola was still not Party to CITES due to bureaucratic errors
- Range States to explore options for regional collaboration for regularly surveying elephant populations;
- The Committee bring importance of MIKE and ETIS to the attention of SADC ministers
- Coordinated response to CITES Secretariat regarding the “final” *African elephant action plan* circulated by Kenya in December 2009 (estimated cost for three years: 97,350,000 USD)
- Coordinated response to CITES Secretariat regarding the its re-launched interaction with working group on African Elephant Fund (SA and ZW for Southern Africa)

## **9. ISSUES ARISING FROM MEETINGS OF THE MIKE TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP.**

- 9.1. The meeting noted the oral report presented by The TAG member. The TAG member brought to the attention of the Committee some of the issues arising from meetings of the TAG. The issues included site validation as the representativeness of site is in doubt because of aspects such as adding new site; the need for to stick to agreed MIKE sample sites, to place emphasis on collection of carcass data because of use of PIKE in data analysis and the need to measure effort.
- 9.2. The need for feedback to countries and sites was also highlighted as an important aspect to ensure commitment of range states especially of implementers at site level.

## **10. REVIEW OF WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2009 AND WORK PROGRAMME FOR 2010.**

- 10.1 The Sub-regional Support Officer presented the proposed work programme for 2010 for the consideration and endorsement by the Committee. The review of the programme was covered during discussions on matters arising from previous meeting. The major activities of the proposed work programme presented are summarized in paragraphs 10.2 to 10. 7 with additional activities identified in meeting outlined in paragraph 10.8.
- 10.2. Deploying Ranger Based Data Collection systems at national and site levels;
- Establish relevant databases for Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
  - Integrate ConInfo and MIST databases for Namibia
  - Configure Mimmex to enable generation of MIKE data.
  - Conduct national consultations and subsequent establishment of databases in Mozambique
  - Provide support for a 3-5 day training event in RBDC for rangers in relevant range States.
- 10.3. Training in Law enforcement Monitoring and Aerial Surveys at sub-regional, national and site levels
- Conduct national consultations to establish gaps (if any) with existing Ranger Training Curricula
  - Organize a workshop to establish a standard Ranger Training curricular that can be adapted by individual Range States or used at regional Institutes
  - Conduct sub-regional training in MIST/Database Management
  - Update WWF (SARPO) Software for aerial survey designing and analysis
  - Conduct practical training in designing aerial sample surveys and in analyzing aerial survey data and reporting.
- 10.4. Procure and provide equipment (computers and GPSs), taking into account recommendations of the MIKE Technical Advisory Group and Steering Committee;
- Purchase GPSs/tracking devices within the budget limit (USD 8,000)
  - Distribute procured computers to sites
- 10.5. Assisting in undertaking at least one priority population survey
- Support survey of Chewore and Cabora Bassa and encourage use of MIKE standards

- 10.6. Disseminating MIKE information
- Participate at African Wildlife Consultative annual meeting;
  - Participate at SADC Wildlife Technical meetings;
  - Participate at the rhino and elephant security group meetings;
- 10.7. Maintaining functional Sub-regional Steering Committee
- Organize Sub-regional steering committee meeting
- 10.8. Additional items identified at meeting:
- Provide support for and facilitate regional staff exchanges
  - Support communication and logistics of MIKE Site and National officers
  - Incorporate country-specific actions based on country reports and review of technical needs (Mozambique and South Africa to provide specifics)
- 10.9. The meeting noted that all actions must take into consideration that the key demand of MIKE is information on elephant populations and carcasses in specific sites. Comprehensive support programme to deliver on these basic demands, including. training and capacity building in Ranger Based Data Collection and analysis; equipment; analytical support; data base support; etc

## **11. COUNTRY REPORTS**

- 11.1 All range states were requested to prepare progress reports on deployment of RBDC following national consultations meetings held with SSO during period September to November. After each visit to the country, range states were expected to conduct further internal stakeholder consultations in implementing plan of action agreed in national consultation meetings.
- 11.2 The meeting noted progress made by range states towards full deployment of Ranger Based data Collection systems in all participating range states. Mozambique did not have a report.
- Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe had completed designing ground patrol data collection forms and established a list of species and illegal activities to be recorded on ranger patrols.
  - Namibia resolved to retain the Event book used in the Management Oriented Monitoring system (MoMs) for recording patrol data and also to use the Conservation Information (ConInfo) database.
  - South Africa retained the use of Cyber-tracker to record data on ranger patrols and to use the Mommex Database. The database is also linked to South African permitting system.
  - Botswana, Zambia and Zimbabwe adopted MIST database. Botswana would want to integrate MIST with Integrated Wildlife Management Database being developed at national level.

