

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



Sixty-first meeting of the Standing Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 15-19 August 2011

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation

Elephants

REPORT OF THE MIKE-ETIS SUBGROUP

Opening of the meeting

1. The meeting participants were reminded that the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup had been established at the fifty-ninth meeting (SC59) of the Standing Committee and that it was composed of Botswana (Vice-Chair), Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Mali, Uganda (Chair), United Kingdom, United States and Thailand.
2. The Subgroup convened on 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 August 2011 in the sidelines of the 61th meeting of the Standing Committee.
3. The agenda of the meeting, as proposed by the Secretariat and based on paragraphs 7 and 8 of document SC61 Doc. 44.3, was adopted. The Secretariat was asked to assist in the preparation of a report on the findings and recommendation of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup for presentation to the Standing Committee.

Updated MIKE and ETIS analysis and document SC61 Doc. 44.2

4. The updated reports from MIKE and ETIS that TRAFFIC and the Secretariat were requested to prepare for SC61 in accordance with the implementation of Decision 14.78 (Rev. CoP15), and that are presented in document SC61 Doc. 44.2, will briefly be introduced. They can be questioned and commented upon by the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup.
5. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup may wish to examine all recommendations presented in Annex 1 of document SC61 Doc. 44.2 (i.e. those emanating from the MIKE and ETIS analyses, as well as those from IUCN), and extract those that are pertinent for consideration by the Standing Committee. This may require some redrafting or rewording.
6. In view of the partial overlap and significant compatibility between the recommendations in document SC61 Doc. 44.2 and those proposed by the Secretariat in document SC61 Doc. 44.1, it might be appropriate for the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup to consider both documents with a view to combine and consolidate their respective recommendations. Such an approach would however need to be explained to and approved by Standing Committee.

Progress evaluation of the MIKE Phase II project in Africa

7. The Executive summary of the progress evaluation of EC Project No. 9 ACP RPR 42 (MIKE Phase II in Africa) and the full evaluation report itself have been made available to the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup. It should

be noted that the reflections concerning 'General Goals for Phase III' that are proposed in the evaluation report have been taken into consideration in the development of the MIKE Phase III concept note.

- A summary of the evaluation's main findings and recommendations is shown below:
  - *The functional structure reflected a supply-driven rather than a demand-driven process. During MIKE Phase I, the MIKE system was set up in Africa. Phase II has displayed real progress towards implementing that system and producing important results. Within the MIKE CCU, which was re-established and embedded in UNEP DELC, the critical factor was the hiring of the Data Analyst, which allowed two major achievements: the establishment of a baseline of elephant mortality in MIKE sites in 2007, and a comprehensive analysis of MIKE information for the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2010 (CoP15). Subregionally and nationally, there has been an improvement in 'man years' in Phase II. A number of African elephant range States want to join the monitoring programme, while participating range States want to have more MIKE sites. Monitoring is moving from specific sites to wider ecosystems and there is increasingly cross-border cooperation. There is also good uptake of MIST as a preferred method for law enforcement monitoring. While the MIKE system is not perfect, information is now emerging which is appreciated at national and international level.*
  - Concerns include the following:
    - *While SSOs are making more national and site visits, the distribution of these visits is sometimes skewed.*
    - *Many sites are still totally dependent on donor funding, which could be considered good (as it shows that MIKE is considered valuable) or bad (illustrating lack of sustainability).*
    - *Elephant population surveys in MIKE sites should be happening more often.*
    - *There are a number of long-standing concerns, stemming back from Phase I. In particular, this concerns inter-departmental conflicts in certain elephant range States that prevent the normal functioning of MIKE, and the high rate of turnover of National and Site MIKE Officers.*
    - *Additionally, in many elephant range States law enforcement monitoring is still seen as an additional burden and has not been institutionalized as a central activity.*
    - *The bureaucracy in UNEP' may be a challenge for the CCU.*
    - *Mission creep should be cautioned against as the pressure to expand MIKE increases.*
  - The recommendations of the review include:
    - *To support the continuation and expansion of MIKE;*
    - *to review the Terms of Reference for Subregional Support Officers, National and Site MIKE Officers;*
    - *to review range State commitments towards the implementation of MIKE and develop protocols to implement MIKE at national and site levels;*
    - *to more programmatically link MIKE and IUCN;*
    - *to continue to promote close collaboration between MIKE and ETIS to integrate information in their reporting structures;*
    - *to use subregional economic groupings in Africa (EAC, SADC, etc.) to get high-level political awareness of and involvement in MIKE;*
    - *to prepare for bringing additional sites and African elephant range States into the MIKE programme;*
    - *to continue promoting MIST;*

- to develop new standardized ranger curricula in training institutions across the range of African elephants;
  - to review the composition of the TAG and bring in new members;
  - to review the location of the CCU;
  - to update MIKE's elephant survey standards;
  - to examine the potential of MIKE to operate as an 'early warning system';
  - to peer review the methodologies and outputs of MIKE; and
  - to make the entire MIKE data set, along with its analysis protocols, publically available to allow external scientists to undertake additional or better analyses.
8. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup is invited to comment on the findings and recommendations of the independent progress evaluation of the MIKE Phase II project in Africa.
9. In view of the revision of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15), the Subgroup may wish to pay particular attention to recommendations about the operational structures of the MIKE programme in Africa (those concerning range States, MIKE National and Site Officers, the TAG, MIKE Subregional Support Units and the MIKE Central coordination Unit), the relationships of MIKE with IUCN and ETIS and the use of the information and data that is generated through the MIKE programme.

#### Fund-raising for the ETIS and MIKE programmes

10. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup can examine and make recommendations to the Standing Committee as appropriate on proposals from ETIS and MIKE concerning the financial and operational sustainability of the programmes, and ongoing and planned fund-raising efforts of the ETIS and MIKE programmes.
11. The concept note concerning a MIKE Phase III project for Africa will be briefly introduced, and information will be provided on its current status. The efforts put into moving the MIKE programme forward in Asia will be clarified.
12. At its previous meeting, the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup received financial information on the MIKE programme for Phase I (2001-2006) and Phase II (2007-2010), including expenditures under the EU Commission project on MIKE-Africa. This information was acknowledged. If deemed useful, an update could be provided to the Subgroup, for example by its next meeting in 2012 or for the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.
13. Financial information on ETIS and information on current or planned fundraising efforts may be communicated by the ETIS Director.

#### Statement of MIKE Technical Advisory Group (May 2011)

14. At its 10th meeting (Naivasha, May 2011), the MIKE Technical Advisory Group formulated a statement regarding the elephant work of MIKE, ETIS and IUCN that is shown below.

*"The Technical Advisory Group:*

- *Supports the work that has been done to explore the linkages between MIKE, ETIS and the IUCN/SSC elephant monitoring systems and the ivory supply chain;*
- *Recognizes the progress made in recent workshops to identify specific opportunities for analytical, reporting, and operational engagements; and*
- *Expresses concern that the valuable momentum towards such linked MIKE/ETIS/AAED analyses - and on-the-ground implementation of MIKE - achieved in Phase 2 will be lost if there is a hiatus in funding before Phase 3.*

*The TAG therefore recommends that the CITES Secretariat and the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup of the Standing Committee work, in consultation with the TAG, to facilitate continued data collection and the*

*further development of linked analytical models by pursuing vigorously all funding opportunities as a matter of urgency.”*

- The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup may wish to respond to the concerns expressed in the statement, or suggest relevant actions to be undertaken by the Standing Committee, the Secretariat, the TAG, TRAFFIC or IUCN.

#### Examine matters proposed by MIKE and ETIS

15. The Secretariat will outline the arrangements for the further implementation of MIKE Phase II in Africa, which involves some changes in the personnel status in the MIKE Central Coordination Unit but not in the performance or capacities of the CCU.
16. As provided in the Terms of Reference of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup, the MIKE Coordinator or ETIS Director may wish to comment on the participation of elephant range States and Parties in the implementation of ETIS and MIKE.

#### Oversight of the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)

17. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup can evaluate and comment upon the technical and scientific oversight provided to ETIS and MIKE through the Technical Advisory Group (TAG).
18. For this purpose, it is proposed that the following items are briefly introduced to the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup:
  - *Outcomes of the recent regular TAG meetings (TAG9 in December 2010 and TAG10 in May 2011)*
  - *Results of the workshop ‘Assessing factors influencing illegal killing of elephants and illegal trade in ivory in support of the development of analytical frameworks for MIKE and ETIS’ (December 2010)*
  - *Results of the workshop ‘Elephants and the trade in elephant specimens: a review of existing analytical and reporting systems and recommendations for a way forward’ (May 2011)*
19. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup can make recommendations concerning the items that were presented.

#### Implementation of Decision 15.74: revision of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) on Trade in elephant specimens

20. Decision 15.74 calls for the Standing Committee to evaluate Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) on Trade in elephant specimens in consultation with African and Asian elephant range States and the Secretariat. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup can contribute to the implementation of this Decision.
21. In document SC61 Doc. 44.5, the Secretariat recommends the following to the Standing Committee:
  17. *The Standing Committee is invited to agree on a process and timetable for the further implementation of Decision 15.74. The Standing Committee could consider establishing a working group to lead this work, possibly by enlarging the current mandate of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup to include the implementation of Decision 15.74.*
  18. *The Secretariat remains at the disposal of the Standing Committee to assist in the actions outlined in the paragraphs above. It could be tasked with collating different suggestions for amending Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15), and integrating these in a draft revision of the Resolution for consideration by the Standing Committee at its 62nd meeting.*
22. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup could develop a process and timetable for the revision of the sections on MIKE and ETIS in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15), and agree on the role of the CITES Secretariat in this regard. By extension and in case the Standing Committee agrees, the same timeframe and process could be applied for the revision of the entire Resolution.

#### Terms of Reference of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup

23. The current Terms of Reference of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup are presented in Annex 1 of document SC61 Doc.44. 3.
24. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup can examine the existing Terms of Reference, inter alia regarding membership, chairmanship and quorums for holding meetings, and provide advice and formulate recommendations as appropriate for consideration by the Standing Committee. This could be undertaken as inter-sessional work.
- **Chairmanship:** The Chair of the previous MIKE-ETIS Subgroup, Zambia, recommended the appointment of a Vice-Chair to preside over Subgroup meetings in case the Chair is absent, and to otherwise assist the Chair. This proposal was put into practice by the current MIKE-ETIS Subgroup and could be incorporated into its Terms of Reference.
  - **Composition:** The current Terms of Reference provide that “The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup will normally consist of six members of the Standing Committee: two from Anglophone Africa, one from Francophone Africa, two from Asia and one from Europe or North America.” The current membership does not fully correspond to this description, with an “over-representation” of Francophone Africa and Europe/North America, and one member which is not a member of the Standing Committee but an alternate. The Subgroup may wish to reconsider the composition and size of its membership, bearing in mind that it would probably be best to keep numbers manageable, and that it might be practical to retain a certain level of flexibility.
  - **Quorums for holding meetings:** It might be advisable to determine a quorum for holding valid meetings of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup.
    - *In the case of the Standing Committee, Rule 22 provides that “A quorum for a meeting shall consist of Representatives or Alternate Representatives of seven regional members or alternate regional members from at least four regions. No decision shall be taken at a meeting in the absence of a quorum.”*
  - **Tasks of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup:** The tasks of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup are well-defined in its Terms of Reference and limited to aspects directly relating to the two elephant monitoring programmes. It might however be useful to consider adding provisions whereby the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup could be tasked by the Standing Committee to address additional elephant-related matters. An example of such an assignment is presented in document SC61 Doc. 44.5, where the Secretariat suggests that the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup assumes responsibilities in the context of the implementation of Decision 15.74 regarding the review of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) that go beyond those strictly relating to MIKE and ETIS.
  - **Modus operandi:** The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup may wish to reflect upon the observers that participate in its meetings, and perhaps develop some clearer guidance in this regard. It seems for example important that the ETIS Director and MIKE Coordinator attend most if not all MIKE-ETIS Subgroup meetings. Another example concerns the members of the MIKE and ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG). Their Terms of Reference stipulate that “TAG members are encouraged to attend relevant meetings of the Standing Committee or its MIKE-ETIS Subgroup, and of the Conference of the Parties” (See Notification No. 2009/049). In practice, TAG members that happen to be attending Standing Committee Meetings have routinely been invited to take part in the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup meetings, but this is not reflected in the Subgroup’s Terms of Reference.

Any Other Business

25. The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup can agree on inter-sessional actions to be undertaken between the 61st and 62nd meetings of the Standing Committee in 2011 and 2012.

MIKE-ETIS SUBGROUP

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

Introduction

2. Regarding monitoring of illegal hunting of and trade in elephant specimens in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) on *Trade in elephant specimens*, the Conference of the Parties agrees that:
- a) *the systems known as Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) and the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS), established under the supervision of the Standing Committee, shall continue and be expanded with the following objectives:*
    - i) *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;*
    - ii) *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;*
    - iii) *establishing an information base to support the making of decisions on appropriate management, protection and enforcement needs; and*
    - iv) *building capacity in range States;*
  - b) *these monitoring systems shall be in accordance with the framework outlined in Annex 1 for Monitoring of illegal trade in ivory and other elephant specimens and in Annex 2 for Monitoring of illegal hunting in elephant range States;*
  - c) *information on illegal killing of elephants and trade in their products from other credible law enforcement and professional resource management bodies, should also be taken into consideration; and*
  - d) *technical oversight will be provided to both MIKE and ETIS through an independent technical advisory group to be established by the Secretariat.*
3. The Standing Committee created a subgroup at its 41st meeting (Geneva, February 1999) "to oversee, on its behalf, further development, refinement and implementation of MIKE" in the context of the implementation of the predecessor of this Resolution. At its 49th meeting (Geneva, April 2003), the Committee decided to extend the mandate of the subgroup to include ETIS, thereby reflecting amendments to the Resolution adopted at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP12, Santiago, 2002). It is now referred to as the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup.

#### Composition and chairmanship

4. The Standing Committee reconstituted the Subgroup following the 11th, 12th, 13th, 14th and 15th meetings of the Conference of the Parties (Gigiri, 2000; Santiago, 2002; Bangkok, 2004; The Hague, 2007; Doha, 2010).
5. The number of members and the composition of the Subgroup have changed over time, mostly reflecting changes in the Standing Committee membership (see the table below). Members of the Subgroup have consistently been Parties that were involved in implementing the MIKE programme on the ground (i.e. elephant range States), funding part of the ETIS or MIKE programmes, or had shown particular interest in ETIS or MIKE developments. With the exception of the initial years of the MIKE programme, the Chair of the Subgroup has been chosen from amongst one of the African elephant range States in the Subgroup.
6. At its 60th meeting (Doha, March 2010), the Standing Committee re-established a MIKE-ETIS Subgroup composed of Botswana, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Mali, Uganda, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America. However, the new Subgroup expressed concern that the Asian region was not well represented, and therefore requested the CITES Secretariat to invite Thailand to join the Subgroup. Thailand is an Asian elephant range State that participates in MIKE and ETIS, and a member of the Standing Committee in its capacity as Host Country of the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Thailand accepted this invitation in September 2010. In the same month, the Subgroup nominated a chair (Uganda) and a vice-chair (Botswana).

TABLE: HISTORY OF THE MIKE-ETIS SUBGROUP OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE:  
STANDING COMMITTEE MEETINGS WHEN (RE-)ESTABLISHED,  
MEMBERSHIP, CHAIRMANSHIP AND DOCUMENT REFERENCE

CoP meetings	SC meetings	Membership of the Subgroup	Document reference
MIKE Subgroup			
CoP10 (1997)	SC41 (1999)	Burkina Faso, Saudi Arabia (Chair), South Africa, Thailand, United States	SC41 summary report; Doc. SC.42.10.2.2
CoP11 (2000)	SC45 (2001)	Burkina Faso (representative of Francophone Africa), