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Executive Summary

Background

The Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) Phase II project was implemented between April 2006 and December 2012 (including two no-cost extensions) by the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Implementation of the project was made possible through a grant of Euros 9,814,000 (USD 11,178,905) from the European Commission under the Intra-ACP envelope of the 9th European Development Fund (EC Project No. 9 ACP RPR 42), with counterpart in-kind contributions from the participating elephant range States in Africa amounting to USD 3,550,000. MIKE Phase II built on key lessons learnt during MIKE Phase I, which was implemented between November 2001 and April 2004 followed by a period of bridging funding.

This final evaluation of MIKE Phase II was carried out by a two-person team, Dr Robert Malpas (team leader) and Floris D’Udine of the Conservation Development Centre Nairobi, over a 6-month period from December 2012-May 2013. The objectives of the evaluation were as follows:

- to assess MIKE Phase II project performance (in terms of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness) and to identify and examine project outcomes and impacts stemming from the project, including their sustainability;
- to assess the extent to which the project has been able to fulfil the goals and requirements for the MIKE Programme as mandated in CITES Resolution 10.10;
- to identify key lessons learnt from the implementation of MIKE Phase II and make associated recommendations that can form a foundation for the design of follow-on project/programme activities;
- to facilitate learning, feedback and knowledge sharing among CITES, project partners, and participating range State management authorities.

The evaluation used a combination of information collection techniques, including desk review, interviews, field visits (to eight range States and MIKE sites across the continent), and an online survey of MIKE stakeholders. The evaluation team also met with range State management authority directors and members of the MIKE Subregional Steering Committees (SSCs) at the 16th Conference of the Parties (CoP) to CITES held in Bangkok, March 2013.

The evaluation report is divided into five sections. Section 1 provides key background information concerning the MIKE Programme as well as this evaluation; Section 2 looks at the relevance of the MIKE Phase II project in the context of the international and range State needs it was designed to address; Section 3 looks at the effectiveness and efficiency of Phase II project delivery; Section 4 looks at the anticipated ultimate impacts of the Phase II project, including issues of sustainability, scaling up and mainstreaming; and Section 5 looks at key aspects of the project’s implementation and management arrangements, including the key partnerships that underpinned project delivery, the role and functions of project staff, project oversight arrangements, and project administration and financing arrangements.

Importantly, the MIKE Phase II project was not simply a standalone project designed to achieve a specific set of objectives according to the project’s results framework, but was also bound by the broader mandate of the MIKE Programme established by Resolution 10.10 of the CITES Conference of the Parties (CoP10, held in Harare in June 1997), which resolved that a monitoring system be put in place across the entire range of African and Asian elephants, with the aim of providing reliable information on elephant status and trends to inform the dialogue and facilitate decisions by CITES concerning the protected status of elephants. The requirement to fulfil the Resolution 10.10 mandate had important implications for the delivery of Phase II, and also for the framing of this evaluation.

The Resolution 10.10 mandate relates to both the African and Asian elephant populations, however, because the MIKE Phase II project financed by the EC’s Intra-ACP envelope primarily deals with African elephant populations, this evaluation limits itself accordingly.
Relevance

The discussion of relevance is largely based on the original project design, and does not reflect any subsequent adaptations carried out by the Phase II project team in an effort to maximise efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project interventions (discussed in later sections of the report).

Reflecting the two main pillars of the MIKE mandate established in Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), the Phase II results framework is oriented around two main aims: informing appropriate international ivory trade decisions, and strengthening capacity for elephant management, protection and enforcement in the participating range States, through the generation and use of monitoring data. In this regard, the evaluation team felt that the results framework was both appropriate and realistic in terms of achieving the first of these aims - informing the ivory trade decision-making process - and indeed, this aspect of MIKE Phase II was one of its most important successes. In particular, MIKE Phase II’s focus on the robust and impartial analysis of ranger-based monitoring data, rather than relying on third-party or indirect sources of information, was one of the project’s distinguishing features, and has meant that the MIKE Programme has now become, alongside the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS), a crucial component of the international ivory trade decision-making process.

However, the evaluation team questioned whether the MIKE Phase II goal of making a significant contribution to the sustainable management of elephant populations in range States through the application of MIKE-generated monitoring data was a realistic one. Achievement of this goal requires that monitoring information is not simply collected but that there is a corresponding investment, either on the part of the range States themselves or through other donor interventions, to enable participating MIKE sites and range States to actually make practical use of such data. In reality, it will be seen later in this report that, while MIKE Phase II made concerted efforts to enable range States to utilise monitoring data to influence their management practices, with 58 participating MIKE sites across 30 range States, there were simply insufficient financial and human resources to be able to address substantially the comprehensive capacity needs of all the participating sites. To do this, and to achieve lasting impact, would have required a project intervention on a scale of magnitude greatly in excess of the MIKE Phase II project.

In addition, achieving sustainable management of Africa’s elephant populations relies on overcoming a variety of other major challenges and threats facing these populations, not only escalating commercialised poaching and the growing challenges faced by protected areas in mounting law enforcement efforts, but also increasing human-wildlife conflict and loss of elephant habitats. Realistically, the provision of monitoring information on elephant killing and population status, while relevant for international ivory trade decision making, is on its own unlikely to make a significant contribution towards sustainably managed elephant populations, unless other parallel interventions are addressing the broader threats and challenges to these populations.

The evaluation team felt that a basic flaw in the MIKE Phase II project design was to attempt to fulfil both the international policy mandate of MIKE as well as the range State management and capacity building mandate across all 30 range States and 58 sites that participated in MIKE Phase II. Although very challenging in itself, it was both feasible and desirable to collect monitoring data on elephant killing from as many participating range States and MIKE sites as possible, in order to inform international ivory trade decision making. However, it was clearly largely beyond the financial and human resources of the project (or indeed any project) to carry out effective broad-based capacity building in all the range States and sites involved.

The evaluation therefore recommends that any future MIKE project follow-on should more clearly distinguish between fulfilling the international policy mandate of the MIKE Programme, and fulfilling the site management and capacity building mandate. The former mandate can and should continue to be met across a broad set of participating range States and sites as under Phase II, adapted to take account of factors such as the viability of the site’s elephant population and participation of the site in Phase II. The latter mandate - addressing site management capacity needs - should largely focus on a smaller group of priority sites, selected according to criteria based on a “triage strategy”, in which interventions are targeted at those sites where appropriate assistance is likely to lead to significant improvements in elephant conservation and management. The Evaluation further recommends that, in order to achieve the Overall Goal identified by the MIKE Phase II project, follow-on activities to MIKE Phase II should, finances permitting, place greater emphasis on addressing other critical challenges facing elephant population management and protection in Africa.
Efficiency & Effectiveness

In the context of a project’s results framework, the evaluation of a project’s efficiency looks at performance in delivering the identified outputs (in the Phase II logframe, this equates to activities), while effectiveness looks at performance in achieving the desired outcomes (equating to Phase II results). The evaluation’s assessment of efficiency and effectiveness is organised according to the four main outcome areas of the project, broadly corresponding to the four project results.

Monitoring information collection and management

Responding to lessons learnt, early in Phase II the MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU) decided to abandon Phase I’s unpopular MIKE Database and Patrol Form, and to introduce instead a generic protected area monitoring software, Ecological Software Solutions’ Management Information System, or MIST. MIST was already in use in a number of MIKE sites and had several other advantages over the MIKE Database - in particular it was more user-friendly, had GIS spatial analysis capabilities, could be used with other species besides elephants, and was free software.

The adoption and promotion of MIST during Phase II, which commenced in 2008 (the third year of Phase II), was the flagship of the project’s efforts to establish standard monitoring systems in the participating MIKE sites, and was indeed a major success story of the overall project. By 2012 (i.e., in under four years of effort), MIST had become the predominant monitoring system in use at MIKE sites, being used at 85% of sites and in almost 90% of participating range States. Moreover, 26 African range States have taken steps towards adopting MIST for their wider biodiversity and law-enforcement monitoring needs in the MIKE sites, and 16 of these countries are in the process of adopting MIST as their standard ranger-based data collection and data management tool across their entire protected area networks, not just at the MIKE sites.

This substantial progress notwithstanding, there were still important challenges undermining the full adoption and mainstreaming of the MIKE-supported RBM systems by participating range States and sites. There were a wide range of factors responsible for this, including the capacity and commitment of participating sites for carrying out ranger-based monitoring, and their ability to integrate RBM into broader site adaptive management practices (see Capacity for ranger-based monitoring below). However, the evaluation also felt that MIKE Phase II could have done more to consolidate the positive achievements under this outcome area through greater efforts to introduce supportive documentation, operational guidelines and protocols for site-level RBM practices - including data collection, management and analysis - that could eventually be institutionalised into the management practices and standard operating procedures of the participating wildlife authority at both the site and national levels. In this regard, following on from the independent assessment of analytical and data management capacity needs at MIKE sites commissioned by the MIKE CCU in mid-2012, the CCU began to address these needs, by supporting the development of these operational guidelines for the new SMART RBM system.

The evaluation recommends that the production of supporting operational guidelines, protocols and procedures for RBM data collection, management and application be prioritised in Phase II follow-on activities, and that MIKE works with the participating wildlife authorities and sites to adapt and incorporate them into standard operating procedures and management practices in the site and range State concerned. The generic documentation should first be prepared at the international level, but subsequently adapted for the region and range State concerned by the MIKE Subregional Support Officers (SSOs), who should also be responsible for working with the concerned range States to institutionalise the procedures.

Capacity for ranger-based monitoring

The RBM capacity-building support provided by MIKE Phase II did not differ fundamentally from that provided in MIKE Phase I, primarily consisting of training in RBM data collection and management (although in Phase II the focus was MIST rather than the MIKE Database), provision of essential RBM equipment, such as GPSs and computers, and logistical support to MIKE National and Site Officers. The provision of this capacity building support was the primary responsibility of the MIKE SSOs, with a main focus on training in the new MIST system.

It was clear that these training activities were widely appreciated by participating MIKE site and range State staff. Nevertheless, it was also clear that the training provided only partially fulfilled the needs at the participating
sites, especially with regard the practical application of MIST RBM outputs, and that the capacity created was continually being eroded because of turnover of staff. Similarly, with regard the provision of RBM equipment, with a total of 58 sites to support, Phase II only scratched the surface of the actual sites’ RBM-related needs, and in many cases was not able to radically alter the sites’ capacity to carry out effective RBM patrols. In this regard, despite the capacity building support provided during Phase II, many MIKE sites were still unable to carry out effective law enforcement patrols, or could only carry out patrols infrequently, because of insufficient trained staff or funds for rations, fuel, accessibility to the site, and other factors.

Phase II’s inability to radically alter the status of RBM and law enforcement patrolling at the participating MIKE sites can mainly be attributed to the over-ambitious design of the Phase II results framework with regard to its capacity building goals discussed under Relevance above. As noted earlier, the Phase II team recognised these deficiencies in the project design and did their best to overcome them, especially through the promotion of the proven MIST RBM monitoring systems, but with 58 sites to cover, they were evidently limited in what they could achieve.

Although it would clearly be ideal to comprehensively support RBM activities in all MIKE sites, realistically there needs to be a mechanism in place to focus the limited resources at the MIKE Programme’s disposal, since attempting to distribute them on an equitable basis will ultimately only result in their wastage. This **evaluation therefore recommends** that for any follow-on phase, MIKE should adopt a two-pronged approach in which on the one hand, as in Phase II, the programme continues to provide basic capacity building support - i.e., essential training and RBM equipment - to all participating MIKE sites, but with the understanding that this support is unlikely to be sufficient to address the full RBM capacity needs of the sites concerned, and on the other hand the programme provides enhanced capacity building support to a limited number of high priority sites that are selected because of their globally-significant elephant populations, the extent of the threats to that population, and the actual need of the sites concerned.

The evaluation team also felt that, in follow-on MIKE activities, the requirement defined in Resolution 10.10 for range States to begin collecting and compiling data on the law enforcement effort being made to detect and prevent illegal killing and trade in elephants should also be prioritised, by the range States themselves as well as by MIKE. The compilation of such law enforcement and patrol effort data, which is one of the key outputs of both the MIST and SMART monitoring systems, is not only important for the verification and further improvement of the PIKE analysis (see below), but will also serve to provide the CITES CoP as well as the participating range States with vital information on the effectiveness of their law enforcement efforts, and to identify critical sites where greater investment in law enforcement is needed to address worsening poaching situations.

This **evaluation recommends** that in follow-on activities to MIKE Phase II, MIKE’s information requirements should be expanded to collect regular data in participating MIKE sites on a set of benchmarks that reflect the RBM and law enforcement effort underway in these sites, as the foundation for a law enforcement effort analysis to complement the PIKE analysis. A preliminary set of appropriate benchmarks will need to be worked out by the CCU and agreed with the MIKE Technical Advisory Group (TAG) before being field tested. The **evaluation further recommends** that the introduction of the law enforcement benchmarks measurement should be an important future responsibility of the MIKE SSOs (alongside the range States themselves), and that this should be reflected in any future revision of their job description and TORs.

For these recommendations to succeed, it will be vital that the range States themselves begin to take on greater responsibility for the effective implementation of the MIKE Programme, as per the commitments outlined in Resolution 10.10. Although the financial and resource limitations of many of the range States with regard effective protected area management is clear, the evaluation team felt that up until now, many range States have overly relied on MIKE to fulfil the capacity needs for carrying out effective ranger patrols, rather than strengthening their own capacity support to complement the efforts and interventions made by MIKE. The reasons for this may in part relate to the unrealistic expectations surrounding the implementation of the MIKE Programme, a lack of appreciation of the full scope of the programme and the consequent limitations on resources available to individual range States, and the possibility that the range State’s sense of ownership of the MIKE Programme had been undermined by insufficient involvement in the MIKE site selection process at the beginning of Phase I. Another important factor may be that, although MIKE was established and mandated by the range States themselves at a number of CITES CoPs, the programme does not necessarily enjoy the high-level political support from the range States needed to leverage sufficient national support and investment.
Data analysis

This Phase II outcome area primarily addresses the international policy aspects of the MIKE mandate, focusing on the generation of regular and reliable information on the status and trends in elephant population and illegal killing, as a basis for informing decision making concerning the ivory trade at CITES CoP meetings and other international forums. As such, the delivery of this outcome is at the core of the successful achievement of the international component of the MIKE mandate. The main focus of Phase II was on developing a robust and practical analytical framework that had scientific credibility, and then applying the framework in generating appropriate analyses that could inform CITES decision-making.

To overcome the difficulties experienced during MIKE Phase I with collecting appropriate detection effort data, Phase II developed an innovative new approach to analysing carcass information called the “Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants”, or PIKE. PIKE is calculated as the ratio of illegally killed elephants to all carcasses found (both illegally killed and natural deaths), and is based on the assumption that the measure of effort is common to both the numerator and denominator of the ratio, and therefore cancels out. The PIKE analytical approach was first introduced as part of the MIKE Baseline Report submitted to the 55th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in June 2007, although at that stage the analysis had not yet been given its PIKE acronym. Subsequently, the MIKE CCU produced four comprehensive analyses of MIKE data based on PIKE, which were submitted to CoP15 in March 2010 and CoP16 in March 2013, as well as at SC61 in August 2011 and at SC62 in July 2012. The production of these reports on MIKE’s analytical findings represented a significant milestone in the history of the MIKE Programme. After a decade of investment and effort in MIKE Phases I and II, the MIKE Programme had finally begun producing the kind of robust and credible analyses of elephant illegal killing information that was foreseen in the Resolution 10.10 mandate.

The PIKE analysis is now widely accepted as a pragmatic and promising analytical approach, whose usefulness has been confirmed by the conformity between PIKE projections on illegal killing of elephants with ivory trade information that has been generated by ETIS. The MIKE CCU and the TAG are both to be commended for the efforts invested in enabling the MIKE Programme to produce a robust and scientifically-credible analysis that could appropriately inform CITES decision-making processes. The recent developments in the MIKE analysis being pioneered by the CCU and the TAG aimed at generating site-level data on estimated elephant mortality rates due to illegal killing, based on PIKE and estimates of natural mortality rates, are especially promising for making the MIKE analysis more relevant to site-level management as well as international needs, and the Evaluation recommends that the further development and field testing of these aspects should be prioritised in future phases of MIKE.

Despite the usefulness of the PIKE analysis, the MIKE CCU and TAG both recognised the potential limitations of the approach. In this regard, the key areas where the PIKE analysis needed to be validated were eventually consolidated at the MIKE Standard Analytical & Reporting Framework (SARF) Workshop held in May 2011, including the need to carry out further studies on issues such as: the reliability of within-site carcass data; the influence of patrol coverage and effort on site-level detection probability, the influence of the cause of elephant death on detection probability; and the influence of changes in elephant mortality and the history of illegal killing at the site. In response, the MIKE CCU subsequently initiated studies designed to validate the PIKE analysis.

The other important development in MIKE’s reporting was the effort invested during Phase II to integrate MIKE reporting with that of its sister programme ETIS, as well as elephant population status data being produced by AfESG/AED. This integration of elephant data from the various sources makes eminent sense, and has the potential of providing a still stronger understanding of the status of elephant populations in Africa and the key threats impacting on them. Phase II has made good progress with this integration, and forums such as the TAG and the African Elephant Meetings are important mechanisms for building future collaboration and integration. In this regard, the proposal to develop a Standard Analytical and Reporting Framework that incorporates MIKE, ETIS and AfESG/AED-generated information makes perfect sense, and is timely considering the important changes that have taken place concerning the MIKE data analysis during Phase II, and the work that MIKE, ETIS and AfESG/AED have already done to implicitly develop such a joint SARF through the production of integrated reports to the CITES Standing Committee.

This evaluation recommends that in a follow-on phase of MIKE, an integrated MIKE-ETIS-AfESG/AED SARF is developed and documented to consolidate the progress that has been made in joint reporting by the three
programmes. **The evaluation further recommends** that this joint analytical and reporting framework be backed up by efforts to strengthen the collaboration between the three programmes, in particular through putting in place enhanced collaboration arrangements between them.

With regard the sometimes controversial issue of MIKE site selection, the evaluation appreciated the recent discussions held during the 10th meeting of the TAG in this regard, and the requirement to shift emphasis away from issues concerning the statistical representativeness of existing MIKE sites, to the much more important issue of ensuring the quality and quantity of data produced at existing MIKE sites. In this regard, **the evaluation supports the recommendation** of the TAG that future phases of MIKE should take a more pragmatic approach concerning the selection and participation of MIKE sites, and should instead focus efforts on ensuring that data from individual MIKE sites is of a high standard, regularly produced, and representative of the site concerned.

**Collaboration & coordination**

As an internationally-mandated programme being implemented under the auspices of the CITES Conference of the Parties, with currently 30 participating range States, as well as various international partners, and whose credibility and ultimate impact is heavily dependent on the quality, timeliness and relevance of its information outputs, the coordination, collaboration and technical oversight mechanisms established by the MIKE Programme are clearly of critical importance to the success of the project. In this regard, all three of the coordination and oversight mechanisms utilised during Phase II – the Subregional Steering Committees, African Elephant Meetings and the TAG – had already been established in MIKE Phase I and were simply continued during Phase II, with improvements based on lessons learnt. All three mechanisms are costly both in terms of finance and human resources. Nevertheless, the views expressed to the evaluation team by the various MIKE stakeholders – both from participating range States and from the MIKE staff and major partners – indicated that the mechanisms are generally regarded as an important component for the successful delivery of the project, and provided good value for money.

The MIKE Subregional Steering Committees (SSCs) were established during MIKE Phase I as a mechanism for engaging range States in the sub-region concerned in overseeing the implementation of MIKE, and also to strengthen collaboration between participating range States in the sub-region. During Phase II, a total of 20 SSC meetings were held (4 for Eastern Africa, 4 for Southern Africa, 7 for Central Africa, and 5 for West Africa). While the SSCs have played an important role in ensuring range State engagement in MIKE implementation, it is also clear that the functioning of these meetings could potentially be enhanced to make them more effective. In particular, the evaluation felt that the SSCs could in future play an important role in overseeing monitoring of site-level RBM and law enforcement benchmarks which should be established as recommended previously, and in promoting improved performance against these benchmarks. The evaluation also felt that the SSCs could potentially be more effective if they also involved key non-governmental organisations working in the subregion concerned. Although such NGOs are sometimes invited to participate in the SSCs, they have no formal membership of the committees. **The evaluation therefore recommends** that the roles and responsibilities of the SSCs be reviewed and revised for any future phases of MIKE, taking into account lessons learnt from their operation in Phase II, and these recommendations.

Although the African Elephant Meetings formed an important additional mechanism for ensuring the effective delivery of both MIKE and ETIS, they were chiefly convened not so much for the MIKE and ETIS programmes per se, but to provide a forum for African elephant range States to work together to address broader elephant conservation and management issues and solutions. In this regard, an especially important function of the African Elephant Meetings during Phase II was the development of the African Elephant Action Plan, as well as its associated funding mechanism, the African Elephant Fund, the development of which had been previously mandated by CITES Decisions 14.75 and 14.79 respectively.

The MIKE-ETIS TAG is responsible for providing technical oversight and support to both MIKE and ETIS, and comprises of both global and regional elephant conservation experts and other specialist skills, such as statistics. In this regard, the TAG has played a crucial role in the development of MIKE’s analytical processes and standards, in particular the PIKE analysis, and in ensuring that MIKE’s analytical outputs are statistically relevant and scientifically robust. The specific contributions of the TAG in this regard are identified in the relevant sections of this evaluation report.
Impact & Sustainability

Since impacts are only realised after many years, it is not realistic to directly measure the delivery of impacts at the end of the project. Instead, a mechanism is needed to assess the likelihood that the project will make a contribution towards achieving impact; i.e. to identify and then assess a proxy, or proxies, of the delivery of impact. To achieve this, the evaluation used the Global Environment Facility’s (GEF) Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) methodology for evaluating the anticipated impacts of a project, based on the Phase II project’s Theory of Change that was developed during the evaluation inception phase, a simplified form of which is given in Annex 5. The ROtI methodology identifies three critical sets of factors in the path towards delivering eventual impacts - Impact Drivers (factors within the ability of the project to influence), Assumptions (factors beyond the ability of the project to influence), and Intermediate States (transitional conditions between the project’s outcomes and impacts that must be achieved in order to deliver the intended impacts).

The evaluation’s analysis of the Phase II Theory of Change identified two Intermediate States that needed to be achieved:

- Intermediate State #1: Biodiversity monitoring is fully integrated into range States’ national wildlife decision-making and management systems at both national and site levels
- Intermediate State #2: MIKE generated biodiversity monitoring information is effectively informing international conservation and trade decision making on a sustainable basis

These two Intermediate States reflect the two main components of the MIKE mandate, respectively dealing with building capacity for biodiversity monitoring at the national and site level, and the role of MIKE in international decision making concerning elephant conservation and the ivory trade.

Overall, the evaluation team felt that MIKE Phase II has made significant progress in moving towards eventual impacts, and in particular in putting in place the key factors to ensure integration of the MIKE monitoring systems at national and site levels, as well as enhancing the credibility of MIKE-generated data in international decision-making concerning elephant conservation and ivory trade action. Crucially, Phase II has radically transformed the situation prevailing at the end of Phase I, when there was only limited buy-in to the MIKE monitoring systems, and the programme was unable to produce regular and reliable information on illegal killing of elephants. Despite this broad success story, a number of key factors continue to impact on the sustainability and scaling up of the MIKE Programme, discussed below.

National and site-level integration of biodiversity monitoring

The introduction of the MIST monitoring system represented a major step forward in providing participating range States and MIKE sites with a well-tested, generic and relatively simple monitoring system that could be used to collect monitoring data on other species and management aspects beyond the MIKE-specific needs. However, weaknesses in the MIST system design with regard data analysis coupled with the inability of Phase II to build capacity in participating sites in the application of MIST data in addressing the site’s broader law enforcement and adaptive management needs meant that by the end of Phase II, the majority of sites were unable to make effective use of their monitoring data for informing their management processes, with the system still chiefly being used for the production of MIKE data for international use. This in turn inevitably detracted from site’s commitment to and ultimate ownership over (and therefore sustainability of) the RBM systems. The MIKE CCU recognised the shortcomings of MIST with regard to the application of RBM data in adaptive PA management, and towards the end of Phase II actively engaged in the development of a more user-friendly and advanced system, SMART.

In follow-on MIKE interventions, the Evaluation recommends that MIKE supports the piloting of the SMART software in selected sites and, depending on the success of this piloting, supports the gradual adoption and rolling out of SMART in other sites. However, there will continue to be a need to support the use of MIST in a number of MIKE sites for a number of years, and MIKE will therefore need to continue providing training and mentoring support for MIST where it is still in use. It is further recommended that follow-on MIKE interventions provide additional support and training for the use of both SMART and MIST in addressing the various adaptive management needs of participating MIKE sites, for example in ranger patrol planning, identifying poaching hotspots, fire response and management, etc. Because of the large number of MIKE sites involved, this
additional support for enhancing the adaptive management capabilities of monitoring systems should, as recommended earlier, ideally be provided in a limited number of priority MIKE sites, so that the systems and capacity can be adequately developed, and then further rolled out to other lower-priority sites as resources permit.

The establishment of sustainable capacity for the operation of the MIKE monitoring systems at both site and national levels is possibly the most significant challenge to the achievement of long-term impact by the MIKE Programme. There are two key dimensions to this capacity challenge - human resources and financial/material resources. MIKE Phase II attempted to address both of these challenges, but as described above, these efforts were confounded by a range of factors, including high turnover of staff in participating sites and range State wildlife management agencies, inadequate material and financial resources to mount RBM and law enforcement patrols, and the lack of mainstreaming of the RBM systems in the institutional and operational procedures of many of the participating agencies and sites. All these factors are symptomatic of an even greater underlying issue - the commitment and wherewithal of the participating range States to prioritise and provide adequate resources to manage their protected areas effectively and sustainably. While follow-on MIKE activities can, based on lessons learnt, potentially be enhanced in order to have a greater impact on management capacity (for example through the introduction of the SMART monitoring system), ultimately these efforts are unlikely to be sustainable and to achieve the desired impact on elephant conservation without a strengthened political commitment on the part of the range States, leading to improved allocation of resources for PA management.

As far as MIKE’s own capacity building interventions are concerned, as noted previously, more effort is needed to ensure that the outputs of RBM are made relevant at both the site and national levels, not just at the international level. Also noted earlier, it is not realistic to achieve this in every MIKE site, and in the view of the evaluation team, it will inevitably be necessary to focus these efforts on a limited number of priority sites where more can be achieved with the limited resources available. The evaluation therefore recommends that in follow-on MIKE activities, the programme provides more intensive capacity building support in a limited number of priority sites. At these sites, the emphasis should be on ensuring that RBM information is relevant to PA managers, and that RBM practices are eventually institutionalised, and become an integral and vital part of day-to-day site management.

Use of MIKE data in international decision making

MIKE Phase II has made significant strides in producing and reporting robust and scientifically credible analyses of ranger-based monitoring data on illegal killing of elephants that can be used in international decision making, especially at CITES CoPs. However, the lack of a permanent subregional mechanism for supporting the continuing collection of MIKE data from the participating range States and MIKE sites represents an important challenge to the long-term sustainability of the programme once project funding expires. In this regard, while the IUCN Regional Offices have provided an appropriate home for the MIKE SSOs during Phase II, this is realistically only a temporary arrangement dependant on continuing project funding mechanism to enable MIKE to engage with and support participating range States. The issue of institutionalising MIKE at the subregional level was never a priority for Phase II, and implicitly this was an issue to be addressed in a follow-on phase of MIKE.

Similarly, the Phase II project design did not explicitly define activities aimed at establishing long-term institutional and financing mechanisms for MIKE at the international level, although the Phase II Project Purpose implies that Phase II will lead to a monitoring system being established “on a long-term sustainable basis”. In this regard, although the MIKE Programme is mandated by the CoP, the CITES Parties have not so far supported the inclusion of MIKE core costs into the recurrent CITES core budget (the Trust Fund), even though this issue was raised by the CITES Secretariat at both CoP14 and CoP15. Had the Parties agreed to this, the long-term sustainability of the MIKE Programme would have been significantly enhanced.

Despite the active participation of the range States and of relevant non-governmental organisations working both nationally, subregionally and internationally, the MIKE Programme remains primarily a CITES programme, and is viewed by most MIKE stakeholders as such - an external programme performing an important function, but not yet owned by the stakeholders themselves. Whatever the reasons, the evaluation felt that the MIKE Programme has at the end of Phase II come of age - it has largely succeeded in fulfilling its immediate international policy mandate, and now needs to change gear to work on the development of long-term sustainability at all four levels of its operation - site, national, subregional, and international.
Project implementation & management

Overall supervisory responsibility for the MIKE Programme under CITES CoP Resolution 10.10 has been given to the CITES Standing Committee, which in turn has delegated supervisory responsibility to the MIKE-ETIS Sub-Group. In terms of day-to-day supervisory responsibility for MIKE Programme implementation, the CITES Secretariat has established the MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU) based in Nairobi, as well as four Sub-regional Support Units (SSUs) in each of the four CITES-recognised sub-regions (based in Nairobi, Pretoria, Yaoundé and Ouagadougou respectively).