## **12. COUNTRY SUPPORT NEEDS**

- 12.1 Following country presentations, all range States were asked to highlight further technical support needs from MIKE CCU and SSU.
- 12.2 The table below summarizes the country specific support needs highlighted by each country. South Africa and Mozambique were to consult on the needs.

<b>MIKE Activity/Item</b>	<b>Botswana</b>	<b>Namibia</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>Zimbabwe</b>
Ranger training in RBDC and use of new data collection forms	X		X	X
GPS training-Ranger level	X	X	X	X
GIS training for National and Site officers			X	X
Training in aerial sample surveys(including specific block sample counts for Namibia)	X	X	X	X
Acquaint senior Managers on MIKE programme	X		X	X
Support with GPSs	X	X	X	X
Configuration of MIST and ConInfo		X		

### **13. CLOSING REMARKS**

The chair concluded the meeting by thanking all participants for their active contribution and for their cooperation in working hard to deliberate on a long agenda. The chair emphasized the need to take up issues agreed to seriously and further agreed to present issues that were directed to the SADC Wildlife Committee.

Zambia was chosen as the next host country and chair for the next meeting in 2011.

## Annex 1

### MIKE SUB REGIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE 8 FEBRUARY 2010 GABORONE, BOTSWANA PARTICIPANTS LIST

COUNTRY/ ORGANIZATION	Delegate Name	Email	Phone number
BOTSWANA	Dr Cyril Taolo	<a href="mailto:ctaolo@gov.bw">ctaolo@gov.bw</a>	
	Mr Adrian Kholi	<a href="mailto:akholi@gov.bw">akholi@gov.bw</a>	
MALAWI	Mr Ramosh M Jiah	<a href="mailto:ramosh@wildlifemw.net">ramosh@wildlifemw.net</a>	265 888 834 220
MIKE/CCU	Mr Tom de Muleaner	<a href="mailto:Tom.De-Meulenaer@unep.org">Tom.De-Meulenaer@unep.org</a>	
	Mr Julian Blanc	<a href="mailto:Julian.Blanc@unep.org">Julian.Blanc@unep.org</a>	
MIKE/SSU	Mr Tapera Chimuti	<a href="mailto:taperachimuti@citesmike.org">taperachimuti@citesmike.org</a>	
	Mr Ditse Mdluli	<a href="mailto:ditse.mdluli@iucn.org">ditse.mdluli@iucn.org</a>	
MIKE/TAG	Dr Colin Craig	<a href="mailto:deb-col@iafrica.com.na">deb-col@iafrica.com.na</a>	264 81 241 3069
MOZAMBIQUE	Mr Emilia Veronica Polana	<a href="mailto:epolana@yahoo.com.br">epolana@yahoo.com.br</a>	258 82 3140150
NAMIBIA	Ms Louisa Mupetami	<a href="mailto:lmupetami@met.na">lmupetami@met.na</a>	264-61-284 2530
	Ms Kirsti Nghidinwa	<a href="mailto:knghidinwa@met.na">knghidinwa@met.na</a>	264-61-284 2546/7
SOUTH AFRICA	Ms Sonja Meintjes	<a href="mailto:smeintjes@deat.gov.za">smeintjes@deat.gov.za</a>	082 655 4711
TRAFFIC	Mr Tom Milliken	<a href="mailto:Milliken@wwfsarpo.org">Milliken@wwfsarpo.org</a>	
ZAMBIA	Mr Chomba Chansa	<a href="mailto:nyambef@zawa.org.zm">nyambef@zawa.org.zm</a>	260 211278365
	Ms Francesca Chisangano	<a href="mailto:frachisangano@yahoo.com">frachisangano@yahoo.com</a>	260 955 789982
ZIMBABWE	Mr Onias Ngoro	<a href="mailto:ondoro2001@yahoo.com">ondoro2001@yahoo.com</a>	263-4-792786-9
	Mr Tariona Mtsvakiwa	<a href="mailto:mtsvakiwa@yahoo.com">mtsvakiwa@yahoo.com</a>	263-4-707624-9