The MIKE CCU is staffed by the MIKE Coordinator, the MIKE Data Analyst, and two support staff. In practice however, MIKE Phase II was without a CCU from September 2006 until April 2007, when both the MIKE Coordinator and the MIKE Data Analyst were recruited. The MIKE Coordinator then left the CCU in November 2011 to take up a position with the CITES Secretariat in Geneva, after which the MIKE Data Analyst assumed this role in an acting capacity. As a result, the MIKE CCU was understaffed both for the first and last year of Phase II, and this is likely to have had an impact on the CCU’s ability to oversee and provide support to the SSUs, as well as to undertake other CCU roles. Nevertheless, the CCU made some of its more significant achievements in the latter part of Phase II.

During Phase II, the MIKE CCU was physically located in the UNEP Division of Environmental Law & Conventions (DELC) in Nairobi, under direct supervision by the CITES Secretariat and with administrative and financial support services provided by the United Nations Office in Nairobi (UNON). This represented a shift from Phase I, when the CCU was administratively located within the IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office in Nairobi (albeit in separate premises), and reflected a desire by the CITES Secretariat to make the CCU a more integral part of the Secretariat. As noted by the Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation, the shift undoubtedly resulted in significantly higher CCU running costs; however, it was also clear that the closer integration of the CCU with the CITES Secretariat had significant benefits for both sides. For this reason, the evaluation concluded that overall, while difficult to evaluate in monetary terms, the institutional and administrative arrangements for the CCU in Phase II most probably resulted in net positive benefits for the long-term implementation of the MIKE Programme.

The MIKE SSUs are a crucial delivery mechanism for the practical implementation of the MIKE Programme in the participating range States. In both MIKE Phases I and II, the main focus has been on ensuring that the MIKE Programme activities are effectively and efficiently delivered on the ground, and little attention was paid to the long-term sustainability of the SSUs. Whereas the hosting of the SSUs by the IUCN Regional Offices represented an effective short-term delivery arrangement, it is less clear that this arrangement is the appropriate one in the long-term, since IUCN’s willingness and ability to continue hosting the SSUs depends on the continuation of project funding for the services provided by the Regional Offices. The evaluation recommends that the sustainability of the SSUs forms an important dimension of MIKE follow-on activities, including options for institutionalising the SSUs into existing regional bodies such as SADC and ECOWAS. In this regard, the MIKE 3.0 project is already looking into these possibilities.

Also related to the functioning of the SSUs, there is a need to re-examine the role of the Subregional Support Officers, with a view to enhancing their accountability and reporting relationships with the CCU. In this regard, the Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation recommended that, in order to increase efficiency and to ensure appropriate equity in SSO support to range States and MIKE sites, the SSO Terms of Reference should be re-evaluated and performance criteria drawn up against which SSO activities could be monitored by the CCU. This evaluation agrees with this recommendation, and also recommends that this be combined with enhanced monitoring of SSO activities and deliverables, potentially linked to enhanced site-level law enforcement benchmarks, and enhanced performance appraisal.

There are essentially three main levels of engagement of participating range States in the MIKE Programme - the MIKE Subregional Steering Committee Member (usually the Director of Wildlife), the MIKE National Officer, who is responsible for overseeing and providing support for the collection and synthesis of ranger-based monitoring data at the MIKE sites, and the MIKE Site Officer, responsible for the implementation of MIKE-supported RBM practices at the site concerned. The distinction between the various roles has been recognised by both MIKE Phase I and Phase II, but in practice, there has been significant confusion over the filling of these positions. The filling of these roles is the sole prerogative of the participating range State, not of MIKE, but nevertheless, the evaluation team felt that the project could have done more to clarify the actual roles and responsibilities with
regard the range State’s involvement in the MIKE Programme at the national and site level, through the production of clear Terms of Reference that are discussed and agreed with the range State and sites concerned. Although Terms of Reference for National and Site Officers are included in the Phase II Project Document, the range States were not parties to this document, and it was not clear that Phase II undertook any structured process to agree the various roles and responsibilities with participating countries and sites, instead relying on the mechanisms that were previously established in Phase I.

**The evaluation recommends** that in any follow-on phase of the MIKE Programme, the roles and responsibilities of the different range State officers participating in MIKE should be reviewed and updated according to lessons learnt, and that thereafter the MIKE CCU and SSUs should carry out an exercise to review and agree the revised roles and responsibilities with the participating range States. This could be carried out at a Subregional Steering Committee meeting, and combined with discussions of the range State’s commitments to the implementation of the MIKE Programme and the monitoring of MIKE Site law enforcement benchmarks as discussed previously. In carrying out these negotiations, **the evaluation further recommends** that greater emphasis should be placed on the roles and responsibilities of range State officers participating in MIKE, rather than on the titles of MIKE National Officer and MIKE Site Officer as such. So long as the range State nominates a focal point for all MIKE implementation contacts and communication, there is no need to have the formal titles, which may serve to enhance MIKE edifices, rather than encouraging the range States to mainstream and operationalize MIKE-related monitoring systems in their own management structures.

The MIKE Phase II project has developed strong partnership arrangements with both ETIS and the AfESG, as demonstrated by the integrated outputs now being produced by the three organisations – such as the integrated reporting to the CITES Standing Committee in 2011 and 2012, as well as the Rapid Response Assessment report, *Elephants in the Dust*, produced in 2013. Despite this strong practical progress, the evaluation team felt that, considering the importance of this collaboration in the delivery of Resolution 10.10, it would be helpful if an explicit collaboration framework could be put into place between the three programmes. This would help to still further enhance the partnership as well as the information outputs. In this regard, **the evaluation recommends** that the MIKE-ETIS-AfESG collaboration arrangements and roles and responsibilities be further elaborated in the Standard Analytical Reporting Framework (SARF) document recommended previously.

With regard monitoring the implementation of the MIKE Programme, **the evaluation recommends** that the efforts to establish an explicit MIKE Implementation Monitoring System (MIMS) that have commenced in the MIKE 3.0 project be strengthened still further in any follow-on phase of MIKE, linked to the development of law enforcement and management effort benchmarks as discussed previously. MIMS is likely to contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the MIKE Programme in several ways: it will provide a basis for monitoring implementation performance, for focusing the SSUs on priority needs, and also as a means of monitoring the achievements and challenges of the participating range States and MIKE sites in strengthening law enforcement and in protecting their elephant populations.
**Summary Table of Key Actionable Evaluation Findings & Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Reference in Main Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Relevance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MIKE Phase II project design attempted to fulfil both the international policy mandate of MIKE as well as the range State management and capacity building mandate across all 30 range States and 58 sites that participated in MIKE Phase II. While it was feasible and desirable to collect monitoring data on elephant killing from as many participating range States and MIKE sites as possible, it was largely beyond the financial and human resources of the project to carry out effective broad-based capacity building in all the range States and sites involved.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #1</strong>: In future, the MIKE Programme should more clearly distinguish between its international policy and site management and capacity building mandates. The former mandate can and should continue to be met across a broad set of participating range States and sites, adapted to take account of factors such as the viability of each site’s elephant population and participation of the site in Phase II. The site management capacity mandate should, however, focus on a smaller group of priority sites, selected according to criteria based on a “triage strategy”, in which interventions are targeted at those sites where appropriate assistance is likely to lead to significant improvements in elephant conservation and management.</td>
<td>Para. 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #2</strong>: In order to achieve the Overall Goal identified by the MIKE Phase II project, follow-on activities to MIKE Phase II should, finances permitting, place greater emphasis on addressing other critical challenges facing elephant population management and protection in Africa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficiency &amp; Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The adoption and promotion of the MIST monitoring system was the flagship of the project’s efforts to establish standard monitoring systems in the participating MIKE sites, and was a major success story of the overall project. By 2012 (i.e., in under four years of effort), MIST had become the predominant monitoring system in use at MIKE sites, being used at 85% of sites and in almost 90% of participating range States. This substantial progress notwithstanding, there were still important challenges undermining the full adoption and mainstreaming of MIKE-supported RBM systems by participating range States and sites.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #3</strong>: The production of supporting operational guidelines, protocols and procedures for RBM data collection, management and application should be prioritised in Phase II follow-on activities, and MIKE should work with the participating wildlife authorities and sites to adapt and incorporate them into standard operating procedures and management practices at the sites and range State concerned. The generic documentation should first be prepared at the international level, but subsequently adapted for the region and range States concerned by the MIKE Subregional Support Officers (SSOs), who should also be responsible for working with the concerned range States to institutionalise the procedures.</td>
<td>Para. 44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The evaluation felt that MIKE Phase II could have done more to consolidate these positive achievements through greater efforts to introduce supportive documentation, operational guidelines and protocols for site-level RBM practices that could eventually be institutionalised into the management practices and standard operating procedures of the participating wildlife authority at both the site and national levels. The MIKE CCU began to address these needs towards the end of the project by supporting the development of these operational guidelines for the new SMART RBM system.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finding</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Reference in Main Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>While MIKE Phase II’s training activities were widely appreciated by participating MIKE site and range State staff, they only partially fulfilled the needs at the participating sites. Additionally, the capacity created was continually being eroded because of turnover of staff. Similarly, with regard the provision of RBM equipment, with a total of 58 sites to support, Phase II only scratched the surface of the actual sites’ RBM-related needs, and in many cases was not able to radically alter the sites’ capacity to carry out effective RBM patrols.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #4</strong>: In future, MIKE should adopt a two-pronged approach whereby the programme continues to provide basic capacity building support - i.e., essential training and RBM equipment - to all participating MIKE sites, but with the understanding that this support is unlikely to be sufficient to address the full RBM capacity needs of the sites concerned, and on the other hand the programme provides enhanced capacity building support to a limited number of high priority sites that are selected because of their globally-significant elephant populations, the extent of the threats to that population, and the actual needs of the sites concerned.</td>
<td>Para. 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As part of Resolution 10.10, the elephant range States commit themselves to begin collecting and compiling data on the law enforcement efforts being made to detect and prevent illegal killing and trade in elephants. The compilation of such law enforcement and patrol effort data is not only important for the verification and further improvement of the PIKE analysis, but will also serve to provide the CITES CoP as well as the participating range States with vital information on the effectiveness of their law enforcement efforts. This process will also facilitate the identification of critical sites where greater investment in law enforcement is needed to address worsening poaching situations.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #5</strong>: In future, MIKE’s information requirements should be expanded to collect regular data at participating MIKE sites on a set of benchmarks that reflect the RBM and law enforcement effort underway at these sites, as the foundation for a law enforcement effort analysis to complement the PIKE analysis.</td>
<td>Para. 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To overcome the difficulties experienced during MIKE Phase I with collecting appropriate detection effort data, Phase II developed an innovative new approach to analysing carcass information called the “Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants”, or PIKE. During Phase II, the MIKE CCU produced four comprehensive analyses of MIKE data based on PIKE, which were submitted to CoP15 in March 2010 and CoP16 in March 2013, as well as at SC61 in August 2011 and at SC623 in July 2012. The production of these reports on MIKE’s analytical findings represented a significant milestone in the history of the MIKE Programme. The PIKE analysis is now widely accepted as a pragmatic and promising analytical approach, whose usefulness has been confirmed by the conformity between PIKE projections on illegal killing of elephants with ivory trade information that has been generated by ETIS. The MIKE CCU and the TAG are both to be commended for the efforts invested in enabling the MIKE Programme to produce a robust and scientifically-credible analysis that could appropriately inform CITES decision-making processes.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #6</strong>: The introduction of the law enforcement benchmarks measurement should be an important future responsibility of the MIKE SSOs (alongside the range States themselves), and this should be reflected in any future revision of their job description and TORs. For these recommendations to succeed, it will be vital that the range States themselves begin to take on greater responsibility for the effective implementation of the MIKE Programme, as per the commitments outlined in Resolution 10.10.</td>
<td>Para. 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Reference in Main Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementing the development of PIKE, during Phase II, the MIKE CCU made a significant effort to integrate MIKE reporting with that of its sister programme ETIS, as well as elephant population status data produced by AFESG/AED. This integration of elephant data from the various sources makes eminent sense, and has the potential of providing a still stronger understanding of the status of elephant populations in Africa and the key threats impacting on them.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #8: An integrated MIKE-ETIS-AFESG/AED Standard Analytical &amp; Reporting Framework should be developed and documented to consolidate the progress that has been made in joint reporting by the three programmes. This joint analytical and reporting framework should be backed up by efforts to strengthen collaboration between the three programmes, in particular through putting in place enhanced collaboration arrangements between them.</strong></td>
<td>Para. 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of selecting MIKE sites used during Phase I was controversial, and the selection criteria remained an issue during Phase II. However, at the 10th TAG meeting, it was agreed that the statistical representativeness of existing MIKE sites was not the priority concern, and that more emphasis needs to be put on ensuring the quality and quantity of data produced at existing MIKE sites.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #9: Future phases of MIKE should take a more pragmatic approach concerning the selection and participation of MIKE sites, and should instead focus efforts on ensuring that data from individual MIKE sites is of a high standard, regularly produced, and representative of the site concerned.</strong></td>
<td>Para. 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MIKE Subregional Steering Committees (SSCs) were established during MIKE Phase I as a mechanism for engaging range States in the sub-region concerned in overseeing the implementation of MIKE, and also to strengthen collaboration between participating range States in the sub-region. While the SSCs have played an important role in ensuring range State engagement in MIKE implementation during Phase II, it was also clear that the functioning of these meetings could potentially be enhanced to make them more effective.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #10: The roles and responsibilities of the SSCs should be reviewed and revised for any future phases of MIKE, taking into account lessons learnt from their operation in Phase II. In particular, the SSCs could play an important role in overseeing monitoring of site-level RBM and law enforcement benchmarks, and in promoting improved performance against these benchmarks. The SSCs could also potentially be more effective if they also involved key non-governmental organisations working in the sub-region concerned.</strong></td>
<td>Para. 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Impact &amp; Sustainability</strong></td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #11: MIKE should continue to support the piloting of the SMART software in selected sites and, depending on the success of this piloting, support the gradual adoption and rolling out of SMART in other sites. However, there will continue to be a need to support the use of MIST in a number of MIKE sites for a number of years, and MIKE will therefore need to continue providing training and mentoring support for MIST where it is still in use.</strong></td>
<td>Para. 138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE Phase II has made significant progress in moving towards eventual impacts, and in particular in putting in place the key factors to ensure integration of the MIKE monitoring systems at national and site levels, as well as enhancing the credibility of MIKE-generated data in international decision-making concerning elephant conservation and ivory trade action. Crucially, Phase II has radically transformed the situation prevailing at the end of Phase I, when there was only limited buy-in to the MIKE monitoring systems, and the programme was unable to produce regular and reliable information on illegal killing of elephants.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #12: In future, MIKE should provide additional support and training for the use of both SMART and MIST in addressing the various adaptive management</strong></td>
<td>Para. 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The introduction of the MIST monitoring system represented a major step forward in providing participating range States and MIKE sites with a well-tested, broadly applicable and relatively simple monitoring system. However, weaknesses in the MIST system design with regard data analysis coupled with the inability of Phase II to build capacity in participating sites in the application of MIST data in addressing the site’s broader law enforcement and adaptive management needs meant that by the end of Phase II, the majority of sites were unable to make effective use of their monitoring data for informing their management processes, with the system still chiefly being used for the production of MIKE data for international use. This in turn inevitably detracted</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #13: MIST should continue to be supported to improve the software, and to ensure that it can be easily integrated with other systems, allowing for more efficient data analysis and more effective decision-making.</strong></td>
<td>Para. 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Reference in Main Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from site’s commitment to and ultimate ownership over (and therefore sustainability of) the RBM systems. The MIKE CCU recognised the shortcomings of MIIST, and towards the end of Phase II actively engaged in the development of a more user-friendly and advanced system, SMART.</td>
<td>needs of participating MIKE sites, for example in ranger patrol planning, identifying poaching hotspots, fire response and management, etc. Because of the large number of MIKE sites involved, this additional support for enhancing the adaptive management capabilities of monitoring systems should ideally be provided in a limited number of priority MIKE sites, so that the systems and capacity can be adequately developed, and then further rolled out to other lower-priority sites as resources permit.</td>
<td>Para. 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of sustainable capacity for the operation of the MIKE monitoring systems at both site and national levels is possibly the most significant challenge to the achievement of long-term impact by the MIKE Programme. There are two key dimensions to this capacity challenge - human resources and financial/material resources. MIKE Phase II attempted to address both of these challenges, but these efforts were confounded by a range of factors, many of which were symptomatic of an even greater underlying issue - the commitment and wherewithal of the participating range States to prioritise and provide adequate resources to manage their protected areas effectively and sustainably.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #13:</strong> Ultimately, MIKE’s capacity building efforts are unlikely to be sustainable and to achieve the desired impact on elephant conservation without a strengthened political commitment on the part of the range States, leading to improved allocation of resources for PA management. Nevertheless, MIKE can enhance the sustainability of its capacity building efforts by focusing on a limited number of priority sites where more can be achieved with the limited resources available. At these sites, the emphasis should be on ensuring that RBM information is relevant to PA managers, and that RBM practices are eventually institutionalised, and become an integral and vital part of day-to-day site management.</td>
<td>Para. 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project implementation &amp; management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MIKE SSUs are a crucial delivery mechanism for the practical implementation of the MIKE Programme in the participating range States. While the IUCN Regional Offices have provided an appropriate home for the MIKE SSOS during Phase II, this is realistically only a temporary arrangement dependant on continuing project funding. In phase II, the issue of ensuring the long-term sustainability of the SSUs was implicitly left to a follow-on phase of MIKE.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #14:</strong> The lack of a permanent subregional mechanism for supporting the continuing collection of MIKE data from the participating range States and MIKE sites represents an important challenge to the long-term sustainability of MIKE once project funding expires. The sustainability of the SSUs should form an important dimension of MIKE follow-on activities, including options for institutionalising the SSUs into existing regional bodies such as SADC and ECOWAS.</td>
<td>Para. 177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation recommended that in order to increase efficiency and to ensure appropriate equity in SSO support to range States and MIKE sites, the SSO Terms of Reference should be re-evaluated and performance criteria drawn up against which SSO activities could be monitored by the CCU. This evaluation agrees that, along with efforts to identify a sustainable future for the SSUs, there is a need to re-examine the role of the SSUs with a view to enhancing their accountability and reporting relationships with the CCU.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #15:</strong> In future, the monitoring of SSO activities and deliverables should be strengthened, with a view to enhancing their accountability and reporting relationships with the CCU. This could potentially be linked to enhanced site-level law enforcement benchmarks, and enhanced performance appraisal.</td>
<td>Para. 180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are three main levels of engagement of participating range States in the MIKE Programme - the MIKE Subregional Steering Committee Member (usually the Director of Wildlife), the MIKE National Officer, who is responsible for overseeing and providing support for the collection and synthesis of ranger-based monitoring data at the MIKE sites, and the MIKE Site Officer, responsible for the implementation of MIKE-supported RBM practices at the site concerned. The distinction between the various roles has been recognised by both MIKE Phase I and Phase II, but in practice, there has been need...</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #16:</strong> The roles and responsibilities of the different range State officers participating in MIKE should be reviewed and updated according to lessons learnt, and thereafter the MIKE CCU and SSUs should carry out an exercise to review and agree the revised roles and responsibilities with the participating range States. This could be carried out at a Subregional Steering Committee meeting, and combined with discussions of the range State’s commitments to the implementation of the MIKE Programme and the monitoring of MIKE Site law enforcement benchmarks. Further...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Reference in Main Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>significant confusion over the filling of these positions. While this is the sole prerogative of the range state concerned, MIKE could potentially do more to clarify the actual roles and responsibilities with regard to the range State’s involvement in the MIKE Programme at the national and site level.</td>
<td>more, greater emphasis should be placed on the roles and responsibilities of range State officers participating in MIKE, rather than on the titles of MIKE National Officer and MIKE Site Officer as such.</td>
<td>Para. 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The MIKE Phase II project has developed strong partnership arrangements with both ETIS and the AFESG, as demonstrated by the integrated outputs now being produced by the three organisations - such as the integrated reporting to the CITES Standing Committee in 2011 and 2012, as well as the Rapid Response Assessment report, Elephants in the Dust, produced in 2013.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation 17:</strong> Despite this strong practical progress, considering the importance of this collaboration in the delivery of Resolution 10.10, it would be helpful if an explicit collaboration framework between the three programmes could be put into place. This would help to still further enhance the partnership as well as the information outputs. In this regard, the MIKE-ETIS-AFESG collaboration arrangements and roles and responsibilities could be further elaborated in the Standard Analytical Reporting Framework (SARF) document.</td>
<td>Para. 185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of a MIKE Implementation Monitoring System (MIMS) is likely to contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the MIKE Programme in several ways: it will provide a basis for monitoring implementation performance, for focusing the SSUs on priority needs, and will also serve as a means of monitoring the achievements and challenges of the participating range States and MIKE sites in strengthening law enforcement and in protecting their elephant populations.</td>
<td><strong>Recommendation #18:</strong> The efforts to establish MIMS that have commenced in the MIKE 3.0 project should be strengthened still further in any follow-on phase of MIKE, linked to the development of law enforcement and management effort benchmarks as discussed previously.</td>
<td>Para. 196</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Background

1.1 Introduction

1. The Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) Phase II project was implemented between April 2006 and December 2012 (including two no-cost extensions) by the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Implementation of the project was made possible through a grant of Euros 9,814,000 (USD 11,178,905) from the European Commission under the Intra-ACP envelope of the 9th European Development Fund (EC Project No. 9 ACP RPR 42), with counterpart in-kind contributions from the participating elephant range States in Africa amounting to USD 3,550,000. MIKE Phase II built on key lessons learnt during MIKE Phase I, which was implemented between November 2001 and April 2004 followed by a period of bridging funding, and was independently evaluated in September 2004.¹

2. The MIKE Phase II project financing agreement makes provision for carrying out a mid-term evaluation in the second part of the third year of the project, and a final evaluation at the end of the project. This report presents the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the final evaluation, which also takes into account the findings of the mid-term evaluation², as well as a variety of other comprehensive and informative specialist assessments, studies and stakeholder workshops that have been carried out throughout the implementation of Phase II. These rich information sources for the evaluation are listed in footnotes to the main body of findings presented here, as well as more systematically in Annex 7.

3. The evaluation was carried out by a two-person team, Dr Robert Malpas (team leader) and Floris D’Udine³, both of the Conservation Development Centre Nairobi, over a 6-month period from December 2012-May 2013. This included visits to a total of eight participating sites and range States, as well as meetings with a number of other range State delegations attending the 16th Conference of the Parties (CoP) to CITES held in Bangkok in March 2013.

4. This evaluation report is divided into five sections. Section 1, this section, provides key background information concerning the MIKE Programme as well as this evaluation; Section 2 looks at the relevance of the MIKE Phase II project in the context of the international and range State needs it was designed to address; Section 3 looks at the effectiveness and efficiency of Phase II project delivery, organised around the main anticipated outcomes of the project; Section 4 looks at the anticipated ultimate impacts of the Phase II project, including issues of sustainability, scaling up and mainstreaming; and Section 5 looks at key aspects of the project’s implementation and management arrangements, including the key partnerships that underpinned project delivery, the role and functions of project staff, project oversight arrangements, and project administration and financing arrangements. Each section ends with a set of key conclusions, lessons learnt and recommendations for future MIKE-related initiatives. The key findings and recommendations are then further consolidated and condensed in the report’s Executive Summary, as well as concisely listed in an overall summary table.

5. Like MIKE Phase I, the MIKE Phase II project is a very ambitious and complex undertaking, which has been the subject of much discussion and debate and, as noted above, considerable written documentation concerning the overall expectations of the project and the specific mechanisms for achieving these expectations. Realistically, this evaluation report cannot hope to capture the full extent of this extensive information base, which has importantly served to guide the adaptive evolution of the programme over the seven years since Phase II’s inception. Any attempt to do this would have inevitably ended up with a much

³ Robert Malpas took the lead in the overall evaluation and undertook the eastern and southern Africa (English-speaking) site and country visits, while Floris D’Udine undertook the west and central Africa (French-speaking) site and country visits.
longer evaluation report which would likely serve to confound rather than draw out the key issues, lessons learnt and recommendations emerging from the evaluation. In agreement with the CITES Secretariat and the MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU), therefore, this evaluation report deliberately aims to provide a concise and user-friendly digest of the key issues that have emerged from the evaluation. For more in-depth understanding of specific aspects, the reader is referred to the extensive MIKE-related documentation listed in Annex 7.

1.2 The MIKE Programme

6. As a foundation, it is important to understand that MIKE Phase II is not simply a standalone project designed to achieve a specific set of objectives according to the project’s results framework, but is also bound by the broader mandate of the MIKE Programme established by the Conference of the Parties (CoP) of CITES. The MIKE mandate, formally termed Resolution Conf. 10.10\(^6\), was first established at the 10\(^{th}\) CITES CoP held in Harare in June 1997, which resolved that a monitoring system be put in place across the entire range of African and Asian elephants, with the aim of providing reliable information on elephant status and trends to inform the dialogue and facilitate decisions by CITES concerning the protected status of elephants. This initial resolution was further modified and elaborated at subsequent CITES CoPs, most recently at CoP16 (Bangkok, 2013). At present, Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP16)\(^5\) has the following objectives for MIKE and its sister programme, the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS):

- **Objective 1**: Measuring and recording levels and trends, and changes in levels and trends, of illegal elephant killing and trade in ivory and other elephant specimens in elephant range States, ivory consumer States and ivory transit States;
- **Objective 2**: Assessing whether and to what extent observed trends are related to: measures concerning elephants and trade in elephant specimens taken under the auspices of CITES; changes in the listing of elephant populations in the CITES Appendices; or the conduct of legal international trade in ivory;
- **Objective 3**: Establishing an information base to support the making of decisions on appropriate management, protection and enforcement needs; and
- **Objective 4**: building capacity in elephant range States and, as applicable, countries involved in trade in elephant specimens, to implement and make use of MIKE and ETIS in managing elephants and enhancing enforcement.

7. MIKE Phase II therefore essentially has two sets of performance measurement criteria: the first relating to the Phase II project’s specific results framework of objectives and outputs to be delivered, the second relating to the overarching MIKE Programme mandate established by CITES Resolution 10.10. Of course, the Phase II logframe was principally designed to feed into the delivery of the overarching MIKE Programme mandate, so there are no major contradictions involved. However, the main function of this present evaluation is to assess the performance of the MIKE Phase II Project according to the results framework set out in the Phase II project document. The evaluation has, however, also identified key findings related to the overall MIKE Programme mandate, especially under section 2 on Relevance.

8. Another important aspect to note is that the MIKE Programme mandate as detailed above can crucially be divided into two separate components: Objectives 1 and 2 that chiefly address the “international policy” aspects of the mandate, that is providing reliable information for dialogue and decision making at the CITES CoPs; and Objectives 3 and 4 that mainly address the “range State management” objectives of the mandate, that is providing the participating range States with the wherewithal (information, tools and capacity) to enable them to appropriately monitor, manage and protect elephant populations on the ground. This important distinction between the two basic components of the MIKE Programme mandate according to Resolution 10.10 was, however, not well recognised in the design of the Phase II project, in part because the final capacity building objective of the MIKE mandate was only added at CoP 12 (Santiago, 2002), at the

\(^4\) CITES 1997. Resolution Conf. 10.10. Trade in elephant specimens

\(^5\) CITES Resolution 10.10 has since been amended at the 11th, 12th, 14th, 15th and 16th meetings of the CoP.
request of the elephant range States, who were concerned about the inadequate capacity in participating MIKE sites to deliver on MIKE’s information requirements. In the view of the evaluation, the fact that the Phase II project design does not fully take account of the distinction between the range State management and international policy dimensions of the MIKE Programme has had important implications for the successful implementation of Phase II. This aspect is further discussed in section 2 on Relevance, and is a recurring underlying theme of the findings, conclusions and recommendations throughout the remainder of this report.

9. Also important is that Resolution 10.10 refers to putting in place a monitoring system that generates reliable information on elephant population status and trends. The MIKE Programme addresses one dimension of this - information on the illegal killing of elephants - which generates indirect information on elephant population trends. ETIS, on the other hand addresses another dimension - trade in ivory and elephant products. Yet other aspects concerning elephant population distribution and abundance are addressed by other MIKE partners, in particular the IUCN Species Survival Commission African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG), and the related African Elephant Database (AED). The implication is that in order to fully address Resolution 10.10, there is an important need for collaboration and integration, as well as adequate resourcing, of the other programmes responsible for delivering on the 10.10 mandate. MIKE Phase II’s successes at achieving this are also discussed in this evaluation report.

10. Lastly, the Resolution 10.10 mandate relates to both the African and Asian elephant populations. Because the MIKE Phase II project financed by the EC’s Intra-ACP envelope primarily deals with African elephant populations, this evaluation limits itself accordingly. However, it is important to note that some aspects of the EC-financed project indirectly supported the delivery of MIKE’s Asian elephant monitoring mandate, for example through the financing of the MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU) and the work of the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG), which serviced and supported both the African and Asian dimensions of the MIKE Programme, and through the sharing of analytical tools and methodologies developed through the EC-funded project, but also implemented in Asia.

1.3 Evaluation Objectives

11. The Evaluation had the following main objectives:

   • to assess MIKE Phase II project performance (in terms of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness) and to identify and examine project outcomes and impacts stemming from the project, including their sustainability;

   • to assess the extent to which the project has been able to fulfil the goals and requirements for the MIKE Programme as mandated in CITES Resolution 10.10;

   • to identify key lessons learnt from the implementation of MIKE Phase II and make associated recommendations that can form a foundation for the design of follow-on project/programme activities;

   • to facilitate learning, feedback and knowledge sharing among CITES, project partners, and participating range State management authorities.

1.4 Evaluation Methodology

12. The evaluation used a combination of information collection techniques, including desk review, interviews, field visits, and an online survey of MIKE stakeholders. Both qualitative and quantitative data were used to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts, wherever possible triangulating data from different sources.

See Paragraph 104.
13. **Document desk review.** This included an examination of project agreements and other formal frameworks such as the concerned CITES resolutions and decisions; project monitoring reports and information; annual reports to the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and the CITES Secretariat; output-related project technical reports; training and awareness materials; etc. A full bibliography of the key documents consulted is provided in Annex 7.

14. **Interviews.** The evaluation conducted interviews with key MIKE Phase II stakeholders, using standard interview question templates as a framework for the discussions. Key MIKE Phase II stakeholders interviewed during the evaluation included:

- MIKE range State national and site officers and others involved in project delivery (during the site visits)
- CITES Secretariat staff (visit to Geneva in January 2013)
- Range State management authority directors and members of the MIKE Subregional Steering Committees (at CITES CoP 16 in Bangkok, March 2013)
- MIKE Subregional Support Officers (MIKE 3.0 inception and activity planning meeting, Nairobi, February 2013)
- MIKE Central Coordination Unit staff (Various meetings at UNEP Nairobi and CDC)
- Members of the MIKE TAG (Various meetings in Nairobi)
- Members of the MIKE ETIS Subgroup (Evaluation briefing meeting at CITES CoP)
- MIKE partners, including TRAFFIC/ETIS and AfESG (Meetings in Nairobi)
- Other knowledgeable stakeholders as appropriate

A full list of MIKE stakeholders interviewed is provided in Annex 2.

15. **Field visits.** Field visits were made to selected MIKE sites and associated MIKE range State protected area management agencies in the four subregions in which MIKE is operating, to interview project MIKE National and Site Officers, concerned national wildlife authorities, and other persons who have participated in the project as consultants and/or have been trained. This included an examination of additional specific products such as MIST\(^7\) monitoring records and reports, meeting and workshop reports, and training activity reports. Site selection aimed at providing a suitable cross-section of the implementation achievements and challenges that the project has experienced at the national and site levels. Table 1 below shows the eight range States and associated sites visited during the evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Range State</th>
<th>MIKE Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Boumba-Bek NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Dzanga-Sangha NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Africa</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Murchison Falls NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Chobe NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>South Luangwa NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Pendjari NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Nazinga NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Mole NP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. For each of the range States and MIKE sites visited, the evaluation met wherever possible with the following key evaluation respondents:

- **National level**
  - MIKE National Officer
  - Head of Wildlife Agency
  - Head of Wildlife Agency departments for law enforcement and ecological monitoring
  - National CITES Focal Point

\(^7\) Management Information SysTem
20. MIKE Site level
   - MIKE Site Officer
   - Site Warden in Charge
   - Law enforcement department head and rangers
   - Head of Site monitoring department
   - MIST data entry technicians

17. Online Survey: An online survey was carried out to expand on and reinforce information collected through field visits. The survey involved project staff, PA partners in participating range States, members of MIKE Subregional Steering Committees, members of the MIKE TAG, and other relevant stakeholders. The survey, which was made available in both English and French, was sent out to over 300 MIKE stakeholders, and in the event received 104 responses, an encouraging response rate of approximately 35 percent. The key outputs of the online survey are given in the appropriate sections of the evaluation findings, and a consolidated summary of survey outcomes is provided in Annex 6.

2. Relevance

18. As introduced in Paragraph 7 above, CITES Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) establishes two distinct components of the MIKE Programme mandate: the “international policy” component which largely addresses the need for reliable information concerning the illegal killing of elephants to inform decision making at the CITES CoPs; and the “range State management” component that addresses the need to enable participating range States to appropriately monitor, manage and protect their elephant populations. This section on relevance therefore needs to examine the relevance of MIKE Phase II in the context of each of these dimensions of the MIKE mandate. In addition, it will also be important to understand the relevance of the project’s results framework itself: i.e., whether the project’s objectives and implementation strategies are appropriate and realistic in achieving the project’s overall goals. In this regard, the MIKE Phase II results framework is set out in Figure 1 on page 3, and discussed in the next section.

19. It is important to note that, as will be discussed in the assessment of project performance under Section 3, Effectiveness & Efficiency, in practice, the Phase II project results framework has been gradually adapted by the Phase II project team according to lessons learnt from implementation, in order to maximise efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability of the project interventions. However, these changes were not subsequently reflected in any revision of the Phase II results framework. The discussion of relevance below is therefore based on the original project design (as detailed in Figure 1), and does not reflect any subsequent adaptations carried out in an effort to enhance the project’s relevance, which are discussed in later sections of this report.

2.1 Review of Phase II Results Framework

20. Figure 1 on page 3 gives an overview of the MIKE Phase II results framework that has guided the implementation of the project. This assessment of Phase II relevance primarily focuses on the upper levels of the framework: i.e. the Overall Goal, Project Purpose, and Results. The activities designed to achieve the Results will be discussed when considering the efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation (see Section 3 below).
### Figure 1. Summary of MIKE Phase II Results Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Goal</th>
<th>Project Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elephant populations in Africa and Asia are managed sustainably by using the monitoring information to assist in making appropriate management and trade decisions.</td>
<td>A standardized data collection and a statistically robust method of analysis provided to the African Elephant Range States on a long term sustainable basis, with information in regard to changes in their elephant populations and the factors influencing these changes, and through which the impact of CITES decisions can be assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Result 1
**Capacity of Range States built to ensure the flow of primary monitoring data is sustainable in the long term**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity 1.1: Provide subregional and site-based trainings</th>
<th>Activity 2.1: Evolve and improve MIKE methodology and database software</th>
<th>Activity 3.1: Undertake workshop for developing standard analytical and reporting framework</th>
<th>Activity 4.1 Hold Subregional Steering Committee meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.2: Undertake assessment study of building analysis capacity at national and site level</td>
<td>Activity 2.2: Use task force to evolve approach to measuring effort</td>
<td>Activity 3.2: Provide MIKE analysis and reports on a routine basis at the different levels, &amp; procure CCU hardware and software for handling CCU data management and analysis needs</td>
<td>Activity 4.2 Provide Central Coordinating Unit inputs and provide Subregional Support Unit inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.3: Procure and provide equipment</td>
<td>Activity 2.3: Undertake population surveys</td>
<td>Activity 3.3: Develop scoring approach for influencing factor and site variable characteristics</td>
<td>Activity 4.3 Provide TAG inputs and hold TAG meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.4: Provide subregional and national training (ETIS)</td>
<td>Activity 2.4: Undertake elephant meat trade impact study</td>
<td>Activity 3.4: Validate site sample for regional and subregional analysis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.5: Enhance MIKE National Coordinator and Site Officer routines</td>
<td>Activity 2.5: Undertake ivory trade studies</td>
<td>Activity 3.5: Develop MIKE-ETIS analysis &amp; produce ETIS country reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1.6: Produce training manual</td>
<td></td>
<td>Activity 3.6: Develop MIKE/AED integration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Result 2
**Standard routines adopted for the collection, handling and quality control of data**

#### Result 3
**Robust analysis and integration of primary and secondary data routinely undertaken and reported on**

#### Result 4
**MIKE structure efficiently and effectively managed, coordinated and monitored**
21. The Overall Goal of MIKE Phase II was: “Elephant populations in Africa and Asia are managed sustainably by using the monitoring information to assist in making appropriate management and trade decisions”. The goal statement asserts that the main intended impact that Phase II was expected to make a significant contribution towards was enhanced management of elephant populations in Africa and Asia⁸, achieved in two main ways: a) by enabling range States to better manage their elephant populations through the application of monitoring information; and b) by using monitoring information to inform international decision making concerning trade in ivory at CITES CoPs. This reflects the dual mandate of the MIKE Programme as discussed in section 1.2 above.

22. The use of MIKE Phase II’s monitoring data to inform CITES decision-making concerning the ivory trade corresponds with a key pillar of the MIKE mandate, and seems to be both appropriate and realistic. Indeed, as will be shown later in this evaluation report, this aspect of MIKE Phase II was one of its most important successes. However, the evaluation team questioned whether the MIKE Phase II goal of making a significant contribution to the sustainable management of elephant populations in range States through the application of MIKE-generated monitoring data was a realistic one, for several reasons. Firstly, achievement of the goal requires that monitoring information is not simply collected but that there is a corresponding investment, either on the part of the range States themselves or through a donor intervention, to enable participating range States to actually make practical use of such data. In practice however, it will be seen later in this report that, while MIKE Phase II made concerted efforts to enable range States to utilise monitoring data to influence their management practices, this was in reality largely beyond the capacity of the Phase II project on its own, working as it was across 30 range States and in 58 MIKE sites, to achieve.

23. Secondly, achieving sustainable management of Africa’s elephant populations relies on overcoming a variety of other major challenges and threats facing these populations, including escalating commercialised poaching, growing challenges faced by protected areas in mounting law enforcement efforts, escalating human-wildlife conflict, and loss of elephant habitats. Realistically, the provision of monitoring information on elephant killing and population status, while relevant for international decision making concerning the ivory trade, is on its own unlikely to make a significant contribution towards sustainably managed elephant populations, unless other parallel interventions are addressing the broader threats and challenges to elephant populations. In practice, all the project sites visited during the evaluation were experiencing escalating challenges and threats to their elephant populations that were not being adequately addressed, and in some cases were not being addressed at all.

24. The MIKE Phase II Project Purpose is: “A standardized data collection and a statistically robust method of analysis provided to the African Elephant range States on a long term sustainable basis, with information in regard to changes in their elephant populations and the factors influencing these changes, and through which the impact of CITES decisions can be assessed”. The purpose statement therefore echoes the weakness of the MIKE Phase II Overall Goal, by chiefly focusing on the collection and analysis of monitoring information, and omitting the need to at the same time enhance range States’ capacity to utilise monitoring information in strengthening elephant population management and protection. The project purpose also establishes a very high bar for the project, by stating that the elephant monitoring systems established by Phase II should be sustainable in the long-term. The issue of long-term sustainability of the MIKE Phase II monitoring systems is discussed under section 4 (Impact and Sustainability).

25. The Phase II Project Purpose also establishes an ambitious aim for the use of monitoring information in assessing the impact of CITES decisions concerning the trade in ivory on illegal elephant killing on the ground. The demand for the MIKE Programme to demonstrate causality between CITES decisions and illegal killing of elephants stems from the original CITES Resolution that established the MIKE system. However, not long before the start of MIKE Phase II, the CITES Parties recognised that, while it may be possible, given adequate data, to demonstrate some level of correlation between trends in illegal killing and CITES trade decisions, it is a more formidable challenge to demonstrate an actual causal relationship between the two. There are two main reasons for this. Firstly, it is always difficult to establish causality from observa-

⁸ In the event, the MIKE Phase II project was primarily focussed on African elephant range States and sites. This evaluation therefore focusses on MIKE activities implemented in Africa, financed through the European Union contribution agreement.
tional (as opposed to experimental) data. Secondly, the low number of CITES trade decision events, and the time lags between decisions and their actual implementation, make it nearly impossible to reliably demonstrate a causal link with any level of confidence. Also important here are the potentially overwhelming influences of other parallel global economic events - such as the global recession and increasing demand for ivory in China as a result of increased prosperity in that country, an important factor identified by MIKE Phase II. As a result of all these factors, the MIKE Resolution 10.10 mandate was altered at CoP 11 (Gigiri, 2000) so that the programme was not required to attempt to demonstrate causality between trade decisions and illegal killing of elephants, but simply to establish whether any correlations exist\(^9\) (see also the discussion of Phase II's relevance to Resolution 10.10 below).

26. The four MIKE Phase II project results designed to achieve the project purpose were as follows:
   
   - Capacity of Range States built to ensure the flow of primary monitoring data is sustainable in the long term
   - Standard routines adopted for the collection, handling and quality control of data
   - Robust analysis and integration of primary and secondary data routinely undertaken and reported on.
   - MIKE structure efficiently and effectively managed, coordinated and monitored.

27. As with the Overall Goal and Project Purpose, the main focus of these results is on the generation and analysis of monitoring data. None of the four results focuses on enabling participating sites and range States to utilise the monitoring data to bring about effective management of elephant populations. Rather, for the reasons discussed in section 1.2 above, the main focus of the results is primarily on the component of MIKE’s mandate related to informing international decision-making concerning the trade in ivory. These aspects of how the Phase II results framework relate to the MIKE mandate are further discussed in the next section.

2.2 Relevance to CITES Res. 10.10

28. The four objectives of MIKE according to the mandate for the programme as established under Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP16) are given in Paragraph 6 above. In this discussion, we refer to the earlier Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) objectives, since these are the one that applied when MIKE Phase II was designed. In this regard, the first two objectives focus on the international policy dimensions of the MIKE (and ETIS) Programme:
   
   - Objective 1: Measuring and recording levels and trends, and changes in levels and trends, of illegal hunting and trade in ivory in elephant range States, and in trade entrepôts; and
   - Objective 2: Assessing whether and to what extent observed trends are related to changes in the listing of elephant populations in the CITES Appendices and/or the resumption of legal international trade in ivory.

29. As discussed in the previous section, the Phase II Programme Overall Goal, Project Purpose and Results all emphasise and are primarily focussed on achieving this international policy mandate. In fact, a major strength of the design of MIKE Phase II (and the Phase I predecessor) is the strong emphasis on generating regular and reliable field-based data on elephant killing and population status, largely based on grassroots ranger patrols and population surveys in the participating sites, rather than relying on third-party or indirect sources of information. This hands-on, field-oriented dimension of MIKE is one of the Programme’s distinguishing features, and the reason why, despite the deficiencies in the project’s results framework outlined in this section on relevance, the project is largely positively supported by its stakeholders. In an environment where reliable and up-to-date information is scarce, MIKE Phase II’s focus on the direct measurement of illegal killing of elephants and on the robust and impartial analysis of this information to inform international decision making with regard the ivory trade, means that the MIKE Programme has now become, alongside ETIS, a crucial component of the international ivory trade decision-making process.

30. The third and fourth objective of MIKE according to Resolution 10.10 are as follows:
   - Objective 3: Establishing an information base to support the making of decisions on appropriate management, protection and enforcement needs; and
   - Objective 4: Building capacity in range States.

31. As discussed previously, these objectives largely relate to the needs of the range States with regard to building broad-based capacity for ranger-based monitoring as a contribution towards improved elephant management and protection. The need for this capacity building was identified by the range States themselves at CITES CoP12, and led to the revision of MIKE’s mandate in Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) to include a poorly defined capacity-building component - i.e., Objective 4 above. Similarly, the MIKE Phase II project design also attempted to respond to the pressures for additional capacity building originating from the range States, but like the revised MIKE mandate, did this inadequately. Specifically, the Phase II capacity building activities chiefly related to the establishment of the information base itself (i.e. Objective 3 above), not to the practical application of that information base in enhancing elephant conservation and management.

32. As will be seen in section 3, Efficiency and Effectiveness, below, the MIKE CCU recognised the weaknesses in the original project design in this regard, and made efforts to re-orientate the project activities to place greater emphasis on broad-based capacity building for RBM, revolving around the introduction of the MIST RBM system. In reality, however, the project had neither the financial nor human resources to support adequate broad-based RBM capacity building in all the 58 participating MIKE sites. In particular, the project team had to focus their efforts on RBM data collection and the establishment and management of the MIST system itself, and there were insufficient resources to put significant emphasis on building the capacity of range States to effectively utilise the MIST information base for improved elephant management and conservation. As such, even after the efforts of the project team to re-orientate and reinforce the project’s capacity building activities, the Phase II results framework was ultimately mainly relevant to Objective 4 of the MIKE mandate in so far as the establishment of the information base was concerned, not its practical application.

2.3 Conclusions and Recommendations

33. The MIKE Phase II results framework is oriented around two main aims: enabling appropriate international ivory trade decisions, and enhancing capacity for elephant management, protection and enforcement in the participating range States through the generation and use of monitoring data. These two aims reflect the two main pillars of the MIKE mandate established in Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12). While the project results framework seemed to be appropriate and realistic in terms of achieving the first of these aims - enabling appropriate trade decisions - it was not fully relevant with regard to bringing about improved elephant population management and protection in the participating range States. This is because the generation and management of monitoring information must necessarily be complemented by efforts to strengthen the capacity of range States to practically use this RBM information in contributing to elephant population management and protection. More broadly, the lack of monitoring information and its practical use is only one of many problems currently undermining the sustainable management of elephant populations. In the absence of parallel efforts to address these other challenges, the MIKE Phase II project could not realistically hope to make a significant contribution to the desired overall project goal.

34. With regard the MIKE Programme mandate established under Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), the project was well designed to achieve the first two objectives of the mandate relating to international decision-making on the ivory trade, but less well designed to address the capacity and management needs of the participating range States. This was partially because of the broader elephant management and protection challenges faced by the range States as mentioned above, and also because, despite the best efforts of the project team to appropriately re-orientate and strengthen the project’s capacity building activities, the project design meant that, with 58 participating MIKE sites, the limited financial and human resources needed to be chiefly focussed on building the capacity of range States for collection and management of
monitoring information, and to a lesser degree on its practical application as part of effective elephant protection and management efforts.

35. The Evaluation recommends that for any follow-on activities to MIKE Phase II, and if finances allow, greater emphasis needs to be placed on addressing other critical challenges facing elephant population management, protection, and enforcement in Africa, in order to achieve the Overall Goal identified by the MIKE Phase II project. The evaluation further recommends that, as far as ranger-based monitoring information is concerned, now that Phase II has successfully strengthened capacity for monitoring data collection and management through the introduction of the MIST system (see section 3, Efficiency & Effectiveness below), greater emphasis needs to be placed on the practical application of monitoring data in strengthening elephant population management at the site and national levels.

36. Related to these recommendations, the evaluation team felt that a fundamental flaw in the MIKE Phase II project design was to attempt to fulfil both the international policy mandate of MIKE as well as the range State management and capacity building mandate across all 30 range States and 58 sites that participated in MIKE Phase II. Although very challenging in itself, it was both feasible and desirable to collect monitoring data on elephant killing from as many participating range States and MIKE sites as possible, in order to inform international ivory trade decision making. However, it was clearly largely beyond the financial and human resources of the project (or indeed any project) to carry out effective broad-based RBM capacity building in all the range States and sites involved. To do this, and to achieve lasting impact, would require a project intervention on a scale of magnitude greatly in excess of the MIKE Phase II project.

37. The evaluation therefore recommends that any future MIKE project follow-on should more clearly distinguish between fulfilling the international policy mandate of the MIKE Programme, and fulfilling the site management and capacity building mandate. The former mandate can and should continue to be met across a broad set of participating range States and sites as under Phase II, adapted to take account of factors such as the viability of the site’s elephant population and participation of the site in Phase II. The latter mandate - addressing site management capacity needs - should largely focus on a smaller group of sites, selected according to criteria based on a “triage strategy”, in which interventions are targeted at those sites where appropriate assistance is likely to lead to significant improvements in elephant conservation and management, rather than sites which are already sufficiently well managed, or sites where the scale of interventions required are impractical, or else where elephant populations are too small to warrant the necessary investment.

3. Efficiency & Effectiveness

38. In the context of a project’s results framework, the evaluation of a project’s efficiency looks at performance in delivering the identified outputs, while effectiveness looks at the project’s performance in achieving its desired outcomes. For MIKE Phase II, the project results are defined at the level of outcomes, while the activities are generally defined at the level of outputs. Since there are many overlaps and synergies between these two levels of the MIKE Phase II results framework, for the sake of brevity and clarity, this Evaluation reports on both efficiency and effectiveness aspects together, by first discussing the key outputs (efficiency) delivered under the concerned outcome, and then assessing the overall delivery of the outcome itself (effectiveness).

39. The assessment of efficiency and effectiveness is organised according to the four main outcome areas of the project, broadly corresponding to the four project results. However, the following analysis reorders the results such that the discussion of MIKE’s ranger-based monitoring (RBM) systems (Result 2) precedes capacity building (Result 1); i.e., the report first looks at the RBM systems themselves, then at how the project has gone about building capacity in their use.

10 See Appendix 4: List of MIKE Phase II participating sites and countries.

11 For the purposes of this evaluation, Outputs are defined as “The goods and services that the project delivered in order to achieve the outcomes”, while Outcomes are defined as “The behavioural or systemic effects that the project aims to deliver in order to achieve impacts".
40. It should be re-emphasised that while this assessment of efficiency and effectiveness is inevitably organised in accordance with the MIKE Phase II results framework given in Figure 1 above, in practice, the Phase II project underwent significant adaptation according to lessons learnt and changing circumstances, in an effort to enhance project performance and ultimate impact. The main ways in which the Phase II results framework was adaptively enhanced in this way are identified in the following discussion.

3.1 Monitoring information collection and management

41. The Result 2 outcome is: “Standard routines adopted for the collection, handling and quality control of data”. In this section, we will chiefly focus on the actual ranger-based monitoring (RBM) systems introduced and supported by MIKE Phase II. How well these systems are functioning in practice will be examined in the next section, which looks at the efficiency and effectiveness of Phase II in strengthening the MIKE sites' capacity to implement the monitoring systems.

42. As a foundation for understanding the Phase II approach towards establishing standardised monitoring systems, it is useful to first consider the approach to monitoring information collection and management that was established in MIKE Phase I, and subsequently modified in Phase II according to lessons learnt. In this regard, the key monitoring elements established in Phase I were as follows:

- **The MIKE Carcass Form**, which was used by ranger patrols to collect information on elephant carcasses found, location, cause of death, time since death, and other variables;

- **The MIKE Patrol Form**, which was used by ranger patrols to collect more general information about the patrol itself, including the track followed by the patrol, duration, etc. In Phase I, the primary intended use of this information was to quantify the carcass detection effort\(^{12}\) at the MIKE site, which was regarded as a crucial denominator in understanding trends in illegal killing of elephants in the site, and enabling comparison and synthesis between sites (using a “catch per unit effort” approach);

- **The MIKE Database**, which was based on Microsoft Access software, linked to ArcView GIS spatial analysis software. The function of the database was to record carcass and patrol data for onward transmission to the MIKE National Officer, thence to the MIKE Subregional Support Officer (SSO) and MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU).

43. In practice, significant difficulties were experienced with the Phase I monitoring system, in particular with the extensive MIKE Patrol Form, because of inadequate capacity, materials and motivation to complete the Patrol Forms under practical conditions, as well as with the MIKE Database, which was generally regarded as user-unfriendly and not well suited or relevant to site monitoring and management needs\(^{13}\). In particular, Phase I experienced challenges in practically measuring detection effort in the participating MIKE sites, to the extent that the usefulness of the limited MIKE elephant carcass monitoring information produced during Phase I was greatly undermined\(^{14}\).

Efficiency

44. The original Phase II project design anticipated the continuation of many of the features of the MIKE Phase I monitoring system, in particular the continuing use of the MIKE Database, and this was the status quo at the beginning of Phase II implementation. However, responding to the lessons learnt in Phase I, early in Phase II implementation the MIKE CCU made the far-reaching decision to abandon the unpopular MIKE Database and Patrol Form, and to begin a transition to a new approach to monitoring information collection and management involving the introduction of the generic protected area monitoring software, Ecological Software Solutions’ Management Information System, or MIST, originally developed for use in

---

\(^{12}\) The MIKE Workshop on Law Enforcement and Detection Effort (Naivasha, December 2009) defines detection effort as the time and/or space covered by patrols spent looking for signs of illegal activity, i.e. elephant carcasses.

\(^{13}\) The MIKE Database also had some programming flaws, such as an over-elaborate security system, and was linked to the ArcGIS spatial analysis software, which was expensive to purchase and difficult to operate.

Uganda’s national parks. Thereafter, MIKE Phase II introduced MIST as a standard solution across all the participating range States and sites, except in those instances (for example in Namibia and South Africa) where another monitoring system was already well established and functioning. MIST had several perceived advantages over the previous MIKE Database: it could be used for recording information for a variety of potential patrol data and species, not just elephants, and therefore was of greater potential relevance to site managers and participating wildlife management agencies; it had spatial analysis capabilities similar to those provided by ArcView but without the associated cost; it was already in use in several African range States such as Uganda, Ghana and Rwanda, which could be used as a showcase for the promotion of the system elsewhere; it potentially enabled the all-important patrol effort information to be easily stored and analysed, and it was free software.

45. In Phase II therefore, the MIKE Database was gradually discontinued and replaced by the introduction of the MIST software, and the MIKE Carcass Form continued to be used for the collection of specific elephant carcass data. The MIKE Patrol Form was replaced by the standard field data collection form associated with the MIST system, often adapted to the specific needs of the participating site. Notably, besides collecting information on elephant and elephant carcass sightings, the MIST field data collection form allowed data to be collected on other species sightings, as well as illegal activities (e.g. snares) and other significant sightings such as fires, which could be adapted to the needs of individual sites and which overall made the data collection and subsequent analysis potentially far more relevant to the participating sites than the previous MIKE Patrol Form. In addition, the MIST data collection form also allowed basic information to be collected on patrol effort, by recording the duration of patrols as well as their length and spatial coverage calculated from GPS records.

46. The adoption and promotion of MIST during Phase II, which commenced in 2008 (the third year of Phase II), was the flagship of the project’s efforts to establish standard monitoring systems in the participating MIKE sites, and is indeed a major success story of the overall project. By 2012 (i.e., in under four years of effort), MIST had become the predominant monitoring system in use at MIKE sites, being used at 85% of sites and in almost 90% of participating range States. Moreover, 26 African range States have taken steps towards adopting MIST for their wider biodiversity and law-enforcement monitoring needs in the MIKE sites, and 16 of these countries are in the process of adopting MIST as their standard ranger-based data collection and data management tool across their entire protected area networks, not just at the MIKE sites.

47. While the roll-out of MIST was largely successful and appropriate for the sites concerned, the evaluation team felt that there were some instances where the introduction of MIST was not entirely appropriate for the site in question. For example, in one of the West African sites visited by the team, there was already an alternative monitoring system in place that was being supported by an NGO and which was located in the research and monitoring department, whereas the MIST database was managed by the site’s archivist, who was not part of either the PA’s monitoring or law enforcement departments. This meant that both systems were being used in parallel for storing and analysing patrol data, raising issues of long-term sustainability of one or other, or both, of the systems. At another site visited in southern Africa, it was clear that the site was struggling to use MIST even though an alternative more simple paper-based monitoring system, MOMS, was being used elsewhere in the country concerned. It seems that sometimes the decision to adopt MIST was taken by the range State or site concerned in a desire to be part of the broader MIKE programme, rather than from a clear understanding of the benefits that would accrue from the use of MIST, as compared with an existing system already in place, or an alternative system in use elsewhere in the country.

48. The lesson learnt here is that the primary rationale in Phase II for introducing MIST to the participating sites and range States in Phase II was to provide sites lacking a functional monitoring system with a standardised product that could meet their broader ranger-based monitoring needs (and therefore enhance the system’s sustainability), not just those of MIKE. Where another functional monitoring system was already in place, or where there was no monitoring system at all, it was important that MIKE assisted the range State and site concerned to reach an informed decision about whether MIST would add value, or whether the existing system, or an alternative simpler system, could serve the site’s and MIKE’s monitoring needs equally well. Similarly, with the potential use of other monitoring systems already in use elsewhere in the
country concerned. In this regard, MIKE needed to act as a “devil’s advocate”, ensuring that MIKE sites and range States did not simply opt for MIST because it was what was on offer and what other range States were using, but rather made an informed decision to use the system which best suited their circumstances, including where relevant the system already in place, or alternatively to start off with a paper-based system such as MOMS before graduating to MIST.

49. In this connection, it seems that MIKE Phase I was insufficiently sensitive to the major capacity challenges relating to the establishment and maintenance of comprehensive computer-based monitoring systems in participating MIKE sites, which was an important factor underlying Phase I’s lack of success in this regard. However, Phase I raised significant expectations in the participating range States and MIKE sites with regard the provision of computer-based systems, and it was not easy for Phase II to backtrack on continuing to fulfil these expectations, even though the lesson learnt from Phase I was that comprehensive computer-based systems were inappropriate for some MIKE sites.

50. Another aspect to consider here is that, for some sites that are realistically unable to take advantage of a comprehensive RBM system, whether it be computer or paper-based (for reasons of staffing and/or management capacity), it is probably more appropriate for the MIKE Programme to encourage the use of a simple spreadsheet for managing MIKE-related ranger information, rather than a more comprehensive system that realistically the site concerned cannot maintain or use effectively. Once again, this lesson learnt has been recognised by the MIKE CCU, which has been advocating the use of a simple spreadsheet in sites where ranger-based monitoring and management capacity is poor.

51. Elephant population surveys at MIKE sites were a significant component of MIKE Phase I, being considered an important complement to the carcass information generated through ranger-based monitoring. However, in Phase II, the financial resources available for these surveys were significantly reduced. This was because it was felt that these surveys were not necessarily cost effective for the outputs they produced, that the range States themselves should increasingly take lead responsibility for carrying out these surveys, and that any additional funding required for surveys should ideally be raised from donor sources other than MIKE Phase II itself. In the event, it was not possible to raise such additional funding, but nevertheless MIKE Phase II was able to continue its support for surveys, albeit at a reduced level compared to Phase I. Phase II supported a range of population surveys in all four sub-regions (see Table 2 below), based on initial survey prioritisation guidelines developed by the CCU and endorsed by the TAG. An important priority for Phase II was generating population data for forest sites in Central and West Africa, where little reliable data was available at the commencement of the project. Key to this survey work has been the efforts to improve forest survey methodologies and standards15, as well as efforts to build survey capacity.

Table 2. MIKE Phase II contributions to elephant population surveys (up until 31 December 2012)16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Survey Contribution</th>
<th>No of Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant population survey coordination/participation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary missions in preparation for elephant population surveys</td>
<td>&gt;2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and reporting workshop coordination/participation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

52. Population survey results generated through Phase II support have been integrated into the African Elephant Database (AED) maintained by the African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG). Key challenges experienced have been the very high cost of undertaking population surveys, as well as the continuing problems of reliably estimating elephant population numbers in forest areas based on indirect methods such as

15 The development of MIKE’s forest survey methodologies and standards were an important aspect of MIKE Phase I, and of the work of the MIKE Technical Advisory Group. However, in practice these forest survey standards proved to be impractical for large forest sites, and practical solutions for such sites have yet to be identified.

16 Training events on elephant population survey techniques are summarised in Table 3 below.
dung counts. On the other hand, the evaluation team found from the field visits to selected MIKE sites that Phase II’s support for elephant surveys was especially appreciated by site managers, perhaps because these surveys generated information on elephant population distribution and size that was more immediately and practically relevant to managers than was MIKE’s carcass information. In this regard, 44% of site and national-level PA management staff involved in the implementation of MIKE Phase II activities who took part in the Evaluation’s Online Survey strongly agreed with the statement “MIKE Phase II’s support for elephant population surveys at participating sites has been a significant contribution to elephant conservation efforts”, while 29% somewhat agreed; i.e., 73% of respondents working in PA management viewed MIKE’s contribution to elephant population surveys positively. MIKE Phase II’s support for elephant population surveys was especially appreciated in Central Africa, with 69% strongly agreeing and 13% somewhat agreeing with the statement above (total 82% positive support)17.

Effectiveness

53. The successful introduction of the MIST RBM system across the majority of MIKE sites in a relatively short span of time underscores the broad acceptability of the MIST monitoring system to the participating PA management authorities, as compared to its predecessor, the MIKE Database. Further confirmation of the broad acceptance of MIST to participating national and site-level PA managers was provided by the Evaluation’s Online Survey. In this regard, 61% of PA managers responding to the survey strongly agreed with the statement “MIKE Phase II’s monitoring systems are appropriate to, complement and build on existing ranger-based monitoring activities of the participating Range States”, while 33% somewhat agreed; i.e., an encouraging 94% of participating PA managers positively support the introduced MIST monitoring systems.

54. As a result, MIKE Phase II proved to be significantly more successful than Phase I in collecting adequate carcass information for illegally killed elephants and natural deaths. By the end of 2011, MIKE had collected information on 8,575 elephant carcases found in 49 MIKE sites in 27 range States in Africa that died between 2002 and 2011. This substantial information base provides a strong foundation for the analysis of trends in elephant killing, as discussed in section 3.3, Data Analysis, below.

55. The MIST Patrol Form also seems to have been more acceptable to, and appropriate for, the participating MIKE sites, in part because, following the recommendations of the MIKE Phase I evaluation, the decision was taken to simplify the form to concentrate on the collection of key data for the MIKE analysis, rather than the Phase I strategy of collecting a much broader range of information on the off-chance that it would be useful in future. The fact that the MIST system also allowed the data collection requirements to be tailor-made to the specific management information needs of the site, not just to MIKE’s information needs, also helped encourage buy-in from the participating sites.

56. Nevertheless, it was apparent from the site visits conducted during the evaluation that many MIKE sites were still experiencing significant challenges in undertaking the complete cycle of ranger-based monitoring data collection, management and application that was expected of them to successfully apply the MIST system and to fulfil MIKE’s monitoring requirements. This aspect is discussed further in section 3.2 Capacity for RBM below, which looks at the efficiency and effectiveness of Phase II’s efforts to build sustainable capacity of sites to implement the MIKE-supported monitoring systems. In addition, as with MIKE Phase I, Phase II continued to encounter significant challenges in generating appropriate, reliable and regular information concerning carcass detection effort. The reasons for this relate both to the practical difficulties that many sites experienced in implementing the MIST RBM systems, as well as challenges experienced by the MIKE CCU in comparing and synthesising detection effort information across multiple MIKE sites, each of which has different environmental conditions and law enforcement regimes. The ways in which the Phase II project addressed and partially circumvented this lack of patrol effort data is discussed under section 3.3, Data Analysis, below.

---

17 The high prevalence of positive responses despite the fact that fewer surveys were actually supported by MIKE Phase II in Central Africa compared to other sub-regions (see Table 2) highlights the perceived need and appreciation for this kind of support in the dense forest environment of Central Africa, which poses particular challenges to the organisation and implementation of surveys. It also highlights that in some subregions few – if any – governmental institutions or NGOs regularly undertake such elephant population surveys.
57. To improve future mainstreaming of the MIST monitoring systems, the evaluation team felt that, although MIST comes with its own generic user manual, the project could have done more to develop and help institutionalise the associated RBM operational guidelines and protocols for data collection, management, and application in participating MIKE sites and range States. In this regard, the team saw two site-modified user manuals for ranger-based data collection, one for the South Luangwa NP in Zambia and one for the Mole NP in Ghana. In general, however, the team found that most sites did not appear to have adequate operational guidelines, protocols and site-specific user manuals for RBM data collection, management and application.

58. This deficiency was also noted by the earlier study of MIKE’s analytical and data management capacity needs conducted during the final year of the project, which observed that, while the interest shown in field data for management was extremely encouraging, to achieve sustainability, these systems need to be formally embedded in the management systems of the site concerned. The study goes on to recommend that “a generic handbook on patrol-based data collection and handling should be developed, covering all levels of ranger-based data collection, management and analysis, and then customised for each site and, ideally, signed as ‘standard operating procedures by management’”. This Evaluation agrees with this recommendation for ensuring mainstreaming and long-term sustainability of the monitoring systems (see Impact section 4.1 below).

3.2 Capacity for ranger-based monitoring

59. The Result 1 outcome is: “Capacity of Range States built to ensure the flow of primary monitoring data is sustainable in the long term”. Capacity building carried out by the project to achieve this outcome according to the original results framework (Figure 1) had four main components: a) assessment of ranger-based monitoring (RBM) capacity building needs of the participating sites; b) provision of training in patrol data collection and the establishment and operation of the MIST RBM system; c) provision of essential ranger-based monitoring equipment; and d) provision of logistical support to MIKE national and site officers. The formal assessment of RBM capacity and capacity building needs was mainly carried out as part of the online questionnaires sent to MIKE National and Site Officers as well as MIKE SSOs in 2009 and 2012. The results of these two surveys were analysed and discussed as part of the study of the impact of MIKE’s capacity building activities and needs carried out in June 2012. In addition, the Mid-Term Progress Evaluation of Phase II carried out its own independent online survey covering capacity building needs in 2011.

Efficiency

60. Phase II training activities were largely delivered by the MIKE SSOs, either at site level (especially in the case of patrol data collection training involving rangers), or subregionally (for more advanced MIST and other specialised training). The major types of training provided during Phase II were as follows:

- GPS use and patrol data collection (ranger level)
- Patrol data collection and basic use of the MIST system (national and site officers)
- Patrol data collection and basic use of old MIKE RBM system (national and site officers)
- Carcass identification and data collection procedures
- Advanced MIST training, including data analysis
- Refresher MIST training
- Elephant survey methods (savannah aerial surveys and forest ground counts)

---

18 Although Mole NP had introduced the MIST monitoring system prior to MIKE’s involvement.
20 Until the MIST system was introduced in 2008, training was provided in the use of the MIKE Database.
22 At the outset of Phase II, training focussed on the MIKE Database before the introduction of MIST
61. In practice, training was often tailored to the specific needs of participating sites, so could feature different components of the above list depending on need. Table 3 below gives an overview of the different types of training provided over the course of Phase II (up until December 2011).

**Table 3. Summary of Training Courses Implemented in Phase II (up until 31 December 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Training</th>
<th>No of Training Courses Implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS use and patrol data collection (ranger level)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol data collection and basic use of the MIST system (national and site officers)</td>
<td>9(^{24})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrol carcass data collection and use of old MIKE RBM system (site officers and rangers)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced MIST training, including data analysis</td>
<td>3(^{26})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refresher MIST training</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elephant survey methods (savannah aerial surveys and forest ground counts)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. Broadly speaking, MIKE Phase II’s training activities have been highly appreciated by the participating range States. Responding to the Online Survey question, “MIKE Phase II has provided adequate, appropriate, and user-friendly training for ranger-based monitoring and database management at participating sites”, 59% of national and site-level participating range State staff said they strongly agreed, while 24% said they somewhat agreed, or a total of 83% positively supporting MIKE’s training work. There was also a similar level of support for the efforts of the SSOs to mentor MIKE site officers in between formal training opportunities through site visits, which suggests that there may have been improvements in this regard since the Phase II Mid-Term Progress Evaluation, which was critical of the project’s performance in this area.

63. In addition to training, MIKE Phase II also provided the participating sites with key monitoring equipment, in particular GPS units for use on field patrols, and computers for MIST operation (and previously for the MIKE Database). Additional material support was also regularly provided in the form of batteries for GPS units, printing supplies and other consumables. However, as discussed under section 2, Relevance above, in view of the large number of MIKE sites it was not financially possible to meet the actual monitoring equipment needs of all the participating sites, especially with regard to GPS units. In this regard, while 84% of national and site level PA managers expressed appreciation for the equipment support provided by MIKE during Phase II, a number of individual respondents to the online survey as well as those interviewed during the site visits indicated that this support fell well short of the actual needs on the ground. In particular, rangers and patrol leaders met with during the site visits expressed the need for a wide variety of patrol equipment other than GPS units, including boots, backpacks, uniforms, rations, etc. While none of these equipment needs were anticipated in the MIKE Phase II budget, in practice, they are likely to have a significant impact on the capacity of the participating sites to carry out ranger-based monitoring activities as envisaged under this Outcome (see discussion of effectiveness below). That said, the long-term sustainability of providing this kind of equipment support in the absence of continuing donor interventions is questionable (see section 4, Impact & Sustainability, below).

64. A number of the participating MIKE sites experienced significant problems in maintaining and operating their MIST computers. Often, this was the result of inadequate power supplies at the participating sites, challenging working conditions, or problems with computer viruses, etc. In an effort to overcome these issues, during Phase II MIKE provided many participating sites with “Inveneo” brand computers, which could be run from solar panels, and also because of their Unix operating system were largely immune from most viruses. In practice, however, these computers proved not to be reliable or user-friendly, especially

---

23 Including one training event for anti-poaching staff from hunting safari operators in the Central African Republic.
24 Including one exchange visit by Tanzanian MIKE officers to Uganda to learn about MIST implementation.
25 Including one training event for teaching staff at Garoua Wildlife College, Cameroon.
26 Including one training event for SSU staff held at CCU.
for staff familiar with the Microsoft Windows platform, and they quickly fell into disuse at the majority of participating sites, who either reverted to Windows machines previously provided by MIKE, or else by the PA agency itself, or sometimes to the personal laptops of the concerned MIKE site officer. Overall, an ideal solution for computers to operate the MIST system has yet to be found. Perhaps in the tough field conditions experienced at many sites, no ideal solution exists, but it would still be worthwhile exploring the different options in any follow-on MIKE activities.

65. During Phase II, the project also provided logistical support to MIKE national and site officers to facilitate their activities, in the form of monthly budgets to enable travel to MIKE sites (for national officers), traveling for collecting MIKE data (for site officers), and communications (e.g. the use of faxes, telephones, email, etc.). However, this support has proved difficult to account for, and the project’s auditors at the field level (IUCN’s) have discouraged this practice in future. It is yet to be seen whether the discontinuation of this support will have any appreciable impact on the morale of the concerned national and site officers or on the practical implementation of the MIKE monitoring systems. The role of MIKE national and site officers is discussed further in section 5.2 below.

66. Another intended output under Result 1 was the production of training materials for use in association with the training courses in ranger-based data collection and the operation of the MIST system. In this regard, the project developed some tailor-made MIST training materials to accompany MIST training in each of the four sub-regions, but did not develop any generic MIST training materials. Nevertheless, towards the end of Phase II, MIKE financed the development of a training manual for the new SMART r 27 ranger-based monitoring system, which was developed by the Wildlife Conservation Society on behalf of the SMART Partnership. However, since the SMART system had not been piloted in the field by the end of Phase II, it was not yet possible to assess the appropriateness and acceptability of this training manual.

Effectiveness

67. To gauge the actual effects of MIKE Phase II’s capacity building support for ranger-based monitoring, it would ideally be necessary to collect systematic, regular and preferably independent information on the three main dimensions of RBM at the participating sites – i.e. data collection (e.g. the frequency of patrols carried out at each site and the percentage that are actually collecting MIST data), management (e.g. regularity and accuracy of data entry into the MIST software) and application (types of RBM outputs produced, frequency, and subsequent use by management). However, for a variety of reasons, the systematic and regular collection of such performance data was not feasible in MIKE Phase II (see section 5.5, Monitoring and Evaluation below), and as a result both the Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation (2011) and the MIKE Capacity Assessment Study (2012) largely based their findings concerning site-level capacity on the results of the three online surveys carried out in 2009 (MIKE internal survey), 2011 (Mid-term Evaluation survey) and 2012 (Capacity Assessment survey), which were completed by MIKE site and national officers and the MIKE SSOs. In this regard, the Capacity Assessment Study found that between 2009 and 2012 there had been a significant improvement in law enforcement monitoring at most MIKE sites, in particular in patrol data collection and entry of data into the MIST system.

68. This present evaluation confirmed that in most sites visited during the evaluation, there was a good level of proficiency among law enforcement rangers in the use of the patrol data collection forms linked to MIST, and similarly among MIKE site officers and other monitoring staff in the entry of data into MIST. However, the evaluation team identified a number of factors that are confounding the achievement of Phase II’s RBM capacity outcome, and impacting on the long-term sustainability of monitoring capacity.

69. One of the most important challenges to establishing sustainable capacity for all three components of ranger-based monitoring relates to the high staff turnover at participating MIKE sites, both at the ranger (data collection) level, as well as at the site officer (data management and application) level. Usually, this is the result of staff transfers to other protected areas, or promotions. In the short to medium term, this has meant that the MIKE project must continue to provide training for sites and participating range States that

---

27 Spatial Monitoring And Reporting Tool - which is expected to replace MIST as the standard ranger-based monitoring system in future.
have already previously received training, i.e. there is no obvious easy way to terminate these inputs. The MIKE CCU has recognised that this situation is unsustainable in the long-term, and one of the main aims of the MIKE Capacity Assessment Study described previously was to examine alternative ways of overcoming the continuing need for provision of training, for example by establishing lasting capacity for monitoring training in subregional and national wildlife training institutions.

70. However, there are significant challenges with this latter option, in part because most rangers and law enforcement officers are unlikely to have the opportunity to attend these training institutions. In addition, building sustainable capacity for delivering practical training courses in ranger-based monitoring in these training institutions will require that the institutions themselves take an active interest in developing these courses, and actively market them to range States. This does not align with the increasingly theoretical orientation of the training provided by several of these institutions, and unless they are willing to re-orientate themselves to strengthen their focus on the practical needs of site management, any effort by the MIKE Programme to attempt to build RBM training capacity in these institutions is unlikely to succeed.

71. In the long-run, perhaps the only way of ensuring that sufficient trained staff are in place is by the full adoption and mainstreaming of the MIST monitoring systems across the entire protected area network of the range States concerned. This is the ultimate situation that Phase II was working towards through its efforts to build capacity in the use of the MIST system, although as discussed previously, the project did not have sufficient resources to achieve as much as it would have liked, and the process of mainstreaming the MIST RBM system inevitably takes significantly longer than Phase II’s limited timespan allowed.

72. Other key challenges to building sustainable capacity for ranger-based monitoring are considered below under each of the three dimensions of RBM, and are summarised in Table 4 below.

RBM data collection

73. A major challenge to ranger-based data collection is the inability of many participating sites to actually carry out law enforcement patrols\(^\text{28}\). The evaluation team found this to be the case in a number of the sites visited during the evaluation where, despite the fact that there were trained staff capable of collecting law enforcement monitoring data and entering into a functional MIST system, the site concerned was either unable to carry out any patrols at all, or could only carry out a low-level of patrols, because of insufficient trained staff or funds for rations, fuel, limited accessibility to the site, etc.

74. Even in those instances where the site concerned is able to carry out patrols, there are other factors which may make these patrols only partially effective. Key amongst these is the lack of availability of GPS devices. In this regard, although the online surveys carried out by MIKE showed a significant increase in GPS use from 2009-2012, nevertheless the surveys also suggest that GPS units may only have been available for roughly half of the patrols carried out. Since the spatial data produced by GPS is critical to the effective operation of the MIST system, this lack of GPS units undermines the capacity of sites to use the system. The key challenges posed by the limited availability of GPS devices to data entry into the sites’ MIST databases are described in the RBM data management section (paragraph 81) below.

75. Another factor affecting ranger-based data collection is that for some participating sites, rangers may be unwilling to actually collect monitoring data, either because they regard this as a major distraction from their law enforcement duties, or else because they regard monitoring as an additional task for which they should be compensated. In the short-term, this is not an easy problem for the MIKE Programme to address, and ultimately it falls on the range State concerned to establish monitoring as an integral part of the job responsibilities of rangers, and to incorporate monitoring into basic ranger training from the outset (see section 4.1, Impact & Sustainability, below).

---

\(^{28}\) The 2012 report on the West African MIKE sites (“Rapport de visite des sites MIKE en Afrique de l’Ouest” by D. Kujirakwinja) found that a number of MIKE sites are experiencing severe financial hardship, since they are part of PA networks managed by national agencies for which conservation is not a top priority. The fact that these sites do not receive adequate funding, or in some cases none at all, is exacerbated by the conflict or post-conflict scenarios that affect many of the countries in question, and conservation NGOs are not very active in West Africa compared to other sub-regions. The report suggests that MIKE financial support, however limited, could have a major impact in addressing the most pressing site-level needs.
76. An additional on-going problem, particularly in West Africa\textsuperscript{29}, is the fact that several sites have been using multiple field-data collection forms side by side, to collect the same data, during ranger patrols. This has led to unnecessary duplication of effort, with essentially the same information being recorded once on each different form for use in parallel databases (i.e. Excel and MIST). At some sites, a distinction is still being made between data collected for MIST (commonly viewed as MIKE data) and any other data collected during ranger patrols. In this respect, some confusion remains at the site-level regarding the intended role of MIST, which in several sites continues to be perceived primarily as a system for extracting data for the benefit of the MIKE CCU, rather than an effective PA management tool. This limited awareness of MIST’s potential role in site-level decision making and adaptive management may also contribute to the rangers’ view that the collection of RBM data for entry into the MIST database is an unwelcome distraction from their other duties, as described above.

RBM data management

77. In general terms, the process of data entry into site-level MIST installations and database management has proven to be relatively straightforward when compared to the collection of RBM data itself. In this regard, the ongoing demands for elephant carcass data from the MIKE SSUs and CCU have been instrumental in driving data entry at the site-level, or at least the storage of hard copies of RBM data collection forms in cases where capacity gaps or technical issues prevented the effective use of MIST. However, as described in the RBM data collection section above, MIKE-driven data entry has not necessarily translated into effective patrolling, data collection or data application. In addition, some sub-regions have experienced more significant data management challenges than others. West Africa in particular has been affected by serious technical challenges and capacity gaps, which resulted in many sites not being able to use MIST, or to transmit data through to the MIKE CCU.

78. Despite all these challenges, by early 2012, 37 out of 58 African MIKE sites were routinely collecting and transmitting data to the MIKE CCU, and since 2012, encouraging progress has been made, especially in West Africa after the West and Central Africa SSUs were merged\textsuperscript{30}. Recent site-based capacity building and training by the SSOs has been instrumental in setting up new MIST databases, and many West African sites which previously had no working MIST installation are now able to effectively manage their databases and to tackle backlogs of RBM forms that had accumulated over the previous years. In addition, at sites that were not visited by the SSOs in 2012, an external consultancy was carried out in order to collect carcass information that had not been transmitted to the CCU as well as to evaluate the causes of MIST database malfunctions, the RBM systems in place, the key capacity gaps, and the mechanisms for data transmission to the national and subregional level\textsuperscript{29}.

79. During the course of this evaluation, a number of sites also reported that delays between MIST training events, often held at the subregional level, and the launch of RBM activities at the site level, resulted in lost capacity. In addition, the MIKE site managers’ own decisions sometimes undermined the effectiveness of training. For example, MIKE site managers often opted to attend MIKE subregional training events in person rather than sending their deputies that were actually responsible for day-to-day MIST data entry, which meant that the impact of such training was greatly undermined. Related to this, the site-level staff responsible for data entry and management have raised the issue that capacity building and technical backstopping of site visits by the MIKE SSOs have been too few and far between, as well as not timed regularly. While financial and time constraints impact on the SSOs’ ability to provide on-going capacity building and support, progress has been made in this area during the latter part of Phase II.

80. Computer viruses, lack of adequate equipment and lack of reliable sources of electricity also remain a problem at a number of sites. As discussed in paragraph 64 above, at some PAs these issues have been addressed by installing the MIST database directly on the MIKE Site Officers’ private laptops; however this may not always be a viable solution, particularly due to the high staff turnover rates (see paragraph 69). Reliable power sources are particularly important because delays between field data collection and entry


\textsuperscript{30} However, this merger only occurred following the completion of Phase II.
can lead to errors, and the capacity of MIKE Site Officers to perform data validation independently of SSOs’ inputs remains limited at some sites.

81. An issue related to the availability of GPS devices discussed in paragraph 74 above is the problem that a number of sites have experienced in uploading GPS data into the MIST software. This could either be because some of the new GPS units are not compatible with the MIST data reception ports, or because GPS units are permanently based in the field at ranger outposts and could not realistically be transported to PA Headquarters, or else because, due to the limited number of GPS units, they needed to be quickly recycled to the field with insufficient time to download data. The usual solutions in these circumstances has been either to transfer the GPS data manually (writing them out on the patrol form and then again into MIST, with possibilities for corrupted data), or else simply not transferring the GPS data into MIST.

82. As described in paragraph 76 above, duplication of effort, with parallel databases being managed by different site-level departments, has also been an issue at some sites. This problem has been largely due to the appointment of MIKE deputy officers at the site level not always being straight-forward. In the absence of clear guidelines, there have been instances in which site-level power dynamics have prevailed over considerations of efficacy, and on occasion deputy officers have been nominated that are not directly connected to either PA monitoring or law enforcement operations. As a result, these MIKE deputy officers are not empowered to consolidate data stored in databases managed by the site’s monitoring or law enforcement departments, and have limited power to influence PA management, as described in paragraph 86 below. The role of MIKE National and Site Officers is further discussed in section 5.2.

RBM data application

83. Although there has been success with regard site-level data application at some participating sites, in general, the evaluation found during the site visits that a significant proportion of sites are unable to use the MIST monitoring system to produce a variety of data outputs that can be used in adaptive site management, such as in informing the site’s law enforcement and patrol strategies. Similar observations in this regard have been made by the SARF workshop held in May 2011 (see above), and the MIKE capacity building activities and needs assessment in June 2012. As discussed under section 2, Relevance, above, a major factor contributing to this situation was that the broad-based capacity building that is needed to achieve effective ranger-based monitoring and adaptive management was simply not foreseen in the Phase II project design, and even if it had been, it would not have been possible to achieve this across all 58 participating sites. The MIKE project team attempted within the available resources to strengthen capacity building, but realistically they were unable to make substantial progress with regard RBM data application. Another important contributing factor noted earlier was the continuous erosion of capacity at the participating sites, which meant that even where data application capacity had previously been built, it could be quickly lost. This risk is acknowledged in the Phase II project document, although nothing is contemplated to address it. This sustainability aspect is discussed further in section 4.1 below.

84. In addition, the evaluation team found that at a number of sites visited, data collection and management were effectively regarded by site-level staff as activities unrelated to the production of any subsequent data outputs and their application, and the extraction of elephant carcass data to be transmitted to the CITES-MIKE CCU was considered the primary use of the MIST databases. This reflects the prevailing perception among the PA wardens interviewed that it is lack of resources to mount effective patrols, rather than lack of information, that affects their ability to effectively manage and protect their sites, and that the production and application of MIST data outputs at the site level would only be relevant to their management needs if they had the means to take effective action based on the information available.

32 The lack of resources to effectively make use of monitoring data to inform law enforcement and conservation management is not limited to site-level operations. Responding to the Online Survey, a MIKE stakeholder commented “I find it very difficult to know whether MIKE data has helped enforcement agencies. This is because their failure to contain poaching is probably totally independent from any knowledge or “inputs” they might have been provided by MIKE and cannot be taken as an indication that MIKE has not gotten them the information they need. A far more parsimonious explanation is that they do not have the resources and they cannot overcome corruption - regardless of how well they know what the situation on the ground is.”
85. In this context, site visits by the evaluation team revealed how the production of MIST data outputs and their application is still perceived by many PA wardens and other site-level staff as a task for MIKE SSOs or the MIKE CCU rather than an integral part of site-level management. As described in paragraph 76, in many sites the potential role of MIST in site management is not yet fully appreciated at the site level yet, and the adoption of MIST has been driven mainly by the MIKE Programme’s need for elephant carcass information rather than a desire to modernise PA management originating at the national or site level.

86. At the same time, as mentioned in paragraph 83 above, in some cases site-level data entry and management staff are not directly connected to either monitoring or law enforcement operations, and therefore not in a position to use RBM data outputs to inform or influence PA management. While at most sites staff members in charge of ecological monitoring and law enforcement hold regular meetings with the PA wardens in order to plan conservation activities, staff in charge of MIST data entry and database management are not necessarily included in such meetings. As a result the potential for using MIST as a reporting and management tool is often not harnessed, and MIST data outputs that could be beneficial in informing site-level management are not discussed, if performed at all.

87. Another potential field requirement of the MIKE mandate that Phase II was not able to address relates to the participating MIKE sites’ broader law enforcement effort. In this regard, Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP16) relating to the establishment of the MIKE Programme states that: “Elephant range States are primarily responsible for the collection and regular submission of field data as part of their routine biodiversity monitoring activities. Data collection will cover the following topics:

- elephant population data/trends;
- incidence and patterns of illegal hunting; and
- measures of the effort and resources employed in detection and prevention of illegal hunting and trade.”

88. While Phase II has been largely successful in facilitating the generation of data on the first two requirements, it has not as yet been possible to generate significant reliable data on the law enforcement effort of the participating MIKE sites.33 The successful use of the MIST RBM system by participating sites would go a long way towards fulfilling this need, but specific law enforcement benchmarks need to be developed to measure other aspects of the site’s law enforcement effort. In this regard, Phase II has made some efforts to begin supporting the generation of some simple measures of Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME)34, but this has largely been in the context of testing the hypothesis of whether protection effort deters poaching, rather than developing a broader understanding of the law enforcement effort being made to protect elephants across the participating range States and sites (see section 3.3 below for a further discussion of Phase II’s use of PAME data).

Table 4. Key challenges impacting site-level capacity for RBM data collection, management and analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MIST requirement</th>
<th>Key challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBM data collection</td>
<td>• Insufficient numbers of active rangers to implement regular and effective RBM patrols</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient funds for ranger patrol rations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scarcity of water sources for ranger patrols in the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient funds to acquire/maintain basic ranger equipment (boots, uniforms, backpacks, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insufficient funds to acquire/maintain RBM-specific equipment (GPS, batteries, solar chargers, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• RBM data collection perceived by rangers as an obstacle to the fulfilment of their law enforcement mandate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Demands by rangers for higher wages for performing RBM tasks perceived as not falling within their original job description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Duplication of effort due to other field data collection forms being used in parallel with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33 The collection of information on conservation effort at MIKE sites had been part of the Phase I project design, and data needs on this aspect had been included in the original MIKE Patrol Form. However, without specific follow-up and support on these aspects from the MIKE SSOs, the MIKE sites were largely unable or unwilling to collect the data.

### 3.3 Data analysis

89. The Result 3 outcome is: “Robust analysis and integration of primary and secondary data routinely undertaken and reported on”. This outcome primarily addresses the international policy aspects of the MIKE mandate, focusing on the generation of regular and reliable information on the status and trends in elephant population and illegal killing, as a basis for informing decision making concerning the ivory trade at CITES CoP meetings and other international forums. As such, the delivery of this outcome is at the core of the successful achievement of the international component of the MIKE mandate.

90. By the end of Phase I, MIKE had been largely unsuccessful in generating regular and reliable information on status and trends in elephant populations and illegal killing. There were a variety of reasons for this which are reported on in the Phase I final evaluation, but key factors were:

- The Phase I project had not succeeded in recruiting a full-time Data Management Officer (DMO) to oversee the design and implementation of data analysis, although this position had been envisaged in the Phase I project document;

- The MIKE site selection process which took place prior to the launch of Phase I was largely top-down, and did not involve substantial participation from the range States themselves. Although there were subsequent efforts to modify the site selection according to range State feedback, overall, the lack of range State participation in the initial site selection process most likely undermined their ownership over the implementation of the MIKE data collection process on the ground;

- Phase I also faced practical challenges in getting range States to buy into the complex MIKE data collection requirements and to the MIKE Database itself, as detailed under section 3.1 above;

- Phase I did not succeed in putting into place a clear and pragmatic analytical approach or model by which status and trend analysis could be carried out based on field-generated data. The development of the analytical model was a primary responsibility of the DMO. Of particular importance here were the difficulties that Phase I experienced in generating reliable and appropriate information on ranger patrol effort, a vital index for correcting carcass detection data to provide an accurate analysis of ele-
phant mortality at the concerned site. In response to these perceived deficiencies in the Phase I approach, the Phase I evaluation recommended that the project should put in place a “Standard Analytical & Reporting Framework” which would set out the data requirements of the MIKE analysis, how the data would be utilised in generating reliable status and trend information on illegal killing of elephants, and how the analysis should be reported to the CITES CoP, participating range States, and other stakeholders.

91. These were some of the key challenges that the MIKE Phase II project set about addressing in order to strengthen its data analysis capacity and methodologies according to the Result 3 outcome, as discussed below.

Efficiency

92. Addressing the first challenge experienced in Phase I, the MIKE Data Analyst was recruited in April 2007, which put in place the necessary human resources to allow the project to firm up its analytical approach and data requirements. In addition, the challenges faced in Phase I in generating RBM data at the site level were gradually overcome, largely as a result of the new standardised MIST monitoring systems introduced under Phase II Result 2 (see section 3.1 above), coupled with the extensive capacity building support for the use of these systems provided under Result 1 (see section 3.2). With these foundations, the main outstanding challenge that remained was the further refinement and, as recommended in the Phase I evaluation, simplification of the MIKE analytical framework, which was an important initial focus of Result 3. In particular, this involved overcoming the crucial issue of carrying out a robust analysis of carcass data in the absence of reliable and appropriate data on detection effort.

93. To overcome the difficulties with collecting appropriate detection effort data, MIKE Phase II developed an innovative new approach to analysing carcass information called the “Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants”, or PIKE. PIKE is calculated as the ratio of illegally killed elephants to all carcasses found (both illegally killed and natural deaths), and is based on the assumption that the measure of effort is common to both the numerator and denominator of the ratio, and therefore cancels out. The PIKE analytical approach was first introduced as part of the MIKE Baseline Report produced in the first half of 2007, and submitted to the 55th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee held in The Hague, Netherlands in June 2007, although at that stage the analysis had not yet been given its PIKE acronym. The MIKE Baseline, which was intended to be one of the early outcomes of Phase I, was therefore only published at the beginning of Phase II, although much of the information presented was generated in Phase I. The MIKE Baseline was also summarised in the report to CoP14, which followed on from the 55th Standing Committee in June 2007. Subsequently, the first comprehensive analysis of the trends and factors influencing levels of illegal killing of elephants based on the PIKE methodology was presented to MIKE TAG Meeting No. 8 held in December 2009.

94. Complementing the ongoing work on the development of PIKE, and responding to the recommendations made by the MIKE Phase I Evaluation, the project convened two workshops aimed at strengthening MIKE’s analytical framework. The first of these, held in November 2009, chiefly focussed on the detection and law enforcement effort aspects of the MIKE analysis, and highlighted key effort data that needed to be collected as part of RBM methodologies. One important indirect outcome of this workshop was the establishment of the basic information requirements of the new SMART RBM system (see paragraph 66 above). The

---

35 For statistical purposes, data on patrol effort is actually required at the level of the individual patrol, not the aggregated patrol effort for the site in question. See: TAG Meeting #8, Document 6 (Annex 1).
second workshop, held in May 2011, examined the potential limitations of the PIKE analysis, and provided recommendations on how PIKE could be validated in practice.49

95. As noted previously, MIKE Phase I was unable to produce effective analytical outputs and as a result, during Phase I no substantive analytical reports were presented to the CITES CoP (i.e., to the 11th, 12th, and 13th CoPs held in Nairobi (2000), Santiago (2002) and Bangkok (2004) respectively). The first CoP to be convened during the present phase was the 14th CoP held in The Hague in June 2007, at which a summary of the MIKE Baseline Report was presented. Following on from the 14th CoP, the 58th Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in July 2009 requested the CITES Secretariat to prepare and present up-to-date and complete information on elephant carcass data that had been collected by MIKE, and this led to the MIKE Programme’s first major analytical report on MIKE’s data on the illegal killing of elephants, which was presented at CoP15 held in Doha in March 2010.40

96. The production of this comprehensive analytical report on MIKE data collection and analytical findings represented a significant milestone in the history of the MIKE Programme, and in effect a turning point in the Programme’s fortunes. After a decade of investment and effort in MIKE Phases I and II, the MIKE Programme had finally begun producing the kind of robust and credible analyses of elephant illegal killing information that was foreseen in the Resolution 10.10 mandate.

97. Following CoP15, the MIKE CCU produced further technical and analytical reports on MIKE data which, after being reviewed by the MIKE TAG, were presented to the 61st Meeting of the MIKE Standing Committee (held in Geneva in August 2011)41, as well as at the 62nd Meeting (held in Geneva in July 2012)42. This then led to a further comprehensive MIKE analytical report which was presented to the 16th CITES CoP held in Bangkok in March 2013.43

98. Besides the presentation of MIKE data to CoPs 15 and 16, the other important initiatives carried out under this Phase II outcome area were the efforts to integrate MIKE data with information being generated by the TRAFFIC ETIS programme on the illegal trade in ivory, and by IUCN/AfESG on elephant population status and trends through the African Elephant Database (AED). The integration efforts were spurred by the desire to ultimately develop a standard analytical and reporting framework that pulled together elephant-related information from all three data sources - MIKE, ETIS and AfESG/AED.44 They also responded to CITES CoP Decision 14.78, which recognised four primary global elephant monitoring systems - CITES MIKE, TRAFFIC ETIS, IUCN AfESG/AssE, and UNEP WCMC. As a result, the MIKE Programme and its partners presented an integrated report on elephant status information to SC61 as indicated above. As the SC61 report notes, this represented an important first step towards developing linkages between the different monitoring systems so that critical information and data on elephants are assessed and presented in an integrated manner to support CITES decision making. The integration exercise was repeated for SC62 in July 2012. However, reporting to the CoPs themselves continued to be separate, with a separate MIKE and ETIS report being submitted, in accordance with CoP requirements.

99. Besides the efforts to disseminate MIKE data and analyses through the CITES channels of the CoP and Standing Committee, Phase II also made efforts to disseminate MIKE data more widely in other channels, including publication in the open-access online scientific journal Plos-One in September 2011,45 as well as in the AfESG network publication, Pachyderm, which Phase II also supported the publication of.46 MIKE reports and other publications were also disseminated through the MIKE webpages on the CITES website.

40 CoP15 Doc. 44.2 (Rev. 1)
41 SC61 Doc. 44.2 (Rev. 1); SC61 Inf. 7
42 SC62 Doc. 46.1 (Rev. 1)
43 Although the meeting was held outside the MIKE Phase II timeframe, the project document envisages that some activities, such as reporting to CITES and disseminating MIKE information, would take place after the Phase II operational implementation period.
44 One of the strong recommendations of the SARF Workshop in May 2011.
46 A total of 9 MIKE updates were published in Pachyderm during Phase II.
Effectiveness

100. As described above, during Phase II, MIKE made concerted efforts to establish a standardised, reliable and as far as possible simple method of analysing MIKE data, and as a result of these efforts, the PIKE analysis that was developed is now widely accepted as a pragmatic and promising analytical approach. The usefulness of PIKE has also been confirmed by the conformity between PIKE projections on illegal killing of elephants with ivory trade information that has been generated by ETIS. The importance attached by MIKE’s stakeholders to the PIKE analysis was confirmed by the responses received to the Online Survey carried out by this Evaluation. Responding to the question “The credibility of MIKE’s monitoring information on illegal killing of elephants can be attributed to the scientifically objective, reliable and unbiased nature of the information collection and analysis methods”, 34% of respondents to the evaluation’s online survey strongly agreed, while 41% saying they somewhat agreed, a total positive response of 75%. Similarly, responding to the question “Monitoring information generated through MIKE’s support has been crucial to informing appropriate decision making at CITES Conferences of the Parties concerning trends in illegal killing of elephants, and regulation of the ivory trade”, 38% of respondents strongly agreed, while 28% somewhat agreed, an overall positive response of 66%. These outcomes represent a significant improvement over the situation at the end of Phase I, when MIKE had little to show in terms of data analysis, and reflect the significant investment made by both the MIKE CCU and the TAG in ensuring that the MIKE analysis is statistically and scientifically robust and as far as possible subject to peer review.45

101. However, while the recent progress that Phase II has made through the PIKE analysis is clearly appreciated by MIKE’s stakeholders, there is still room for progress in improving both the analytical approach itself as well as buy-in from MIKE’s stakeholders. With regard the analytical approach, the MIKE project team recognised the potential limitations of the PIKE analysis at an early stage, and the key areas where the PIKE analysis needed to be validated were eventually consolidated at the SARF Workshop held in May 2011 (see paragraph 94 above), including the need to carry out further studies on issues such as: the reliability of within-site carcass data; the influence of patrol coverage and effort on site-level detection probability, the influence of the cause of elephant death on detection probability; and the influence of changes in elephant mortality and the history of illegal killing at the site. The workshop concluded that, while the PIKE analysis was a significant step in the right direction, its reliability needed to be verified by: a) checking carcass data quality at participating sites on a regular basis; and b) testing various PIKE-related indices, such as carcass detection effort and site coverage at selected sites, where sufficient data is available. In particular, the need to examine the relationship between carcass sightings and detection effort at the level of individual patrols, as well as triangulation with non-patrol based data, was emphasised. In response, the MIKE CCU subsequently initiated studies designed to validate the PIKE analysis, including Hugo Jachmann’s pilot study to validate PIKE-based inferences at the site level carried out in 2012,47 as well as a preliminary verification and analysis of MIKE GPS location data by Iacopo Sinibaldi in 2012.48

102. With regard the need to measure detection effort, at its 7th meeting, the MIKE TAG recommended that the CCU look into indices of Protected Area Management Effectiveness (PAME), as a possible proxy measure of management effort in MIKE analyses. In this regard, the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) has been compiling existing assessments of PAME from around the world. WCMC provided the CCU with access to this information, but in the event data were only available for 22 MIKE sites, and given this limitation, PAME scores could not be incorporated in the MIKE analysis conducted in August 2009. However, the MIKE CCU identified four potentially important PAME indicators that appeared to correlate with PIKE and then went on to collect data for those four indicators from all MIKE sites. The CCU subse-

103. The need to put in place a MIKE Standard Analytical & Reporting Framework (SARF) was identified in the MIKE Phase I evaluation, and was the subject of the subsequent SARF workshop mentioned above. However, although the current MIKE analytical framework has been described in CITES reports and in research publications, a concise and clear summary of the revised analytical framework has yet to be developed. In this regard, the evaluation team felt that a user-friendly and readily accessible documentation of the MIKE SARF would be very useful at this stage, especially considering the strengthening of MIKE’s analytical approaches that have taken place in Phase II, the on-going work in this area of both the MIKE CCU and the TAG, and the considerable body of additional knowledge that has been built up during Phase II. Although, the analytical framework is constantly evolving based on lessons learnt, the documentation of the SARF, as it stands at the end of Phase II, will not only provide a strong basis for the on-going work of the CCU and the TAG, but will also be important in enhancing understanding of MIKE’s analytical processes with MIKE’s other stakeholders - especially the range States themselves.

104. Another reason for putting in place an explicit SARF framework at this stage relates to the recent advances that the Phase II project has made with regard converting the PIKE data into elephant population trend measures that are more relevant at the site level. Specifically, at the 11th and final meeting of the TAG for Phase II held in December 2012, new analyses were discussed that potentially will enable MIKE to produce information on the proportion of the total elephant population being poached at a particular site, based on the existing PIKE analysis combined with information on the expected natural rates of mortality for elephants at the site concerned. This is potentially a significant step forward in the MIKE analysis, because it potentially enables information on estimated mortality rates due to illegal killing at a MIKE site to be compared with the expected natural rate of increase of elephant populations49, which in turn can provide an understanding of whether the elephant population at the site is in overall decline, without necessarily the requirement for expensive elephant population surveys. Of course, all the provisos regarding the PIKE analysis and its potential pitfalls still apply, and there are also important assumptions to be made with regard natural mortality rates and natural rates of population increase, but nevertheless this new analysis is an encouraging advance that could eventually make the MIKE analysis much more relevant to the participating range States and the MIKE sites themselves.

105. There is yet another important justification for putting in place an explicit SARF at this stage, which is the ongoing process of integration between MIKE analyses and reporting and those of ETIS and AFESG/AED, as discussed above. This provides a potential opportunity to develop a SARF that not only covers MIKE, but ETIS and the AED as well. In this regard, the SARF Workshop emphasised the importance of the linkages between the information generated by AFESG/AED and ETIS and the continuing development of the MIKE analytical framework, and emphasised the need for a joint analytical and reporting framework.

106. With regard range State buy-in to the MIKE analysis, as detailed in paragraph 90 above, MIKE Phase I got off to a poor start, by primarily basing the selection of MIKE sites on the need to ensure a statistically representative sample of Africa’s total elephant population. In practice, however, the top-down identification of sites probably alienated a number of the range States involved, and in the event the criteria underlying the eventual selection process were probably not sufficiently robust (or the available data insufficient) to ensure that the statistical selection process was a sound one. One important drawback of the process, for example, was that all the MIKE sites selected were, for practical reasons, drawn from official protected areas, whereas a good proportion of Africa’s elephant populations are still located outside of protected areas.

107. With hindsight, therefore, it would most likely have been better to have prioritised the participation of the range States in site selection, to ensure their full buy-in, support and ownership of the subsequent MIKE data collection processes. This aspect was underscored during the technical discussions that took place at
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49 Inferred from elephant research studies across Africa.
the 10th meeting of the MIKE-ETIS TAG in May 2011, which highlighted that the more important statistical issue was not so much the overall representativeness of the MIKE sites themselves, but the quality and quantity of data flowing from the individual MIKE sites. Following these technical discussions, it was accepted that MIKE should take a more inclusive and pragmatic approach to MIKE site selection, attempting as far as realistic to collect data from as many sites as possible, and focusing efforts on improving the quantity and quality of data being generated by the participating sites.

108. With regard broader international awareness of MIKE’s information outputs, towards the end of Phase II, the CITES Secretariat commissioned a rapid response assessment of the emerging crisis with regard illegal elephant killing and the ivory trade with funding provided by MIKE Phase II, and incorporating the latest MIKE data as well as data from ETIS and the AfES AED. The report was published by UNEP GRID-Arendal, and besides providing an overview of the current status of African elephants and trends in illegal killing, also provided recommendations for action to ensure the species’ protection. The assessment report was launched with the international media at a side event held at CITES CoP 16 in Bangkok in March 2013.

109. Responding to the evaluation Online Survey statement “Monitoring information generated through MIKE’s support has contributed significantly to raising international awareness of the illegal killing of elephants”, 18% of respondents strongly agreed, while 39% somewhat agreed, i.e. 67% gave positive responses. This suggests that, despite the efforts that MIKE Phase II has made to raise international awareness of the plight of Africa’s elephants, such as through the rapid response assessment, there is still scope in any follow-on phase of MIKE to strengthen international visibility activities concerning the MIKE Programme’s information outputs, although the CITES CoP will inevitably remain the programme’s primary audience.

3.4 Collaboration & coordination

110. The Result 4 outcome is: “MIKE structure efficiently and effectively managed, coordinated and monitored”. However, aspects of Phase II relating to the efficient and effective management of the MIKE structure are addressed under section 5, Project Implementation & Management, below, including MIKE’s supervision structures such as the MIKE-ETIS Sub Group. Similarly monitoring of MIKE Programme implementation is also dealt with under section 5. In this section, therefore, we look at Phase II’s efforts to put in place effective and efficient coordination mechanisms. This chiefly relates to three main coordination mechanisms: the Subregional Steering Committees, the African Elephant Meetings, and the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group.

Efficiency

MIKE Subregional Steering Committees

111. The MIKE Subregional Steering Committees (SSCs) were established during MIKE Phase I as a mechanism for engaging range States in the sub-region concerned in overseeing the implementation of MIKE, and also to strengthen collaboration between participating range States in the sub-region. The main function of the SSCs was to receive reports of the implementation of the MIKE Programme from each of the participating range States in the region concerned and the status of MIKE-related activities and surveys, as well as more general reports from the MIKE SSO on Phase II progress, achievements and challenges. Membership of the committees was in general either the head of the national wildlife agency or his/her representative, or the national CITES focal point, or the MIKE National Officer, or a combination drawn from these, with the committee secretariat being provided by the MIKE SSO concerned. The number of Subregional Steering Committees held during Phase II (including the no-cost extensions), is given in Table 5 overpage.

112. As shown in the table, each SSC involves a quite a number of participating range States, especially in West Africa. Taken together with attendance by the SSO and a representative of the CCU, as well as other ob-
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servers (such as ETIS and IUCN), and considering the travel costs involved, each Subregional Steering Committee was inevitably expensive to organise - on the order of US$ 15-30,000 per meeting. With a total of 20 meetings in all, this adds up to a significant amount of the Phase II budget. In this regard, the effectiveness of these meetings in facilitating the implementation of the MIKE Programme needs to be carefully considered.

Table 5. Subregional Steering Committees held during Phase II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Region</th>
<th>No of range States</th>
<th>No. of Meetings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

African Elephant Meetings

113. In addition to the SSCs, MIKE Phase II also supported a series of continent-wide meetings, the African Elephant Meetings (AEMs), the first of which was held in Mombasa, Kenya in June 2008, and the following three meetings all being held at UNEP Headquarters in Nairobi (2009, 2010 and 2012)\(^{53}\). These meetings involved representatives from all the range States participating in the MIKE Programme, plus representatives from the CITES Secretariat, the MIKE Programme (CCU and SSUs), and the major project partners - IUCN, AFESG and TRAFFIC/ETIS. The major function of the meetings as defined in the Phase II project document was to provide a forum at which elephant range States could meet together on a continent-wide basis to discuss and share experiences concerning common issues, problems and solutions with regard elephant conservation and management. The meetings also provided an important opportunity for the major implementation partners in MIKE Phase II - CITES, IUCN, AFESG and TRAFFIC/ETIS to interact with the range States and to provide broad information and advice on elephant conservation, illegal killing and ivory trade aspects.

114. An especially important function of the African Elephant Meetings was the development of the African Elephant Action Plan, as well as its associated funding mechanism, the African Elephant Fund, the development of which had been previously mandated by CITES Decisions 14.75 and 14.79 respectively. Development of these mechanisms took place at the first three African Elephant Meetings\(^ {54}\), but the two mechanisms were also important items on the agenda for the fourth and final AEM during Phase II held in April 2012. Other significant issues at the AEMs were the reporting on the major activities and outputs of the MIKE and ETIS Programmes, reporting on the status of Africa’s elephant populations, trends and challenges according to the African Elephant Database, follow-up on the implementation of CITES Resolutions and Decisions, including Resolution 10.10 and, for the last AEM, discussion of potential follow-up priorities and initiatives after the completion of MIKE Phase II.

MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group

115. The MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was established by the CITES Secretariat according to the mandate set out in CITES Resolution 10.10, and is responsible for providing technical oversight and support to both MIKE and ETIS, in particular in the following areas\(^{55}\):

- Helping to ensure the consistency and appropriateness of the design, development and implementation of MIKE and ETIS across the six sub-regions in Africa and Asia\(^ {56}\);

\(^{52}\) See Annex 4 for details of participating range States in Phase II

\(^{53}\) MIKE Phase I also held one Elephant Meeting, involving Asian as well as African range states. The meeting was held in Nairobi in September 2002.

\(^{54}\) The African Elephant Action Plan was subsequently approved by participating range States at CITES CoP15 (Doha, 2010).

\(^{55}\) Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev CoP16) has now transferred this mandate to the CITES Standing Committee.
116. Although Resolution 10.10 refers to one TAG, during Phase II, MIKE and ETIS have in practice held separate TAG meetings, each with its own agenda, but held back-to-back. TAG membership as well as meeting agendas covered Asia as well as Africa. The MIKE “sub-TAG” comprised of 12 members, with six members appointed on a “Global” basis made up of elephant conservation experts and statistician, and another six members appointed as elephant specialists representing MIKE’s six subregions (four in Africa, two in Asia). The ETIS Sub-TAG comprised six members: four members in common to the MIKE TAG drawn from the Global specialists’ category, and two additional ivory trade specialists of which in the event only one was appointed. The ETIS Sub-TAG had no subregional specialists. The sub-TAG meetings were chaired by the representative of the MIKE Programme and the ETIS Programme respectively. During Phase II, a total of seven TAG meetings were held (compared to four TAG meetings held during Phase I).

117. Some of the most important contributions that the TAG has made to the efficient and effective delivery of Phase II include:

- Advising on appropriate analytical procedures and timeframes for MIKE and ETIS outputs to the CITES Parties or relevant bodies established by the Parties; and
- Assisting the CITES Secretariat with the establishment of relevant databases and standard reporting protocols for the reporting of illegal hunting by CITES Management Authorities in range States and for monitoring in specific sites or areas (MIKE-specific responsibility).

Effective

118. As an internationally-mandated programme being implemented under the auspices of the CITES Conference of the Parties, with currently 30 participating range States, as well as various international partners, and whose credibility and ultimate impact is heavily dependent on the quality, timeliness and relevance of its information outputs, the coordination, collaboration and technical oversight mechanisms established by the MIKE Programme are clearly of critical importance to the success of the project. In this regard, all three of the coordination and oversight mechanisms utilised during Phase II – the Subregional Steering Committees, African Elephant Meetings and the TAG – had already been established in MIKE Phase I and were simply continued during Phase II, with improvements based on lessons learnt in Phase I. Although the African Elephant Meetings formed an important additional mechanism for ensuring the effective delivery of both MIKE and ETIS, they were chiefly convened not so much for the MIKE and ETIS programmes per se, but to provide a forum for African elephant range States to work together to address broader elephant conservation and management issues and solutions.

119. As noted above, all three of these coordination mechanisms are costly both in terms of finance and also in the human resources required to service them. Nevertheless, the views expressed to the evaluation team by the various MIKE stakeholders – both from participating range States and from the MIKE staff and major partners – indicated that the mechanisms are generally regarded as an important component for the successful delivery of the project, and provide good value for money. For example, responding to the online

---

56 MIKE Phase II funding has also enabled the TAG to oversee MIKE implementation in Asia as well as Africa, even though this was not formally in the Phase II results framework.
57 ETIS is a global programme and is not tied to elephant range States.
58 However, it is important to note that the members of the three bodies generally provide their time inputs free of cost.
survey question “MIKE has significantly strengthened collaboration in elephant conservation and protection at the subregional and regional level through forums such as the Subregional Steering Committees and the African Elephant Meetings”, 42% of respondents strongly agreed, while 34% somewhat agreed, i.e. an encouraging 76% of overall respondents felt that the MIKE Phase II coordination mechanisms (SSCs and African Elephant Meetings) were making an important contribution to collaboration in elephant conservation and management across the continent.

120. With regard the contributions made to Phase II by the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group, in response to the online survey question “The MIKE-ETIS TAG has been an essential mechanism for ensuring the scientific rigour and technical suitability of MIKE’s monitoring systems”, 40% of respondents strongly agreed, while 27% somewhat agreed, an overall 67% positively acknowledging the contribution of the TAG to the effectiveness of Phase II. Nevertheless, the evaluation shared the concerns of some stakeholders concerning the TAG’s primary emphasis on ensuring that MIKE data was statistically robust and appropriate for informing international decision-making, as opposed to the site-level realities of MIKE data collection. In this regard, one well-placed respondent to the online survey stated that “The TAG was generally too divorced from field realities. The result was scientific rigour in statistics at the top level but very little rigour in most of the field sites”.

3.5 Conclusions & Recommendations

121. The evaluation of Phase II’s efficiency and effectiveness has demonstrated that the project made important advances in a number of areas compared with the situation at the end of Phase I, although there were also a number of areas where further improvement is needed in order to consolidate the progress that has been made, and to achieve lasting impacts and sustainability (see section 4 below). This section sums up the key achievements made and challenges experienced according to the four major outcome areas of Phase II as detailed above, and also provides key recommendations concerning the design of follow-on activities to Phase II.

Monitoring information collection and management

122. Based on the lessons learnt from MIKE Phase I, summarised in the Phase I final evaluation report, the MIKE monitoring information collection and management methodologies were substantially revamped in Phase II, including the simplification of field data collection requirements and, importantly, the introduction of the generic ranger-based monitoring system, MIST. As a result of the changes introduced, Phase II achieved significant improvements in the generation of RBM data, as well as in the site-level management of this information through the MIST system. There was also substantial progress in the acceptance of the MIKE-supported monitoring systems by the participating sites and range States, because of the improvements in user-friendliness of the new systems, as well as the greater relevance of MIST to the broader management needs of the sites and PA authorities.

123. This substantial progress notwithstanding, there were still major challenges undermining the full adoption and mainstreaming of the MIKE-supported RBM systems by participating range States and sites. There were a wide range of factors responsible for this, which can relate to the capacity and commitment of participating sites for carrying out ranger-based monitoring, and their ability to integrate RBM into broader site adaptive management practices (see Capacity for ranger-based monitoring below). However, the evaluation also felt that MIKE Phase II could also have done more to consolidate the positive achievements under this outcome area through the introduction of supportive documentation, operational guidelines and protocols for site-level RBM practices – including data collection, management and analysis, that could eventually be institutionalised into the management practices and standard operating procedures of the participating wildlife authority at both the site and national levels. Following on from the independent assessment of analytical and data management capacity needs at MIKE sites commissioned by the MIKE CCU in mid-2012, the CCU began to address these needs through supporting the development of these operational guidelines for the new SMART RBM system.
124. This evaluation recommends that the production of supporting operational guidelines, protocols and procedures for RBM data collection, management and application be prioritised in Phase II follow-on activities, and that MIKE works with the participating wildlife authorities and sites to adapt and incorporate them into standard operating procedures and management practices in the site and range State concerned. The generic documentation should first be prepared at the international level, but subsequently adapted for the region and range State concerned by the MIKE SSO, who should also be responsible for working with the concerned range States to institutionalise the procedures.

Capacity for ranger-based monitoring

125. The RBM capacity-building support provided by MIKE Phase II did not differ fundamentally from that provided in Phase I, primarily consisting of training in RBM data collection and management (although in Phase II the focus was MIST rather than the MIKE Database), provision of essential RBM equipment, such as GPS’ and computers, and provision of logistical support to MIKE National and Site Officers. The provision of this capacity building support was the primary responsibility of the MIKE Subregional Support Officers. A key aspect of the workload on these officers in Phase II was the provision of training in the new MIST system, at both ranger data collection, management and application levels. While these training activities were widely appreciated by participating MIKE site and range State staff, it was also clear that the training provided only partially fulfilled the needs at the participating sites, especially with regard the application of MIST RBM outputs, and that the capacity created was continually being eroded because of turnover of staff. Similarly, with regard the provision of RBM equipment, with a total of 58 sites to support, Phase II could only scratch the surface of the actual sites’ RBM-related needs, and in many cases was not able to radically alter the sites’ capacity to carry out effective RBM patrols.

126. This situation can largely be attributed to the over-ambitious design of the Phase II results framework with regard to its capacity building goals, which in turn can be traced back to the broad and ambiguous MIKE capacity building aims defined in Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12). Another compounding factor was Phase II’s emphasis on the RBM data collection and management aspects of capacity building, which chiefly responded to MIKE’s international decision-making information needs. The Phase II team recognised these deficiencies in the project design and did their best to overcome them, especially through the promotion of the proven MIST RBM monitoring systems, but with 58 sites to cover, they were evidently limited in what they could achieve, and decided to focus the available resources on building effective capacity for RBM data collection and management, mainly leaving RBM data application aspects to a follow-on phase of MIKE.

127. Although it would be preferable to comprehensively support RBM activities in all MIKE sites, with limited resources at the programme’s disposal, there must be a mechanism in place to focus these resources, since attempting to distribute them on an equitable basis will ultimately only result in their wastage. This evaluation therefore recommends that for any follow-on phase, MIKE should adopt a two-pronged approach in which on the one hand, as in Phase II, the programme continues to provide basic capacity building support - i.e., essential training and RBM equipment - to all participating MIKE sites, but with the understanding that this support is unlikely to be sufficient to address the full RBM capacity needs of the sites concerned, and on the other hand the programme provides enhanced capacity building support to a limited number of high priority sites that are selected because of their globally-significant elephant populations, the extent of the threats to that population, and the actual need of the sites concerned.

128. The evaluation also felt that in follow-on MIKE activities to Phase II, the requirement defined in Resolution 10.10 for range States to begin collecting and compiling data on the law enforcement effort being made to detect and prevent illegal killing and trade in elephants should also be prioritised, by the range States themselves as well as by MIKE (see Paragraph 87 above). The compilation of such law enforcement and patrol effort data, which is one of the key outputs of both the MIST and SMART monitoring systems, is not only important for the verification and further improvement of the PIKE analysis, but will also serve to provide the CITES CoP as well as the participating range States with vital information on the effectiveness of their law enforcement efforts, and to identify critical sites where greater investment in law enforcement is needed to address worsening poaching situations.
129. **This evaluation therefore recommends** that in follow-on activities to MIKE Phase II, MIKE’s information requirements should be expanded to collect regular data in participating MIKE sites on a set of benchmarks that reflect the RBM and law enforcement effort underway in these sites, as the foundation for a law enforcement effort analysis to complement the PIKE illegal killing of elephants analysis. A preliminary set of appropriate benchmarks will need to be worked out by the CCU and agreed with the TAG before being field tested (for practicality and relevance) in a set of pilot sites. **The evaluation further recommends** that the introduction of the law enforcement benchmarks measurement should be an important future responsibility of the MIKE SSOs (alongside the range States themselves), and that this should be reflected in any future revision of their job description and TORs (see section 5.6 below).

130. For these recommendations to succeed, it will be vital that the range States themselves now step up to the plate in taking responsibility for the effective implementation of the MIKE Programme, as per the commitments outlined in Resolution 10.10, which are detailed in Paragraph 87 above. Although the financial and resource limitations of many of the range States with regard effective protected area management is clear, the evaluation team felt that up until now, there has been too much reliance on the part of the range States on the MIKE Programme to fulfil the capacity needs for carrying out effective ranger patrols, rather than strengthening their own capacity support to complement the efforts and interventions made by MIKE. The reasons for this may in part relate to the unrealistic expectations surrounding the implementation of the MIKE Programme, a lack of appreciation of the full scope of the programme and the consequent limitations on resources available to individual range States, and the fact noted earlier that there had been insufficient involvement of the range States in the original Phase I MIKE site selection process. Another important factor may be that, although MIKE was established and has been mandated by the range States themselves at a number of CITES CoPs, the programme does not necessarily enjoy the high-level political support from the range States needed to leverage sufficient national support and investment.

**Data analysis**

131. The main focus of Phase II towards the delivery of its data analysis outcome has been on developing a robust and practical analytical approach framework that had scientific credibility, and then applying the approach in generating appropriate analyses that could inform CITES decision-making. Phase II was broadly very successful in achieving these aims, albeit that the analytical approach adopted - the PIKE Analysis - was still in need of further verification in the field, and that there was still significant scope for further enhancing the methodology through new efforts to measure management and detection effort. Nevertheless, during Phase II, besides the original MIKE Baseline Report, the MIKE Programme produced four comprehensive analytical reports on the illegal killing of elephants in Africa and Asia, for the 15th and 16th meetings of the CITES CoP (March 2010 and March 2013), and the 61st and 62nd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (August 2011 and July 2012).

132. All these reports were well received, and as noted previously, represented a turning point in MIKE’s fortunes. The MIKE CCU and the TAG are both to be commended for the efforts invested in enabling the MIKE Programme to produce a robust and scientifically-credible analysis that could appropriately inform CITES decision-making processes. The recent developments in the MIKE analysis being pioneered by the CCU and the TAG aimed at generating site-level data on estimated elephant mortality rates due to illegal killing, based on PIKE and estimates of natural mortality rates, are especially promising for making the MIKE analysis more relevant to site-level management needs, and **the Evaluation recommends** that the further development and field testing of these aspects should be prioritised in future phases of MIKE.

133. The other important development in MIKE’s reporting was the effort invested in Phase II to integrate MIKE reporting with that of its sister programme ETIS, as well as elephant population status data being produced by AfESG/AED. This integration of elephant data from the various sources makes eminent sense, and has the potential of providing a still stronger understanding of the status of elephant populations in Africa and the key threats impacting on them. Phase II has made good progress with this integration, and forums such as the MIKE-ETIS TAG and the African Elephant Meetings are important mechanisms for building future collaboration and integration. In this regard, the proposal to develop a Standard Analytical and Reporting Framework that incorporates MIKE, ETIS and AfESG/AED generated information makes perfect sense, and
is timely considering the important changes that have taken place concerning the MIKE data analysis during Phase II, and the work that MIKE, ETIS and AfESG/AED have already done to implicitly develop such a joint SARF through the production of integrated reports to the CITES Standing Committee.

134. **This evaluation therefore recommends** that for any follow-on phase of MIKE, an integrated MIKE-ETIS-AfESG (AED) SARF is developed and documented to consolidate the progress that has been made in joint reporting by the three programmes. **The evaluation further recommends** that this joint analytical and reporting framework be backed up by efforts to strengthen the collaboration between the three programmes, in particular through putting in place enhanced collaboration arrangements between them (see section 5.3, Partnerships below).

135. With regard the sometimes controversial issue of MIKE site selection, the evaluation appreciated the recent discussions held during the 10th meeting of the TAG in this regard, and the requirement to shift emphasis away from issues concerning the statistical representativeness of existing MIKE sites, to the much more important issue of ensuring the quality and quantity of data produced at existing MIKE sites. In this regard, **the evaluation supports the recommendation** of the TAG that future phases of MIKE should take a more pragmatic approach concerning the selection and participation of MIKE sites (see also Paragraph 37 above), and should instead focus efforts on ensuring that MIKE data is of a high standard, representative of the site concerned, and is regularly produced.

**Collaboration & coordination**

136. MIKE Phase II’s collaboration and coordination mechanisms - comprising the MIKE Subregional Steering Committees (SSCs), the African Elephant Meetings and the MIKE TAG (although the TAG also has an important technical oversight and support role), have all played a crucial role in strengthening range State ownership of and participation in the MIKE Programme. All three coordination mechanisms were carried forward from MIKE Phase I.

137. While the SSCs have played an important role in ensuring range State engagement in MIKE implementation, it is also clear that the functioning of these meetings could potentially be enhanced to make them more effective. In particular, the evaluation felt that the SSCs could in future play an important role in overseeing monitoring of site-level RBM and law enforcement benchmarks which should be established as recommended under Paragraph 123 above, and in promoting improved performance against these benchmarks. The evaluation also felt that the SSCs could potentially be more effective if they also involved key non-governmental organisations working in the subregion concerned. Although such NGOs are sometimes invited to participate in the SSCs, they have no formal membership of the committees. **The evaluation therefore recommends** that the roles and responsibilities of the SSCs be reviewed and revised for any future phases of MIKE, taking into account lessons learnt from their operation in Phase II, and these recommendations.

**4. Impact & Sustainability**

138. The previous section looked at MIKE Phase II project performance in terms of the efficiency and effectiveness of project delivery. This section now examines the progress that the project has made in establishing a foundation for the eventual achievement of long-term impacts. The analysis of impact is based on the Phase II project’s Theory of Change that was developed during the evaluation inception phase, a simplified form of which is given in Annex 5.

139. Since impacts are only realised after many years, it is not realistic to directly measure the delivery of impacts at the end of the project. Instead, a mechanism is needed to assess the **likelihood** that the project will make a contribution towards achieving impact; i.e. to identify and then assess a proxy, or proxies, of the delivery of impact. To achieve this, the evaluation has used the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROI)
methodology\(^{59}\) that has been developed by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) Evaluation Office to assess the progress of GEF projects towards delivering environmental and sustainable livelihood impacts. The ROtI methodology assumes that, in order to achieve eventual impact, certain conditions need to be in place to bring about impact, and also that intermediate states in the achievement of impact can be identified. This is illustrated in the diagram below:

140. The diagram shows the components of the project’s Theory of Change between outcomes and eventual impacts according to the ROtI methodology, and shows that in order to achieve impacts, certain conditions must first be fulfilled - called Assumptions, Impact Drivers and Intermediate States. Both Impact Drivers and Assumptions generally relate to factors that bring about either the long-term sustainability of project interventions, or else encourage the mainstreaming and/or scaling up of project interventions. Crucially, Impact Drivers are potentially within the ability of the project to achieve, and therefore should ideally be included in the project design, while Assumptions are usually beyond the ability of the project to realise, and can therefore only be anticipated in the project design.

141. Annex 5 details the different components of the MIKE Phase II Theory of Change developed during the inception phase of the evaluation. As such, the Theory of Change reflects the evaluation team’s viewpoint on how MIKE Phase II was likely to contribute to the achievement of ultimate impact, not that of the original project designers. Accordingly, this assessment of Phase II’s impact is necessarily subjective, and another team of evaluators might well come up with an alternative Theory of Change for the project of equal or even greater validity.

142. The two Intermediate States identified by the project Theory of Change analysis are as follows:

- Intermediate State #1: Biodiversity monitoring is fully integrated into range States’ national wildlife decision-making and management systems at both national and site levels
- Intermediate State #2: MIKE generated biodiversity monitoring information is effectively informing international conservation and trade decision making on a sustainable basis

These two Intermediate States reflect the two main components of the MIKE mandate, dealing with building capacity for biodiversity monitoring at the national and site level and the role of MIKE in international decision making concerning elephant conservation and the ivory trade respectively.

143. In the next sections, the project’s progress in putting in place the necessary conditions for achieving impacts is discussed according to the two Intermediate States for the project that have been identified. For each Intermediate State, the various Impact Drivers and Assumptions relating to the achievement of the intermediate state are discussed, and the actual state of affairs at the end of the project is indicated.

---

4.1 Intermediate State #1: Biodiversity monitoring is fully integrated into range States’ national wildlife decision-making and management systems at both national and site levels

144. The first Intermediate State “Biodiversity monitoring is fully integrated into range States’ national wildlife decision-making and management systems at both national and site levels” is the logical outcome of the project’s efforts under Results 1 and 2 to build sustainable capacity to implement the MIKE monitoring systems at both site and national levels. To achieve sustainability of these systems, it will ultimately be necessary that the systems are institutionalised and mainstreamed within the wildlife management agencies of the participating countries. In addition, it will also be important that these monitoring systems not only address elephant populations, but other significant biodiversity as well, so that the systems are fully relevant to the host institutions.

Impact Drivers and Assumptions

145. The evaluation identified the following seven Impact Drivers and assumptions that were considered necessary to bridge the gap between the project outcomes and the eventual delivery of the Intermediate State:

- **Impact Driver**: MIKE’s monitoring data needs are compatible with the needs of range State’s management authorities at national and site levels
- **Impact Driver**: National and site-level managers are empowered to utilise monitoring data as part of adaptive management and law enforcement systems
- **Assumption**: National and site institutions are able to maintain appropriate staffing levels and continuity of monitoring staffing
- **Impact Driver**: National and site institutions have access to training for new monitoring staff
- **Assumption**: Protected area law enforcement efforts are adequately prioritised by range States and adequate resources are provided
- **Impact Driver**: Monitoring systems and protocols are appropriate to the needs and circumstances of the participating site/national institutions
- **Impact Driver**: Practical guidelines and manuals are available to facilitate site and national managers in implementing monitoring systems

146. With regard the first Impact Driver “MIKE’s monitoring data needs are compatible with the needs of range State’s management authorities at national and site levels”, the evaluation considered that Phase II had made significant progress in ensuring that MIKE’s data needs are compatible with range States’ monitoring and management needs through the introduction of the MIST system, which allowed participating States/sites to collect monitoring data on other management aspects beyond the MIKE-specific needs. The broad acceptability of MIST was demonstrated by its adoption by 85% of participating MIKE sites and in almost 90% of participating range States, as well as its replication in other non-MIKE sites in a number of countries (see section 3.1 above). Unlike in MIKE Phase I, Phase II also took a broader approach to biodiversity information collection rather than only focussing on elephants, which also facilitated the achievement of the Impact Driver.

147. With regard the Impact Driver “National and site-level managers are empowered to utilise monitoring data as part of adaptive management and law enforcement systems”, the evaluation considered that, while MIKE’s advanced MIST training programmes introduced possibilities of utilising monitoring data as part of wider site-level adaptive management, with the limited time and resources available and the large number of MIKE sites to support, it was not possible for Phase II to make significant progress in achieving this Impact Driver. As discussed in section 3, Efficiency and Effectiveness, a contributing factor here was the original project design, which prioritised capacity building for RBM data collection and management and put less emphasis on the subsequent application of RBM data at the site level. The Phase II project team partially addressed this deficiency through the introduction of MIST, but with 58 sites to support and limited human and financial resources at their disposal, it was not possible for the MIKE Subregional Support Units
to comprehensively address the capacity building needs for RBM data application. Nevertheless, the achievement of this Impact Driver is important to eventual sustainability of the RBM systems, because unless individual sites are able to make full use of monitoring data in informing their own adaptive management, their ownership and support for these systems beyond the life of the project will inevitably be limited.

148. With regard the assumption that “National and site institutions are able to maintain appropriate staffing levels and continuity of monitoring staffing”, the evaluation felt that this assumption did not hold true during Phase II. In practice, continual turnover of staff responsible for the MIST monitoring system for all three dimensions of monitoring – data collection, management and analysis represents a major challenge to the sustainability of MIST monitoring systems, especially where these systems have not been institutionalised beyond the MIKE project interventions (see Paragraph 69 above). For example, in one of the sites visited during the evaluation site visits, the officer responsible for MIST data management and analysis had been transferred to the management agency Headquarters, and it will be necessary for MIKE to provide opportunities for additional advanced training for the new officer concerned. As discussed in section 3.2 above, staff turnover represents an important factor in undermining the sustainability of the MIKE support for ranger-based monitoring, and the long-term solution relies on range States mainstreaming and institutionalising RBM systems and procedures in their national protected area management practices. While MIKE has been assisting in this process, and can potentially intensify these efforts, mainstreaming RBM will inevitably take time, and ultimately success will depend on the commitment of the range States, and the resources they themselves make available.

149. The requirement for sustainable capacity for RBM training is addressed by the Impact Driver “National and site institutions have access to training for new monitoring staff”. This issue has been addressed by the MIKE Capacity Assessment Study, which proposed the option of building long-term RBM training capacity in subregional and national wildlife training institutions. However, for the reasons set out in Paragraph 68 above, this may not be a realistic option. In the long-term, as discussed above, it will be necessary for the range States to mainstream and institutionalise ranger-based monitoring, and to build the necessary capacity for training into their institutional capacity.

150. With regard the Assumption “Protected area law enforcement efforts are adequately prioritised by range States and adequate resources are provided”, it was apparent from the site visits undertaken during this evaluation that several participating range States are clearly not sufficiently prioritising the need for adequate law enforcement efforts in their protected areas, and that as a result, inadequate resources are being made available for protected area management efforts. For example, some MIKE sites are simply unable to undertake ranger patrols on a regular basis, or else ranger patrols may be carried out by poorly equipped and inadequately trained staff. While the resource problems faced by protected area managers across Africa are longstanding and well known, it is still important to recognise that the assumption that range States will fulfil their own responsibilities to ensure that MIKE’s interventions are complemented by the range States’ own resources and policy-level support is not as yet being realised, and that this remains a major obstacle to the long-term sustainability of MIKE interventions.

151. With regard the Impact Driver “Monitoring systems and protocols are appropriate to the needs and circumstances of the participating site/national institutions”, the evaluation felt that Phase II had made significant progress in putting into place ranger-based monitoring systems that are both relevant to and appropriate to the needs of participating range States and sites. In this regard, the MIST monitoring system represented a major advance over the previous MIKE Database promoted in Phase I, which was poorly received in part because it was mainly focussed on elephant monitoring, and also because it was not especially user-friendly. The success in the adoption of MIST over a relatively limited timeframe in Phase II is an object lesson that providing systems that address the tangible needs and capabilities of the participating organisations can lead to very rapid uptake, even though the related capacity building inputs by the project may remain on a similar level.

60 Each SSU had on average to support approximately 15 MIKE sites, often across a dispersed and inaccessible geographical area.
152. With regard the Impact Driver “Practical guidelines and manuals are available to facilitate site and national managers in implementing monitoring systems”, the evaluation felt that this had only been partly achieved. In this regard, the original Phase II project design assumed that the MIKE Database developed in Phase I would continue to be used in Phase II, and made no substantial provisions for the need to institutionalise the RBM monitoring systems in the participating range States and MIKE sites (i.e., the Phase II design assumed that the RBM systems would primarily be used for generating MIKE data, not for meeting the broader management needs of the sites concerned). The MIKE CCU recognised this weakness in the original design and introduced the MIST system to address it. The MIST software has a generic user manual which was provided to participating sites, and sometimes adapted for the specific needs of the site. However, as discussed previously, there were insufficient resources and time to commence the process of fully institutionalising MIST in all participating sites, including the production of practical RBM operational guidelines and manuals (see Paragraph 5757 of section 3.1 above).

Intermediate State

153. Based on the above assessment of Impact Drivers and assumptions, the evaluation felt that MIKE Phase II has been very successful in raising the profile of and capacity for practical ranger-based monitoring in participating range States and sites, which represents a major step forwards compared to the situation at the end of Phase I. However, the weaknesses in the original Phase II project design and the large number of participating MIKE sites meant that it was not feasible to invest adequate resources in building capacity to use these outputs and in institutionalising MIST systems through establishing operational guidelines and procedures. In addition, capacity improvements were held back in many MIKE sites by the lack of adequate commitment to and resources for protected area law enforcement efforts on the part of the range States themselves. As a result, the Intermediate State was only partially achieved by the end of Phase II.

4.2 Intermediate State #2: MIKE generated biodiversity monitoring information is effectively informing international conservation and trade decision making on a sustainable basis

Impact Drivers and Assumptions

154. The evaluation identified the following six Impact Drivers and Assumptions that were considered necessary to bridge the gap between the project outcomes and the eventual delivery of the Intermediate State:

- **Impact Driver**: Appropriate and sustainable subregional mechanisms and capacity are established to support MIKE monitoring systems and to enable effective collaboration in sharing monitoring information
- **Impact Driver**: Long-term institutional and financing mechanisms and partnership arrangements for maintaining MIKE’s central coordination and technical oversight functions are established
- **Assumption**: Range States are open and willing to share monitoring data at the regional and international level
- **Impact Driver**: MIKE data is internationally accepted for its scientific credibility, quality and timeliness
- **Impact Driver**: MIKE is able to identify and correlate key drivers of the illegal killing of elephants and the ivory trade
- **Assumption**: International and range States’ support for the MIKE system is maintained

155. With regard the first Impact Driver “Appropriate and sustainable subregional mechanisms and capacity are established to support MIKE monitoring systems and to enable effective collaboration in sharing monitoring information”, it was never a priority of the Phase II design to establish sustainable long-term subregional support mechanisms for MIKE – rather, the emphasis was on getting the MIKE monitoring systems up and running, and accepted by participating range States and sites. The issue of institutionalising MIKE at the
subregional level was implicitly an issue to be addressed in a follow-on phase of MIKE, and this Impact Driver was therefore not built into the Phase II project design. As with Phase I, the four MIKE Subregional Support Units continued to be hosted by IUCN Regional Offices in Eastern, Southern, West and Central Africa. While the IUCN Regional Offices have provided an appropriate mechanism to enable MIKE to engage with and support participating range States, they are realistically only a temporary home for MIKE, dependent on continued project funding. The relationship between the MIKE Programme and IUCN is further discussed under section 5, Project Implementation & Management, below.

156. The Impact Driver “Long-term institutional and financing mechanisms and partnership arrangements for maintaining MIKE’s central coordination and technical oversight functions are established” relates to the sustainability of the international MIKE mechanisms, in particular the role of the MIKE CCU, the TAG, and other coordination mechanisms such as the African Elephant Meeting. Like the MIKE subregional mechanisms, the Phase II project design did not explicitly define activities aimed at establishing long-term institutional and financing mechanisms for MIKE, although the Phase II Project Purpose implies that Phase II will lead to a monitoring system being established “on a long-term sustainable basis”. In this regard, although the MIKE Programme is mandated by the CoP, the CITES Parties have not so far supported the inclusion of MIKE core costs into the recurrent CITES core budget (the Trust Fund), even though this issue was raised by the CITES Secretariat at both CoP14 and CoP15. Had the Parties agreed to this, the long-term sustainability of the MIKE Programme would have been secured and this Impact Driver would have been fully realised.

157. Nevertheless, several important characteristics of the MIKE Programme suggest that MIKE Phase II was partially successful in achieving sustainability with regard institutional and financing mechanisms, even though no specific activities were built into the project to achieve this. In particular, the Programme is mandated by the CITES CoP, and is fully supported by the CITES Secretariat, and as such, CITES has a significant commitment to maintaining the programme. Furthermore, the MIKE CCU is hosted by UNEP, and CITES’ institutional relationship with UNEP also means that the MIKE Programme has the full backing and support of UNEP. As such, the MIKE Programme enjoys considerable institutional backing and momentum which are likely to ensure institutional and financial support for the programme for the foreseeable future.

158. With regard the Assumption “Range States are open and willing to share monitoring data at the regional and international level”, the evaluation felt that the MIKE Programme has been highly successful in putting into place various coordination and collaboration mechanisms by which the participating range States were able to feel a sense of ownership over the Phase II programme - including the Subregional Steering Committees, the continental African Elephant Meetings, the MIKE-ETIS Sub-Group of the CITES Standing Committee, and the CITES CoP itself. As a result, despite some inevitable national sensitivities about monitoring data that exposed weaknesses in elephant protection in some range States, in general, the majority of range States have allowed good access to MIKE-generated monitoring data.

159. With regard the Impact Driver “MIKE data is internationally accepted for its scientific credibility, quality and timeliness”, it was clear that Phase II has made considerable efforts to ensure that MIKE monitoring data is statistically relevant (MIKE Statistical Consultant and Data Analyst), peer reviewed (MIKE-ETIS TAG and peer-reviewed publications), and regularly produced (reports to the CITES Standing Committee and CoP). As a result, MIKE monitoring data now enjoys significant international credibility. However, as discussed previously, while Phase II made a start at verifying the PIKE analysis at the site level, additional work is still required in this area in order to further enhance the scientific credibility and quality of MIKE data.

160. With regard the Impact Driver, “MIKE is able to identify and correlate key drivers of the illegal killing of elephants and the ivory trade”, Phase II analysed the key drivers of illegal killing of elephants using a series of potential site, country and global-level indicators, or covariates, of underlying drivers of illegal killing drawn from data published by a variety of sources, such as the World Bank, UNDP, Transparency International, and the African Elephant Database, among others. A total of 67 covariates were examined, and the outcomes reported at CITES CoP15 as well as published in a peer-reviewed journal. Important drivers of...
illegal killing that emerged at country level were poor governance and low levels of human development, and at site level, forest cover and size of the site in regions where human population density is low. The results of the analysis represented a significant contribution to effective decision making concerning elephant conservation and illegal ivory trade action at both the national and international levels, and therefore this Impact Driver can be regarded as well achieved.

161. Although “International and range States’ support for the MIKE system is maintained” was identified in the Theory of Change analysis as an assumption, in practice, the fulfilment of the assumption has been influenced in a variety of ways by the work of Phase II, notably the credibility and timeliness of MIKE’s monitoring data outputs during Phase II, continuing efforts to ensure that MIKE’s systems are relevant to participating range States and sites, and Phase II’s efforts to ensure that range States are directly involved in overseeing the Programme, through the MIKE Subregional Steering Committees, the continent-wide African Elephant Meetings, and facilitation of range State participation in CITES CoPs. As a result of all these efforts, international and range State support for MIKE seems to have significantly increased over the lifespan of Phase II. In this regard, responding to the question “MIKE has fulfilled its overall mandate to provide CITES Parties with adequate, appropriate and timely data and other necessary elements to enable decision-making regarding the ivory trade”, 28% of respondents to the evaluation online survey said they strongly agreed, and 44% said they somewhat agreed, a total positive response of 72%.

Intermediate State

162. Based on the above assessment of Impact Drivers and assumptions, the evaluation felt that MIKE Phase II has enjoyed considerable success in achieving the Intermediate State, as demonstrated by the broad acceptance of MIKE-generated data in informing international decision-making concerning elephant conservation and the ivory trade at CITES CoPs 15 and 16. However, the uncertainties concerning sustainable long-term financing for the programme and the lack of an appropriate long-term host for MIKE at the subregional level means that the Intermediate State has yet to be fully achieved.

4.3 Conclusions & Recommendations

163. Overall, MIKE Phase II has made significant progress in moving towards eventual impacts, and in particular in putting in place the key factors to ensure ownership of the MIKE monitoring systems at national and site levels, as well as credibility of MIKE-generated data in international decision making concerning elephant conservation and ivory trade action. Crucially, Phase II has radically transformed the situation prevailing at the end of Phase I, when there was only limited buy-in to the MIKE monitoring systems, and the programme was unable to produce regular and reliable information on illegal killing of elephants. Despite this broad success story, a number of key factors continue to impact on the sustainability and scaling up of the MIKE Programme, and these are summarised below, with recommendations for addressing them where appropriate.

National and site-level integration of biodiversity monitoring

164. The introduction of the MIST monitoring system represented a major step forward in providing participating range States and MIKE sites with a well-tested generic and relatively simple monitoring system that could be used to collect monitoring data on other management aspects beyond the MIKE-specific needs. However, weaknesses in the MIST system design with regard data analysis coupled with the inability of Phase II to build capacity in participating sites in the application of MIST data in addressing the site’s broader law enforcement and adaptive management needs meant that by the end of Phase II, the majority of sites were unable to make effective use of their monitoring data for informing their management processes, with the system still chiefly being used for the production of MIKE data for international use. This in turn inevitably detracted from site commitment to and ultimate ownership over (and therefore sustainability of) the systems. The MIKE CCU recognised the shortcomings of MIST with regard to the application of RBM
data in adaptive PA management, and towards the end of Phase II actively engaged in the development of a more user-friendly and advanced system, SMART.

165. In follow-on MIKE interventions, the Evaluation recommends that MIKE supports the piloting of the SMART software in selected sites and, depending on the success of this piloting, supports the gradual adoption and rolling out of SMART in other sites. However, there will continue to be a need to support the use of MIST in a number of MIKE sites for a number of years, and MIKE will therefore need to continue providing training and mentoring support for MIST where it is still in use. It is further recommended that follow-on MIKE interventions provide additional support and training for the use of both SMART and MIST in addressing the various adaptive management needs of participating MIKE sites, for example in ranger patrol planning, identifying poaching hotspots, fire response and management, etc. Because of the large number of MIKE sites involved, this additional support for enhancing the adaptive management capabilities of monitoring systems should ideally be provided in a limited number of priority MIKE sites, so that the systems and capacity can be adequately developed, and then further rolled out to other lower-priority sites as resources permit.

166. The issue of establishing sustainable capacity for the operation of the MIKE monitoring systems at both site and national levels is possibly the most significant challenge to the achievement of long-term impact by the MIKE Programme. There are two key dimensions to this capacity challenge - human resources and financial/material resources. MIKE Phase II attempted to address both of these challenges, and as has been described under section 3.2 above, these efforts were confounded by a range of factors, including high turnover of staff in participating sites and range State wildlife management agencies, inadequate material and financial resources to mount RBM and law enforcement patrols, and the lack of mainstreaming of the RBM systems in the institutional and operational procedures of many of the participating agencies and sites. All these factors are symptomatic of an even greater underlying issue - the commitment and wherewithal of the participating range States to prioritise and provide adequate resources to manage their protected areas effectively and sustainably. While follow-on MIKE activities can potentially be enhanced based on lessons learnt to strengthen their impact on management capacity (for example through the introduction of the SMART monitoring system), ultimately these efforts are unlikely to be sustainable and to achieve the desired impact on elephant conservation without a strengthened political commitment on the part of the range States, leading to improved allocation of resources for PA management.

167. As far as MIKE’s own capacity building interventions are concerned, as noted previously, more effort is needed to ensure that the outputs of RBM are made relevant at both the site and national levels, not just at the international level. As has been mentioned earlier in this report, it is not realistic to achieve this in every MIKE site, and in the view of the evaluation team, it will inevitably be necessary to focus these efforts on a limited number of priority sites where more can be achieved with the limited resources available. The evaluation therefore recommends that in follow-on MIKE activities, the programme provides more intensive capacity building support in a limited number of priority sites. In these sites, the emphasis should be on ensuring that RBM information is relevant to PA managers, and that RBM practices are eventually institutionalised, and become an integral and vital part of day-to-day site management.

Use of MIKE data in international decision making

168. As described under section 3.3, Data Analysis, above, MIKE Phase II has made significant strides in producing and reporting robust and scientifically credible analyses of ranger-based monitoring data on illegal killing of elephants that can be used in international decision making, especially at CITES CoPs. However, despite the active participation of the range States and of relevant non-governmental organisations working both nationally, subregionally and internationally, the MIKE Programme remains primarily a CITES programme, and is viewed by possibly the majority of MIKE stakeholders as such - an external programme performing an important function, but not yet owned by the stakeholders themselves. This situation goes back to the early roots of the programme in Resolution 10.10, when the primary aim of MIKE was to inform CITES decision making, and the need to eventually mainstream the programme in participating range States through building range State capacity to implement it was only recognised subsequently, and added to Resolution 10.10 in a subsequent revision (CoP12). Other factors also contributed - such as the desire to
establish a strong profile for MIKE to build the programme’s credibility (but potentially at the expense of ownership by other stakeholders) and the need to effectively and efficiently implement the MIKE project itself (both Phase I and Phase II), which encourages that issues of long-term sustainability and impact are superseded by the need to deliver shorter-term project outputs and outcomes. Whatever the reasons, the evaluation felt that the MIKE Programme has at the end of Phase II come of age - it has largely succeeded in fulfilling its immediate mandate, and now needs to change gear to work on the development of long-term sustainability at all four levels of its operation - site, national, subregional, and international.

5. Project implementation & management

5.1 Implementation mechanisms

169. The Phase II implementation mechanisms mainly followed those established for MIKE Phase I. The key supervisory and administrative arrangements are illustrated in Figure 2 below.

Figure 2. Supervisory and administrative relationships under MIKE Phase II

170. As per the Phase II Project Document, overall supervisory responsibility for the MIKE Programme under CITES CoP Resolution 10.10 has been given to the CITES Standing Committee, which in turn has delegated supervisory responsibility to the MIKE-ETIS Sub-Group. In terms of day-to-day supervisory responsibility for MIKE Programme implementation, the CITES Secretariat has established the MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU) based in Nairobi, as well as four Subregional Support Units in each of the four CITES-recognised sub-regions (based in Nairobi, Pretoria, Yaoundé and Ouagadougou respectively). The diagram also shows the role of the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG), which provides technical oversight for the development and implementation of both the MIKE and ETIS programmes (see Paragraph 115 above).
171. In addition to the supervisory relationships for the delivery of the MIKE Programme, Figure 2 also shows the administrative arrangements for Phase II implementation. In this regard, the MIKE CCU is in practice administratively embedded in UNEP in Nairobi, within the Division of Environmental Law & Conventions (DELC), by virtue of the CITES Secretariat’s hosting arrangements with UNEP. Similarly, the four Subregional Support Units are in practice administratively embedded within the IUCN Regional Offices in the region concerned, by virtue of the collaboration and hosting agreement signed between the CITES Secretariat and IUCN Headquarters, as well as four subsidiary project implementation agreements signed with each of the IUCN Regional Offices concerned. In this regard, the IUCN Regional Offices are responsible for hosting and providing administrative support to the SSUs, while overall programmatic supervisory responsibility continues to rest with the MIKE CCU.

172. At the national and site level, MIKE Phase II continued the role established during Phase I of the MIKE National Officer (appointed from the participating range State wildlife management authority or from the CITES focal institution), as well as that of MIKE Site Officers for all participating MIKE Sites. These national and site officers were intended to take the lead in the delivery of Phase II activities at their respective levels.

173. The functioning of the various key components of the MIKE Phase II supervisory and administrative arrangements is discussed in the following sections.

The CCU

174. The MIKE Central Coordination Unit (CCU) had overall responsibility for the day-to-day coordination of MIKE Phase II,64 staffed by the MIKE Coordinator, the MIKE Data Analyst, and two support staff (general service category). In practice however, Phase II was without a CCU from September 2006 until April 2007, when both the MIKE Coordinator and the MIKE Data Analyst were recruited. In addition, the MIKE support staff were recruited at an even later date - with the Finance Assistant joining in October 2008 and the Programme Assistant in 2009. The MIKE Coordinator then left the CCU in November 2011 to take up a position with the CITES Secretariat in Geneva, after which the MIKE Data Analyst assumed this role in an acting capacity. As a result, the MIKE CCU was understaffed both for the first and last year of Phase II, and this is likely to have had an impact on the CCU’s ability to oversee and provide support to the SSUs, as well as to undertake other CCU roles. Nevertheless, as noted under previous sections of this report, the CCU made some of its more significant achievements in the latter part of Phase II.

175. During Phase II, the MIKE CCU was physically located in the UNEP Division of Environmental Law & Conventions (DELC) in Nairobi, under direct supervision by the CITES Secretariat and with administrative and financial support services provided by the United Nations Office in Nairobi (UNON). This represented a shift from Phase I, when the CCU was administratively located within the IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office in Nairobi (albeit in separate premises), and reflected a desire by the CITES Secretariat to make the CCU an integral part of the CITES Secretariat. The Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation drew attention to the significantly higher CCU running costs associated with this shift, and suggested that the relative costs and benefits of the location of the CCU be examined. This current evaluation did not address this issue in any depth, but noted that, while there were undoubtedly increased costs involved in the relocation of the CCU to the UNEP/UNON Nairobi offices rather than IUCN, it was also clear that the resultant closer integration of the CCU in the CITES Secretariat had significant benefits for both sides. For example, the CCU benefitted from even stronger political and policy backing from the CITES Secretariat, which was important both with regard to the effective implementation of Phase II, collaboration with the range States, and also in securing funding for the continuation of the MIKE Programme when Phase II finances ran out (i.e MIKE 3.0). On the other hand, the CITES Secretariat benefitted from enhanced access to information on MIKE’s analytical outputs as well as on elephant conservation status and poaching on the ground in Africa, which in turn ultimately benefitted the CITES parties, for example at the CITES CoPs. The evaluation concluded that overall, while difficult to evaluate in monetary terms, the institutional and administrative arrangements for the

64 It is also important to note that the CCU also supports and services the implementation of MIKE in Asia as well as in Africa. This represents an additional set of responsibilities and workload that are not formally included in the MIKE Phase II project framework.
CCU in Phase II most probably resulted in net positive benefits for the long-term implementation of the MIKE Programme.

**The SSUs**

176. As shown in Figure 2 above, the Subregional Support Units (SSUs) are housed in the respective IUCN Regional Offices in the four sub-regions, through a contractual agreement between the CITES Secretariat and IUCN\(^\text{65}\). The CITES-IUCN agreement clearly defines the roles of the two parties with regard to the establishment and delivery of the SSUs, with IUCN responsible for the employment of the Subregional Support Officers (SSOs), and for the provision of human resources, financial and administrative support services for the implementation of Phase II in the sub-region concerned, while the MIKE CCU responsible for the supervision of the SSO. This aspect of supervision is strongly emphasised in the CITES-IUCN Agreement – for example, the agreement states that the SSO is “placed under the line management of the MIKE Coordinator” and that the MIKE Coordinator also had responsibility for “taking the final decision, in close consultation with IUCN, on issues of disciplinary measures to be taken in respect of MIKE Staff, up to and including termination of employment”. In return for the provision of these hosting services, IUCN was reimbursed administrative costs at the rate of 4% of the total funds remitted by the CITES Secretariat to IUCN and disbursed or otherwise paid by IUCN.

177. By establishing a direct line of command between the SSOs and the CCU, the CITES-IUCN agreement in theory established a simplified Phase II accountability and responsibility structure. There were also cost savings as far as the involvement of the IUCN Regional Offices was concerned, as well as benefits in terms of government relations (since the SSOs were seen as CITES employees). However, communication difficulties between the CCU and the SSUs, and lack of time for ensuring adequate supervision both on the part of the MIKE Coordinator and the SSOs, meant that the SSOs were in effect partially operating “in a void” in which they were in practice neither fully accountable and responsible to the CCU (because of the distance involved), nor to the IUCN Regional Office that hosted them. This lack of day-to-day supervision and oversight perhaps contributed to some inefficiencies in project implementation (see below), depending on the SSO concerned.

178. With regard SSU staffing, the East and Southern Africa SSUs each had one SSO, with the former being located for part of Phase II in the IUCN Regional Office in Nairobi, and partly in the Uganda Wildlife Authority Headquarters in Kampala, while the latter was located in the IUCN South Africa office in Pretoria\(^\text{66}\). Both the West and Central Africa SSUs were staffed by an SSO and a Deputy SSO, in response to the larger number of MIKE sites in both these sub-regions, and as recommended by the Phase I Final Evaluation\(^\text{67}\). In the event, however, Phase II experienced significant staffing difficulties, for example through the death of the DSSO in West Africa in January 2012, and the relocation for personal reasons of the SSO for East Africa back to Kampala, where he was housed in the Uganda Wildlife Authority, even further distanced from interaction with both IUCN and the CCU.

179. Despite these human resource issues, it is clear that the SSOs have generally performed well despite the logistical and managerial challenges that they faced during Phase II, as is evidenced by the performance detailed under the efficiency sections of section 4 above. However, with 30 range States and 58 MIKE sites to service across a dispersed geographical area with poor communications, it was also clear that the four SSOs and their deputies were greatly stretched in their ability to provide the participating MIKE sites with the technical and capacity building support and mentoring that they ideally required. This aspect was addressed in depth in the Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation which, based on the findings of the online survey carried out at the time, found that over the 4-year course of MIKE Phase II, 50% of range States re-

\(^{65}\) Agreement between the CITES Secretariat and IUCN regarding the placement and logistical support for the MIKE Sub-regional Support Units and the provision of technical services to the MIKE Programme. March 2007.

\(^{66}\) The SSO for Southern Africa only joined the project in January 2009, due to delays in the finalization of an agreement with IUCN on the project document for Southern Africa.

\(^{67}\) In addition, SSOs where French-speaking, while DSSOs were English-speaking, to address the needs of both Francophone and Anglophone range States and sites in Central and West Africa.
ceived an average of two visits each, while 50% received an average of 7 visits each, and a further 2 range States were never visited at all by the relevant SSO.

5.2 MIKE National & Site Officers

180. The position of MIKE National and Site Officers, provided by the participating range States themselves, was carried forward from MIKE Phase I, and is an aspect of the MIKE Programme and of MIKE Phase II which has been subject of significant uncertainty and in some cases, disputes and poor performance. The Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation examined the functioning of the MIKE Site and National Officers, and found that in many range States, there was an extremely high turnover rate of both national and site officers, that in some range States there was significant inter-departmental conflict over the ownership and hosting arrangements for the MIKE Programme, and that MIKE monitoring continued to be regarded in some range States as an added burden in fulfilment of the MIKE Programme’s needs, rather than as an integral part of the range State’s own law enforcement effort. All these factors significantly undermine the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of the MIKE Programme as well as the programme’s long-term sustainability.

181. The present evaluation also encountered similar issues with the practical implementation of the MIKE national and site officer concept during the site visits. At the national level, the MIKE National Officer was often not the lead person with responsibility for the implementation of the MIKE monitoring systems, but could either be the Director or Deputy Director of the wildlife agency concerned, or another officer, or could even be from another agency - usually the agency with lead responsibility for CITES affairs if separate from the wildlife management agency (i.e. the CITES focal points). In other cases, there was no officially appointed MIKE National Officer, but rather someone informally acting in that capacity.

182. At the site level, the MIKE Site Officer was sometimes the warden in charge of the site concerned, the warden responsible for law enforcement, or the warden responsible for ecological monitoring. In some sites, there were two officers responsible for MIKE, with the warden in charge being the lead MIKE Site Officer, and an officer responsible for law enforcement or for ecological monitoring acting as the Deputy MIKE Site Officer. MIKE Phase II encouraged this designation of two site officers, so that capacity remained even if one officer was transferred. In several cases there was no formal designation of the MIKE Site Officer or his/her deputy, but rather an informal allocation of these responsibilities.

183. By way of background, it is important to recognise that CITES Resolution 10.10 does not define any specific roles and responsibilities of range States’ wildlife management authorities in the collection of monitoring information on the illegal killing of elephants, nor does it make mention of the establishment of the positions of MIKE Site and National Officers in supporting the implementation of the MIKE Programme. With regard MIKE Phase II, the role of MIKE National and Site Officers is articulated in the Phase II project document, which states that “A National Officer for each country hosting a site is appointed and is responsible for coordinating arrangements for the surveys for the site or sites in their country, working with the national agencies and NGOs” [this evaluation’s emphasis]. The Phase II project document also provides Terms of Reference for both these positions in an appendix. However, the participating range States were not formal parties to the Phase II project agreement, nor were there any other formal agreements made between the implementing partners for MIKE Phase II – i.e. the CITES Secretariat, UNEP and IUCN – and the participating range States. In this regard, it is perhaps not surprising that the roles of MIKE National and Site Officers have experienced a number of practical implementation difficulties. Crucially, it is unlikely that any MIKE National or Site Officer had MIKE duties formally included in their job descriptions, so the fulfilment of MIKE responsibilities remained an additional activity outside the officer’s official duties.

184. Despite the lack of any formal agreements between the participating range States and the Phase II implementing agencies other than Resolution 10.10 itself, it is clear that the effective participation of the range States, and indeed their ownership over the MIKE Programme, is vital to the success of the Programme, and to its long-term sustainability. In this regard, the Evaluation feels that it will be important in any future phase of MIKE to further examine the appropriate nature of the relationship between the MIKE
Programme and the participating range States, and to determine and implement ways that this relationship can be further improved and formalised in future.

5.3 Partnerships

185. In addition to the implementation partnerships between the CITES Secretariat and UNEP and IUCN as described in the previous section, MIKE Phase II also had technical partnerships with several other organisations, most notably with the IUCN Species Survival Commission African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG) and with the TRAFFIC Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS). Towards the later stages of Phase II, MIKE also took part in the founding of the SMART Partnership, which is working on the development of the new SMART RBM software and other tools to improve site management. The Phase II partnership arrangements are not defined in the Phase II Project Document, although the specific activities for which MIKE would partner with both AFESG and ETIS are set out in the detailed description of Phase II results and their associated activities.

AfESG

186. The African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG) has been closely associated with the MIKE Programme since its inception, and AFESG together with its sister group the Asian Elephant Specialist Group (AsESG) played a crucial role in the development of the initial proposal to the CITES parties for the establishment of the MIKE system, under a consultancy contract to the CITES Secretariat, which was presented to and endorsed by the CITES Standing Committee at its 41st meeting held in Geneva in February 1999. During Phase I, AFESG and the MIKE Programme shared adjoining offices, which facilitated the technical collaboration and exchange of information between the two. The collaboration between AfESG and MIKE in Phase I was further facilitated by the fact that both the MIKE CCU and AFESG were hosted by IUCN. This situation changed in Phase II when hosting of the CCU transferred to UNEP, but the two programmes nevertheless maintained close collaboration. The importance of the partnership between the MIKE Programme and AfESG is clearly recognised in the CITES-IUCN Collaboration Agreement for Phase II in the document’s preamble; however, the agreement does not provide any detail on the actual nature of the MIKE-AFESG partnership, and the specific activities to be implemented together. Further detail on the nature of the collaboration is provided in a UNEP sub-project document detailing the MIKE-AFESG collaboration in Phase II. The document outlines the four major activity areas of AFESG towards the implementation of Phase II: 1) Undertaking a study on the impact of the elephant meat trade; 2) Integrating the outputs of MIKE elephant population surveys in the African Elephant Database maintained by AFESG; 3) Providing technical support to MIKE continent-wide African Elephant Meetings, and 4) Facilitating the dissemination of MIKE monitoring data outputs, including through the AFESG’s regular publication, *Pachyderm*.

187. Overall, by the end of Phase II there appeared to be a strong synergistic collaboration between the MIKE Programme and AFESG, even though the relationship between the two programmes had not always been entirely positive. Much of this positive relationship can however be attributed to the efforts of MIKE and AFESG staff members, who have sought ways of working together towards common aims even though no specific mechanisms for achieving effective collaboration and the delivery of shared goals are defined in the CITES-IUCN Agreement.

ETIS

---

70 As an additional aspect of support for the African Elephant Meetings, AFESG also provided technical support and facilitation for the development of the African Elephant Action Plan (in response to CITES CoP Decisions 14.75 to 14.79).
188. Like AfESG, TRAFFIC’s Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) has had a long-standing association with the MIKE Programme. ETIS is the sister programme to MIKE under CITES Resolution 10.10, and the two programmes were initially conceived to operate in parallel, with MIKE producing data on the illegal killing of elephants on the ground, while ETIS produced complementary data on the movements of ivory through the ivory trade chain, from origin countries, through transit points to final destination countries. As such, both MIKE and ETIS share the same set of objectives under Resolution 10.10, as detailed in section 2.2 above. The two programmes also share the same supervisory mechanisms, both falling under the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup of the CITES Standing Committee, and now sharing the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG).  

189. In MIKE Phase II, the collaboration between MIKE and ETIS is formalised in a UNEP sub-project agreement signed with TRAFFIC, which recognises the special relationship between CITES and TRAFFIC in supporting elephant conservation worldwide, in particular through the delivery of Resolution 10.10. The four major activity areas of ETIS towards the implementation of Phase II are as follows: 1) Provision of capacity building and training in the implementation of ivory seizure data at the national level; 2) Carrying out ivory trade studies designed to understand the dynamics of the ivory trade in domestic ivory markets; 3) Carrying out further analysis of ivory trade data, in particular the integration of MIKE and ETIS data on the illegal killing of elephants and trade in their products; 4) Producing ETIS country reports designed to provide origin, transit and consumer countries with timely and accurate information on their role in the illegal trade in ivory.

190. As with the AfESG, relationships between MIKE and ETIS have not always been entirely positive, but have similarly improved in the last two years of Phase II, as MIKE, ETIS and AfESG jointly recognised the importance of integrating data on illegal killing of elephants and the ivory trade from all three programmes, which eventually led to the production of a consolidated MIKE-ETIS/AfESG report to the CITES Standing Committee in 2011, another follow-on consolidated report in 2012 (see Paragraph 97 above), and the production of the Elephants in the Dust: A Rapid Response Assessment in early 2013 (see Paragraph 101 above). The production of these joint reports has further cemented the collaboration between MIKE, ETIS and AfESG. The MIKE-ETIS TAG also has a potentially important role to play in facilitating even greater collaboration between MIKE, ETIS and AfESG in the future (see section 3.4 above).

191. ETIS’ outputs that have been supported by MIKE Phase II have been widely recognised as authoritative and influential as far as informing international decision-making concerning the ivory trade, and it is clear that the Phase II investment in ETIS was money well spent. However, although ETIS has always shared its country reports with range States at events such as SSC and AEM meetings, when the same country trade data are subsequently disseminated more widely, range States sometimes complain that they were not sufficiently informed in advance about ETIS information.

5.4 Financial mechanisms

192. MIKE Phase II has been subject to a comprehensive end-of-project external audit, the report of which has not yet been published at the time that this present report was written. The reader is referred to this report for full information of the performance of MIKE Phase II’s financial mechanisms, including the subsidiary projects established with regard the functioning of the SSUs embedded in IUCN, and the AfESG and ETIS projects. In addition to the end-of-project audit, MIKE Phase II has also been subject to the audit processes carried out by the implementing agencies responsible for the delivery of the project, namely the concerned IUCN Regional Offices (with regard the SSOs), and UNEP/UNON (with regard the CCU).

193. As detailed under section 5.1, Administrative Mechanisms, above, the MIKE Programme, like the CITES Secretariat, is administratively embedded within UNEP, and as such the programme has received financial and administrative support services during Phase II implementation from the UN Office in Nairobi (UNON).

---

71 Until CoP 16, there were separate MIKE and ETIS TAG meetings held back to back. The revised Resolution 10.10 at CoP16 combines the two TAGs into one. The new Terms of Reference of the MIKE-ETIS TAG were approved by the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup at CITES Standing Committee #62 held in Geneva in July 2012.
As such, MIKE Phase II has been subject to UN financial and administrative rules and procedures, which, while cumbersome and sometimes inflexible, have ensured a high degree of financial accountability.

194. One area of the financial mechanisms where the project experienced difficulties was with regard to financial arrangements for the four SSUs embedded in IUCN. Each of these was established as a separate project within the UN Integrated Management Information System (IMIS), with separate accounting codes not integrated into the main Phase II project in IMIS. This created significant challenges for the CCU in overseeing financial management at the SSU level, and in consolidating expenditure reporting for the entire Phase II project. This situation has been rectified in MIKE 3.0 by establishing the SSUs as sub-projects of the main MIKE 3.0 project, with IMIS accounting codes consolidated with the main project accounting structure.

195. The complications with the SSU-level financial supervision and integration with the main MIKE Phase II project may also have resulted in poor financial accountability at the level of the IUCN Regional Offices responsible for hosting the SSUs. Further information in this regard will in due course be provided by the Phase II audit report.

5.5 Monitoring & evaluation

196. Since MIKE by its very nature is focussed on monitoring, the collection of monitoring data and the development of monitoring procedures and protocols necessarily formed an important component of MIKE Phase II. However, with regard the project’s own implementation, the project did not put in place a specific monitoring plan, nor did it systematically monitor project performance against the indicators established in the Phase II project logframe. Instead, the project carried out a series of surveys to monitor the progress in project implementation, specifically the two online surveys carried out in 2009 and 2012, as well as the 2011 survey carried out as part of the Mid-term Progress Evaluation. In addition, the project commissioned specific studies to look at aspects of project delivery, such as the assessment of analytical and data management capacity needs carried out in mid-2012 (see Paragraph 83). The outcomes of these surveys and studies have been discussed in their respective place in this evaluation report.

197. In addition to this, towards the end of Phase II, the MIKE CCU decided that it was necessary to establish a specific mechanism for monitoring performance not only of programme interventions but also of the status of law enforcement and ranger-based monitoring at the participating MIKE sites, which was provisionally referred to as the MIKE Implementation Monitoring System, or MIMS. The establishment of the MIMS also related to the perceived need to enhance the accountability and performance monitoring of the MIKE SSUs, as was identified by the Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation. However, while work on planning MIMS commenced during Phase II, steps to establish the system did not get underway until the follow-on phase, MIKE 3.0.

198. With regard evaluation, as referred to earlier in this report, a mid-term evaluation of Phase II was carried out in early 2011\(^2\). The project lifespan was officially from April 2006-December 2011, so this was late, but since many project activities didn’t in practice get fully underway until early 2007, and there were two subsequent no-cost extensions until December 2012, there were still in practice limited opportunities for the project team to respond to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation, and there was evidence during this present evaluation that wherever possible, they took these opportunities to adapt activities according to lessons learnt.

5.6 Conclusions & Recommendations

199. The MIKE Sub-Regional Support Units (SSUs) are a crucial delivery mechanism for the implementation of the MIKE Programme in the participating range States. In MIKE Phases I and II, the main focus has been on

ensuring that the MIKE Programme activities are effectively and efficiently delivered on the ground, and little attention was paid to the long-term sustainability of the SSUs. Thus whereas the hosting of the SSUs by the IUCN Regional Offices represented an effective short-term delivery arrangement, it is less clear that this arrangement is the appropriate one in the long-term, since IUCN’s willingness and ability to continue hosting the SSUs depends on the continuation of project funding for the services provided by the Regional Offices. Now that the success of MIKE monitoring methodologies has been broadly demonstrated on the ground, the evaluation feels that it is now time to look more closely at the long-term sustainability of the MIKE subregional structures. The evaluation therefore recommends that the sustainability of the SSUs forms an important dimension of MIKE follow-on activities, including options for institutionalising the SSUs into existing regional bodies such as SADC and ECOWAS. In this regard, MIKE 3.0 is already looking into these possibilities.

200. Also related to the functioning of the SSUs, there is a need to re-examine the role of the Subregional Support Officers, with a view to enhancing their accountability and reporting relationships with the CCU. In this regard, the Phase II Mid-term Progress Evaluation recommended that in order to increase efficiency and to ensure appropriate equity in SSO support to range States and MIKE sites, the SSO Terms of Reference should be re-evaluated and performance criteria drawn up against which SSO activities could be monitored by the CCU. This evaluation agrees with this recommendation, and also recommends that this be combined with enhanced monitoring of SSO activities and deliverables, potentially linked to enhanced site-level law enforcement benchmarks, and enhanced performance appraisal.

201. There are essentially three main levels of engagement of participating range States in the MIKE Programme - the MIKE Subregional Steering Committee Member (usually the Director of Wildlife), the MIKE National Officer, who is responsible for overseeing and providing support for the collection and synthesis of ranger-based monitoring data at the MIKE sites, and the MIKE Site Officer, responsible for the implementation of MIKE-supported RBM practices at the site concerned. The distinction between the various roles has been recognised by both MIKE Phase I and Phase II, but in practice, there has been significant confusion over the filling of these positions. MIKE Phase II cannot however be held responsible for this confusion, because the filling of the various roles is the sole prerogative of the participating range State, not of MIKE. However, the evaluation team felt that the project could have done more to clarify the actual roles and responsibilities with regard the range State’s involvement in the MIKE Programme at the national and site level, through the production of clear Terms of Reference that are discussed and agreed with the range State and sites concerned. Although Terms of Reference for National and Site Officers are included in the Phase II Project Document, as noted previously, the range States were not parties to this document, and it was not clear that Phase II undertook any structured process to agree the various roles and responsibilities with participating countries and sites, instead relying on the mechanisms that were previously established in Phase I.

202. The evaluation recommends therefore that in any follow-on phase of the MIKE Programme, the roles and responsibilities of the different range State officers participating in MIKE should be reviewed and updated according to lessons learnt, and that thereafter the MIKE CCU and SSUs should carry out an exercise to review and agree the revised roles and responsibilities with the participating range States. This could be carried out at a Subregional Steering Committee, and combined with discussions of the range State’s commitments to the implementation of the MIKE Programme and the monitoring of MIKE Site law enforcement benchmarks as discussed earlier in this report. In carrying out these negotiations, the evaluation further recommends that greater emphasis should be placed on the roles and responsibilities of range State officers participating in MIKE, rather than on the titles of MIKE National Officer and MIKE Site Officer as such. So long as the range State nominates a focal point for all MIKE implementation contacts and communication, there is no need to have the formal titles, which may serve to enhance MIKE edifices, rather than encouraging the range States to mainstream and operationalize MIKE-related monitoring systems in their own management structures.

203. The MIKE Phase II project has developed strong partnership arrangements with both ETIS and the AfESG, as demonstrated by the integrated outputs now being produced by the three organisations - such as the integrated reporting to the CITES Standing Committee in 2011 and 2012, as well as the Rapid Response Assessment report, *Elephants in the Dust*, produced in 2013. Despite this strong practical progress, the evaluation team felt that, considering the importance of this collaboration in the delivery of Resolution 10.10, it
would be helpful if an explicit collaboration framework could be put into place between the three programmes. This would help to still further enhance the partnership as well as the information outputs. In this regard, the evaluation recommends that the MIKE-ETIS-AfESG collaboration arrangements and roles and responsibilities be further elaborated in the Standard Analytical Reporting Framework (SARF) document recommended in Paragraph 127 above.

204. With regard monitoring the implementation of the MIKE Programme, the evaluation recommends that the efforts to establish an explicit MIKE Implementation Monitoring System (MIMS) that have commenced in MIKE 3.0 be strengthened still further in any follow-on phase of MIKE, linked to the development of law enforcement and management effort benchmarks as discussed earlier in this report. MIMS is likely to contribute to the effectiveness and efficiency of the MIKE Programme in several ways: it will provide a basis for monitoring implementation performance, for focusing the SSUs on priority needs, and also as a means of monitoring the achievements and challenges of the participating range States and MIKE sites in strengthening law enforcement and in protecting their elephant populations.
Annexes

Annex 1: Evaluation TORs

Objective and Scope

1. The terminal evaluation of the MIKE Phase II project is undertaken at the end of the project to assess project performance (in terms of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness) and determine outcomes and impacts stemming from the project, including their sustainability.

2. The Evaluation has two primary purposes: a) to provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements; and b) to promote learning, feedback and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among CITES, UNEP, project partners, and participating range State protected area management authorities. In this regard, the evaluation will also consider the findings and recommendations of the MIKE Phase II progress evaluation carried out in March 2011, as well as the terminal evaluation report on MIKE Phase I.

3. In addition to the performance-related aspects of the MIKE Phase II project, the Evaluation will also examine the extent to which MIKE Phase II has been able to fulfil the goals and requirements for MIKE as mandated in CITES CoP Resolution 10.10, which establishes the functions and modes of operation of MIKE. In particular, the evaluation will investigate whether MIKE Phase II has fulfilled its mandate to provide CITES Parties with adequate, appropriate and timely data and other necessary elements to enable decision-making regarding the ivory trade.

4. The Evaluation will also identify key lessons learnt from the implementation of MIKE Phase II and make associated recommendations as appropriate that can form a foundation for the design of follow-on project activities designed to consolidate and strengthen the role of the MIKE Programme in fulfilling CITES information requirements, and in enabling participating range States to carry out appropriately informed adaptive management and protection of their elephant populations as well as other key CITES-listed megafauna.

Evaluation methodology

5. The evaluation will be conducted using a participatory and interactive approach whereby the Task Manager and other relevant CITES and UNEP staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. Both qualitative and quantitative data will be used to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts, wherever possible triangulating data from different sources. The following data collection methods will be used:

- **Document desk review**, including but not limited to: project agreements and other formal frameworks such as the concerned CITES resolutions; project monitoring reports and information; annual reports to the Technical Advisory Group and CITES Secretariat; output-related project technical reports; training and awareness materials; etc.

- **Interviews**: Structured and semi-structured interviews will be conducted with key project staff and stakeholders, in person, or by telephone/e-mails, including:
  - MIKE Central Coordination Unit and CITES Secretariat staff
  - Subregional Support Officers
  - IUCN Regional Offices hosting SSUs
  - National and site-level protected area management staff involved in implementing MIKE activities
  - Members of the MIKE Subregional Steering Committees
  - Members of the MIKE Technical Advisory Group (TAG)
  - Members of the MIKE ETIS Subgroup
• Other participating staff from MIKE partners, including TRAFFIC/ETIS and AfESG
• Other knowledgeable stakeholders as appropriate

- **Field visits**, to selected representative MIKE sites and associated MIKE range State protected area agencies in the four subregions in which MIKE is operating to interview project MIKE National Officers and MIKE Site Officers and other persons who have participated in the project as consultants and/or have been trained. This will include an examination of additional specific products such as meeting and workshop reports, and training activity reports. In this regard, the evaluation team should visit at least two MIKE Sites from each of the four subregions;

- **Survey**: A survey may be administered to expand on and reinforce information collected through field visits, and may include project participating staff, PA partners in participating range States, members of MIKE Subregional Steering Committees, members of the MIKE TAG, and any other relevant stakeholders;

**Evaluation criteria and questions**

6. Criteria to be addressed by the Evaluation are organised in accordance with the OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Criteria for Evaluating Development Assistance, addressing aspects of project relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability. The evaluation will also examine key aspects of the project’s implementation and management arrangements that have had a bearing on project performance. In this regard, the Evaluation will focus on sets of key questions as detailed in the following sections, which may be expanded by the consultant as deemed appropriate.

7. All evaluation criteria will be rated. Annex 2 provides detailed guidance on how the different criteria should be rated and how ratings should be aggregated for the different evaluation criterion categories.

**Relevance**

8. In order to assess the relevance of the MIKE Phase II project, the evaluation should initially examine the causal logic, or Theory of Change, underlying the project and its expected impacts and effects, to determine whether the logic is appropriate and complete. Where the logic is inappropriate or incomplete, the evaluation should identify key areas of weakness and make recommendations on how the project logic could have been improved upon in order to achieve the anticipated overall objective and project purpose. Based on this examination of the project’s causal logic, the evaluation should then ask the following questions concerning relevance:

- Are the project’s objectives and implementation strategies consistent with the mandate for the MIKE Programme as established by Resolution 10.10?
- Are the project’s objectives and implementation strategies consistent with national and site level needs for monitoring information with regard the illegal killing of elephants, and for contributing to the effective management and protection of elephant populations?
- Are the project’s activities and outputs consistent with the project’s purpose and the results defined to fulfil this purpose?

**Effectiveness**

9. Also based on the examination of the project’s causal logic, the evaluation should examine the extent to which the project has achieved the identified project purpose and results. The evaluation should ask the following questions:

- To what extent were the MIKE Phase II results achieved / are likely to be achieved? In particular:
  - How successful has the project been in building sustainable capacity of the participating range States to generate accurate and timely primary monitoring data on the illegal killing of elephants?
- How successful has the project been in developing standard routines for the collection, handling and quality control of data, and enabling participating range States to adopt them?
- How successful has the project been in carrying out and reporting robust analysis and integration of primary and secondary data?
- How successful has the project been in establishing effective management structures for implementing the MIKE Programme in Africa, and in coordinating and monitoring activities implemented through the Programme?

- What were the major factors influencing the achievement or non-achievement of the project results?

**Efficiency**

10. Efficiency measures the outputs - qualitative and quantitative - in relation to the inputs. In this regard, the Evaluation should ask the following questions:

- Were activities implemented in a cost-efficient way? For example, did the project team make use of pre-existing methods and data sources where appropriate? Were there potentially alternative ways that the project could have explored to achieve its intended outputs and results in a more cost efficient way?
- Were activities implemented on time? For example, how have delays, if any, influenced project execution, and the achievement of project outputs and results?

**Impact**

11. Impacts are defined by OECD DAC as "the positive and negative changes produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended". Based on the MIKE Phase II project’s causal logic (see section 34 above), the Evaluation should ask the following questions:

- What progress has the project made towards achieving its main anticipated impacts? In particular, has the project enabled any intermediate state(s) towards the achievement of impact as identified in the project’s causal logic to be achieved?
- Have the drivers and assumptions identified in the project’s causal logic as being crucial to the ultimate achievement of impact held true? In particular, which drivers or assumptions have been especially crucial in enabling the project’s progress towards realising impacts? In this regard, it should be noted that some or all drivers may be associated with key results or outputs of the project.
- Are there any unintended impacts that the project has had that were not originally identified in the causal logic?

**Sustainability and catalytic role**

12. Sustainability is concerned with measuring whether the benefits of an activity are likely to continue after donor funding has ended. Sustainability factors are likely to be associated with the existence or non-existence of key Impact Drivers and assumptions identified under the evaluation of Impact detailed in paragraph 39 above, and may include financial, institutional, political, and environmental dimensions. The Evaluation should ask the following questions:

- Socio-political sustainability: Are there any social, political or economic risks that may influence positively or negatively the sustenance of project outcomes and progress towards impacts? Are there sufficient public and stakeholder awareness, interest and incentives in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- Financial Sustainability: To what extent are the changes brought about by the MIKE Phase II project likely to continue after funding ceases? For example, how likely is it that the products, tools and institutional mechanisms developed by the project will continue and be put to good use after the project ends?
- Institutional framework and governance: Are there any institutional achievements, legal frameworks,
policies and governance structures and processes in place that contribute to sustaining project benefits? Did the project elaborate an exit strategy?

13. The Evaluation will also examine the extent to which the project has succeeded in playing a catalytic role in promoting the replication, scaling up or mainstreaming of project activities, and the extent to which this has already occurred or is likely to occur in the near future. The MIKE Phase II Impact Drivers identified in the project’s elaborated causal logic developed under paragraph 34 above are also likely to be linked to the project’s catalytic roles. In this regard, the Evaluation should ask the following questions:

- To what extent have the project’s approaches or activities been scaled up at the project focal sites, and/or mainstreamed at the national, regional or global level?
- Have any of the project’s approaches or activities been replicated outside the project’s immediate focal areas?

Project implementation and management

14. The evaluation will examine the project implementation arrangements and management processes that have influenced the attainment of project results. The Evaluation should ask the following questions:

- To what extent have the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document been followed and how effective have they been in delivering project outputs and outcomes? Were appropriate adaptations made to the approaches originally proposed?
- How well did the project design define partnership arrangements and the roles and responsibilities of project partners? Have project partnerships, for example with the African Elephant Specialist Group (AFESG) and the TRAFFIC Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) been strengthened to allow a stronger pooling of technical resources and a higher degree of coherence?
- What efforts were made by the project to ensure appropriate stakeholder participation? How are these efforts likely to promote the stakeholders’ future ownership of the project and facilitate follow up and replication? To what extent have the roles of MIKE’s Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and of the Subregional Steering Committees been strengthened?
- Were there any administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project, and what efforts were made to overcome these problems?
- How effective, appropriate and timely has the project’s financial planning, control of financial resources and financial reporting been? Has project co-financing (cash and in-kind) materialized as anticipated? The evaluation will provide a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the different project components (see Annex 3).
- How effective and efficient was the project’s M&E System, and how has information generated by the M&E system during project implementation (including the Mid-term Progress Evaluation) been used to adapt and improve project execution, achievement of outcomes and ensuring sustainability? How appropriate (including S.M.A.R.T.) were the indicators defined in the project logframe? Was there an appropriate project M&E Plan?
## Annex 2: List of persons interviewed

### Range States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Abilé Atithoun</td>
<td>National Centre of Management of Wildlife Reserves</td>
<td>Pendjari NP Archivist/Information Officer, in charge of MIST database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meryas Kouton</td>
<td>Benin National Centre of Management of Wildlife Reserves</td>
<td>Pendjari NP Director, MIKE Site Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midama Parfait N’Sera</td>
<td>National Centre of Management of Wildlife Reserves</td>
<td>Pendjari NP Chief Ecologist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bangkok attendee</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Dr Cyril Taolo</td>
<td>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</td>
<td>Deputy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Abednico Machame</td>
<td>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</td>
<td>Desk Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Andrew Ndalema</td>
<td>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</td>
<td>Senior Wildlife Warden, Chobe NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mbakile Ntuluki</td>
<td>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Othusitse</td>
<td>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</td>
<td>Head of Law Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Pierre Kafando</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Director of Wildlife and Hunting, MIKE National Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ollo Julien Kambo</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Nazinga NP Deputy MIKE Officer, in charge of MIST database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ibrahim Lankoande</td>
<td>Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development</td>
<td>Director General of Forests and Wildlife Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Djandjouma Mboh</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife</td>
<td>Boumba Bek NP Warden, MIKE Site Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jean Josselin Meka</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife</td>
<td>MIKE National Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tabi Philip Tako-Eta</td>
<td>Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife</td>
<td>Director Ministry of Forestry and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Jean-Baptiste Mamang-Kanga</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing</td>
<td>Director of Wildlife and Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bernadette Mandjoua</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing</td>
<td>Dzanga-Sangha Deputy MIKE Officer, responsible for data entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albert Christian Junior Ndadet</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing</td>
<td>Dzanga-Sangha NP Warden, MIKE Site Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jérémie Ndallo Olobanda</td>
<td>Ministry of Water, Forests, Hunting and Fishing</td>
<td>Head of Wildlife Operations, MIKE National Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Augustin Ngumbi Amuri</td>
<td>Congolese Institute for Nature Conservation</td>
<td>Chief Director, Office of the Director General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Kahsay G/tensae</td>
<td>Ethiopian Wildlife Conservation Authority</td>
<td>Director National Parks and Wildlife Sanctuaries Directorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ludwig Siege</td>
<td>Sustainable Development of the Protected Area System of Ethiopia Project</td>
<td>Chief Technical Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Umaru Farouk Dubiure</td>
<td>Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Mole NP Warden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ali Mahama</td>
<td>Wildlife Division, Forestry Commission</td>
<td>Mole NP MIKE Site Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martha Bechem</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Deputy Subregional Support Officer Central and West Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julian Blanc</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Acting Coordinator, CITES-MIKE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippe Brarda</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant, Administrative Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tapera Chimutu</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Subregional Support Officer Southern and Eastern Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom de Meulenaer</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat</td>
<td>Scientific Support Officer, Scientific Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holly Dublin</td>
<td>African Elephant Specialist Group</td>
<td>Chair, AfESG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben Janse van Rensburg</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat</td>
<td>Chief, Enforcement Support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pia Jonsson</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat</td>
<td>Enforcement Support Officer, Regulatory Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith Lompo</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Administrative Assistant, West Africa Subregional Support Unit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sébastien Luhunu</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Subregional Support Officer, Central and West Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Milliken</td>
<td>TRAFFIC-ETIS</td>
<td>Director, ETIS (TRAFFIC Global Elephant &amp; Rhino Coordinator)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Position</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire Mogambi</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Programme Assistant, MIKE CCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison Nuwamanya</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Subregional Support Officer, East Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Onyango</td>
<td>CITES-MIKE</td>
<td>Administrative and Finance Assistant, MIKE CCU</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Scanlon</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat</td>
<td>Secretary-General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diane Skinner</td>
<td>African Elephant Specialist Group</td>
<td>Programme Officer, AfESG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward Van Asch</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat</td>
<td>ICCWC Support Officer, Regulatory Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 3: List of MIKE Phase II participating sites and countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-region</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central Africa</strong></td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>Boumba-Bek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Bangassou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dzanga-Sangha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sangba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>Zakouma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Nouabale-Ndoki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Odzala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Garamba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kahuzi-Biega*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Okapi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Salonga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Virunga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td>Monte Alén**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>Lopé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Minkébé</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eastern Africa</strong></td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Gash-Setit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Babille</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kafta-Sheraro***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mount Elgon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Meru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Samburu Laikipia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tsavo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Akagera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Katavi Rukwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ruaha Rungwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Selous Mikumi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tarangire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Mount Elgon*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Murchison Falls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Queen Elizabeth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southern Africa</strong></td>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Chobe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Cabora Bassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Niassa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>Caprivi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Etosha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>Kruger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>South Luangwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>Chewore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nyami Nyami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Africa</strong></td>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>Pendjari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W du Bénin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Nazinga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>W du Burkina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Côte D’Ivoire</td>
<td>Comoé*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marahoué</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Taï</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Kakum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td>Ziama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Sapo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-region</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Gourma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Baban Rafi</td>
<td>W du Niger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Yankari</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>Niokolo-Koba*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>Fazao Malfakassa</td>
<td>Kéran*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* No or very few elephants
** Dropped from MIKE in 2009 as a result of poor engagement from the authorities
*** Added as a MIKE site in 2011
# Annex 4: Evaluation matrix (as per evaluation Inception Report)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification/Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A. Relevance to national, regional and international needs | A.1 How appropriate and complete is the project’s causal logic? | • Are the project’s results:  
  - established at an appropriate level?  
  - sufficient and appropriate to achieve the overall project objective? | • Document desk review  
• Interviews (structured and semi-structured) |
| | A.2 How well has MIKE Phase II addressed its mandate under CITES Resolution 10.10? | • To what extent has the project effectively measured and recorded levels and trends, and changes in levels and trends, of illegal hunting and trade in ivory in elephant range States?  
• To what extent has the project been able to establish an information base to support the making of decisions on appropriate management, protection and enforcement needs?  
• To what extent has the project been able to assess whether observed trends are related to changes in the listing of elephant populations in the CITES Appendices and/or the resumption of legal international trade in ivory? | • Document desk review (key document: CITES Resolution 10.10)  
• Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
• Field visits |
| | A.3 How consistent are the project’s objectives with national and site level management and monitoring needs? | • To what extent is the project’s objective of building the capacity of range States to ensure the flow of primary monitoring data consistent with site and national-level priorities?  
• To what extent is the project’s objective of developing and establishing standard routines for the collection, handling and quality control of data consistent with site and national-level priorities?  
• To what extent is MIKE Phase II’s project purpose likely to contribute to the overall objective of strengthening national and site level capacity to manage elephants sustainably? | • Document desk review  
• Interviews (structured and semi-structured) |
| B. Achievement of outcomes | B.1 How successful has the project been in building sustainable capacity of the participating range states to generate accurate and timely primary monitoring data on the illegal killing of elephants? | • To what extent has the project been able to build sustainable capacity for ranger-based monitoring and data synthesis at the site level?  
• To what extent has the project been able to build sustainable capacity for data management, analysis and accessibility at the national level?  
• Have user-friendly, practical training materials aimed at CA wardens, rangers, and national-level conservation officers been developed and tested?  
• What are the key challenges to maintaining adequate capacity identified at each level? | • Document desk review  
• Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
• Field visits  
• Online Survey |
| | B.2 How successful has the project been in develop- | • To what extent has the project been able to develop standard monitoring systems and protocols that are relevant and appropriate to site, national and international needs? | • Document desk review  
• Interviews (structured |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification/Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| B.3   | How successful has the project been in carrying out and reporting robust analysis and integration of primary and secondary data? | - How successful has the project been in gaining adoption of the monitoring systems and protocols at the site and national levels?  
- Are the monitoring systems and protocols in line with capacity, at every level?  
- What backstopping and support has MIKE provided to participating range States to facilitate the adoption of monitoring systems and protocols, and has this support been sufficient and appropriate? | - Document desk review (key documents: 2012 Jachmann Pilot Study to Validate PIKE-based Inferences at Site Level; TAG meeting reports; Pachiderm Journal; CITES-MIKE website)  
- Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
- Field visits  
- Online Survey |
| C.1   | What are the key sustainability factors associated with project impacts, and to what extent have they been realised? | - To what extent was the project able to develop mechanisms for the sustainable financing of the MIKE systems after project completion?  
- To what extent was the project able to imbed and mainstream the MIKE systems in existing institutions at the site, national and regional levels?  
  - To what extent are the project’s data requirements consistent with site and national level monitoring and management requirements?  
  - To what extent are the project’s methodologies and protocols consistent with site-level management systems and structures?  
  - To what extent was the project able to catalyse change in terms of use and application of RBM data by the relevant institutions at every level?  
  - Is there sufficient support among participating range States for the monitoring systems to ensure their long-term sustainability? | - Document desk review  
- Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
- Field visits  
- Online Survey |
| C.2   | To what extent have the MIKE-supported systems been scaled up at | - To what extent have the MIKE systems been adopted and scaled up to address broader site-level monitoring and management?  
- To what extent have the MIKE systems been mainstreamed into national level | - Document desk review  
- Interviews (structured and semi-structured) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification/Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|       |                      | To what extent have the MIKE systems been mainstreamed into the project focal sites, and/or at the national, regional or global level? | • Field visits  
  • Online Survey |
| C.3   | Have any of the project’s approaches or activities been replicated outside the project’s immediate focal areas? | • To what extent have MIKE’s RBM systems been integrated into site-level adaptive management strategies of range States’ CA networks, including non-MIKE sites?  
  • Have MIKE’s RBM systems been implemented in African countries not currently participating in MIKE? | • Document desk review  
  • Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
  • Field visits  
  • Online Survey |
| C.4   | What progress has the project made towards achieving lasting impacts? | • Overall, to what extent has the project been able to make progress towards impacts, through the delivery of key impact drivers and the achievement of intermediate states towards impacts? | • Document desk review  
  • Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
  • Field visits  
  • Online Survey |
| D. Project implementation & management | D.1 To what extent have the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document been followed and how effective have they been in delivering project activities and results? | • To what extent has the project’s field-level delivery arrangements including the SSUs and national and site level MIKE officers been effective in delivering the expected activities and results?  
  • To what extent has the TAG been effective in ensuring the scientific credibility and technical robustness of the projects’ systems?  
  • To what extent has the project’s coordination, data analysis and oversight mechanisms, including the CUC and the MIKE-ETIS Sub-Group been effective in delivering the expected activities and results?  
  • To what extent has the project’s administrative arrangements, including the partnership with IUCN and the housing of the CCU within UNEP DELC, been effective in supporting the delivery of the expected activities and results?  
  • Were appropriate adaptations made to the approaches originally proposed to address emergent needs? | • Document desk review  
  • Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
  • Field visits  
  • Online Survey |
|       | D.2 How well did the project design define partnership arrangements and the roles and responsibilities of project partners? | • What are the key aspects of the partnership with AFESG and how effective has this been in meeting MIKE’s objectives, capitalising on mutual strengths and synergies, and avoiding duplication?  
  • What are the key aspects of the partnership with ETIS and how effective has this been in meeting MIKE’s objectives, capitalising on mutual strengths and synergies, and avoiding duplication?  
  • What are the key aspects of the technical and operational integration with IUCN and CITES-IUCN agreements? | • Document desk review (key documents: EC-CITES finance agreements; CITES-IUCN agreements)  
  • Interviews (structured and semi-structured) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification/Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|       | how effective has this been in meeting MIKE’s objectives, capitalising on mutual strengths and synergies, and avoiding duplication?  
- Have project partnerships, for example with the AFESG and the TRAFFIC/ETIS been strengthened to allow a stronger pooling of technical resources and a higher degree of coherence?  
- What other partnerships has the project established to support project implementation (e.g. NGOs), and how effective have these been? | ▶ To what extent did the project make use of the Subregional Steering Committees and the African Elephant Meeting for ensuring appropriate (sub) regional stakeholder participation?  
▶ To what extent have the roles of the Subregional Steering Committees been strengthened?  
▶ Were site and national coordination officers successful in establishing and implementing mechanisms for ensuring stakeholder participation at the relevant levels?  
▶ To what extent did the project make use of the CITES COP and the CITES Standing Committee for ensuring appropriate international stakeholder participation?  
▶ How are these efforts likely to promote the stakeholders’ future ownership of the project and facilitate follow-up and replication? | ▶ Field visits  
▶ Online Survey                                                                                                                             | D.3 What efforts were made by the project to ensure appropriate stakeholder participation?                                                                                                                  |
|       | ▶ What unanticipated problems influenced the effective implementation of the project?                                                                                                                                  | ▶ Has project co-financing (in-kind) materialized as anticipated?  
▶ Was the project’s financial administration appropriate for achieving the expected results in the project timeframe?  
▶ Was the project’s financial administration able to adequately address and adapt to emergent needs?  
▶ Did financial reporting enable the CCU to maintain adequate control over the SSUs’ financial resources?                                                                 | ▶ Document desk review  
▶ Interviews (structured and semi-structured)  
▶ Field visits  
▶ Online Survey                                                                                                                             | D.4 Were there any administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project, and what efforts were made to overcome these problems? |
|       | ▶ How effective, appropriate and timely has the project’s financial planning, control of financial resources and financial management been?                                                                           | ▶ Field visits  
▶ Online Survey                                                                                                                             | D.5 How effective, appropriate and timely has the project’s financial planning, control of financial resources and financial management been? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Means of Verification/Sources of Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>reporting been?</td>
<td>costs and financial administration?</td>
<td>➤ What were the actual costs of the different project components?</td>
<td>➤ Document desk review (key documents: 2011 Norton-Griffiths Mid-term Progress Evaluation; 2012 Jachmann Pilot Study to Validate PIKE-based Inferences at Site Level; 2012 Fredrick assessment of analytical and data management capacity needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.6 How effective and efficient was the project’s M&amp;E System</td>
<td></td>
<td>➤ Was an appropriate project M&amp;E Plan developed and implemented?</td>
<td>➤ Interviews (structured and semi-structured) ➤ Field visits ➤ Online Survey (2012)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 5: MIKE Phase II simplified Theory of Change analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase II Results</th>
<th>Impact Drivers/Assumptions</th>
<th>Intermediate States</th>
<th>Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Capacity of Range States built to ensure the flow of primary monitoring data is sustainable in the long term** | ID: MIKE’s monitoring data needs are compatible with the needs of range State’s management authorities at national and site levels  
ID: National and site-level managers are empowered to utilise monitoring data as part of adaptive management and law enforcement systems  
Ass: National and site institutions are able to maintain appropriate staffing levels and continuity of monitoring staffing  
ID: National and site institutions have access to training for new monitoring staff  
Ass: Protected area law enforcement efforts are adequately prioritised by range States and adequate resources are provided | Biodiversity monitoring is fully integrated into range States’ national wildlife decision-making and management systems at both national and site levels |  |
| **2. Standard routines adopted for the collection, handling and quality control of data** | ID: Monitoring systems and protocols are appropriate to the needs and circumstances of the participating site/national institutions  
ID: Practical guidelines and manuals are available to facilitate site and national managers in implementing monitoring systems |  |  |
| **3. Robust analysis and integration of primary and secondary data routinely undertaken and reported on** | ID: Appropriate and sustainable subregional mechanisms and capacity are established to support MIKE monitoring systems and to enable effective collaboration in sharing monitoring information  
ID: Long –term institutional and financing mechanisms and partnership arrangements for maintaining MIKE’s central coordination and technical oversight functions are established  
Ass: Range States are open and willing to share monitoring data at the regional and international level | MIKE generated biodiversity monitoring information is effectively informing international conservation and trade decision making on a sustainable basis |  |
| **4. MIKE structure efficiently and effectively managed, coordinated and monitored** | ID: MIKE data is internationally accepted for its scientific credibility, quality and timeliness  
ID: MIKE is able to identify and correlate key drivers of the illegal killing of elephants and the ivory trade  
Ass: International and range States’ support for the MIKE system is maintained |  |  |

*Africa’s elephant populations are managed sustainably*
Annex 6: Summary results of the Evaluation Online Survey

A. General

A total of 104\(^73\) people answered at least part of this evaluation’s online survey, although not all completed the entire questionnaire. The diagram below illustrates the sub-regions of the MIKE Phase II programme that respondents identified themselves as being primarily involved with.

Survey respondents identified themselves as being involved primarily with various aspects of operations, as illustrated by the diagram below. The “Other” category comprises mainly respondents themselves as being involved with multiple aspects of the programme.

\(^{73}\) There were 106 responses to the survey page, but two of these only filled in part of their personal details or questions.
B. MIKE’s Mandate

The mandate for the implementation of the MIKE Programme is provided by Resolution Conf. 10.10 of the CITES Conference of the Parties (Rev. CoP 15).

Q3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to the main aspects of MIKE’s mandate under CITES Resolution 10.10?

Q3.1 MIKE has fulfilled its mandate to measure and record levels and trends, and changes in levels and trends, of illegal hunting of elephants in elephant range States;

Q3.2 MIKE has fulfilled its mandate to establish an information base to support the making of decisions on appropriate management, protection and enforcement needs for Africa’s elephants;

Q3.3 MIKE has fulfilled its mandate to build capacity in range States for monitoring the illegal killing of elephants;

Q3.4 MIKE has fulfilled its mandate to assess whether and to what extent observed trends in elephant killing are related to changes in the listing of elephant populations in the CITES Appendices and/or the resumption of legal international trade in ivory;

Q3.5 MIKE has fulfilled its overall mandate to provide CITES Parties with adequate, appropriate and timely data and other necessary elements to enable decision-making regarding the ivory trade.

Online survey results for Q3.3, below, illustrate that respondents from the Central Africa sub-region gave particularly positive responses regarding MIKE Phase II’s fulfilment of its mandate to build capacity in range States for monitoring the illegal killing of elephants.
C. Generation, Analysis and use of monitoring information

The appropriate generation, analysis and use of monitoring information concerning the illegal killing of elephants is a central pillar of the fulfilment of MIKE’s mandate.

Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to MIKE Phase II’s work to support and enable the generation, analysis and use of monitoring information?

Q4.1 MIKE Phase II has enabled participating sites to produce user-friendly, reliable and timely ranger-based monitoring information;

Q4.2 MIKE Phase II’s monitoring systems are appropriate to, complement and build on existing ranger-based monitoring activities of the participating Range States;

Q4.3 MIKE’s support for ranger-based monitoring has significantly strengthened law enforcement operations at the participating sites;

Q4.4 Monitoring information generated through MIKE’s support has enabled national protected area agencies to better understand trends in illegal killing of elephants, and to make appropriate management decisions for elephant conservation;

Q4.5 Monitoring information generated through MIKE’s support has enabled sub-regional institutions to provide appropriate policy support to combat illegal killing of elephants;

Q4.6 The monitoring systems supported by MIKE are being increasingly institutionalised into the management systems of Range States at the site and national level;

Q4.7 Monitoring information generated through MIKE’s support has been crucial to informing appropriate decision making at CITES Conferences of the Parties concerning trends in illegal killing of elephants, and regulation of the ivory trade;

Q4.8 The credibility of MIKE’s monitoring information on illegal killing of elephants can be attributed to the scientifically objective, reliable and unbiased nature of the information collection and analysis methods;

Q4.9 MIKE’s monitoring information on illegal killing of elephants is readily accessible to stakeholders;

Q4.10 Monitoring information generated through MIKE’s support has contributed significantly to raising international awareness of the illegal killing of elephants.

Online survey results for Q4.7, overpage, indicate that the role of monitoring information generated through MIKE Phase II’s support in informing appropriate decision making at CITES CoPs concerning trends in illegal killing of elephants, and regulation of the ivory trade, is most appreciated by respondents involved in MIKE’s international-level work.
D. Capacity Building and Mentoring

The generation of monitoring information depends on building appropriate capacity, especially at the site and national levels of participating Range States.

**Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to MIKE Phase II’s provision of capacity building?**

- **Q5.1** MIKE Phase II has provided adequate, appropriate, and user-friendly training for ranger-based monitoring and database management at participating sites;
- **Q5.2** MIKE has provided adequate and appropriate training in implementing ranger-based monitoring systems for participating range state wildlife agencies at the national level;
- **Q5.3** MIKE has provided an appropriate level of continuing mentoring and support for national and site-level MIKE focal points;
- **Q5.4** MIKE has established appropriate and effective protocols and routines to facilitate data collection, storage and analysis;
- **Q5.5** MIKE has provided adequate and user-friendly training materials and manuals to support ranger-based monitoring;
- **Q5.6** MIKE has facilitated ranger-based monitoring by providing critical material support, such as computers, software, GPS, etc.
Online survey results for Q5.1, below, illustrate site-level training for ranger-based monitoring and database management was particularly appreciated in the Central Africa sub-region.

![Graph showing survey results for Q5.1]

Online survey results for Q5.6, below, illustrate critical material support provided by MIKE Phase II was particularly valued in the West Africa and Central Africa sub-regions.

![Graph showing survey results for Q5.6]

E. Coordination and Cooperation

The effective use and application of monitoring information depends on coordination, cooperation and joint action among key stakeholders at the national, sub-regional, regional and international levels.

Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements relating to MIKE Phase II’s work to promote stakeholder coordination and cooperation?

Q6.1 MIKE has significantly strengthened collaboration in elephant conservation and protection at the sub-regional and regional level through forums such as the Sub-Regional Steering Committees and the African Elephant Meetings;

Q6.2 The MIKE Sub-Regional Support Officers have played an effective role in facilitating elephant conservation coordination and cooperation at the sub-regional level;

Q6.3 The MIKE Sub-Regional Support Officers have played an effective role in raising awareness about illegal killing of elephants with decision makers at the national level;
Q6.4 MIKE’s support for and participation in other African elephant conservation initiatives such as the African Elephant Action Plan, the African Elephant database, the African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG), and the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) has been appropriate and effective;

Q6.5 The MIKE/ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG) has been an essential mechanism for ensuring the scientific rigour and technical suitability of MIKE’s monitoring systems;

Q6.6 MIKE Phase II’s support for elephant population surveys at participating sites has been a significant contribution to elephant conservation efforts;

Q6.7 MIKE’s support for studies designed to understand the dynamics of the ivory trade and the drivers of illegal killing of elephants has been instrumental in informing decision making concerning elephant conservation and regulation of the ivory trade.

Online survey results for Q6.2, below, illustrate widespread support for the role of MIKE Sub-Regional Support Officers (SSOs) in facilitating elephant conservation coordination and cooperation at the sub-regional level across the four sub-region. Support for the role of SSOs was somewhat lower among respondents primarily involved in MIKE’s international-level work.

Survey results for Q6.4, overpage, illustrate respondents primarily involved in MIKE’s international-level work in particular overwhelmingly held positive views of MIKE’s support for and participation in other African elephant conservation initiatives such as the African Elephant Action Plan, the African Elephant database, the African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG), and the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS).
Online survey results for Q6.6, below, indicate MIKE Phase II’s role in supporting elephant population surveys has been particularly appreciated in the East and Central Africa sub-regions.
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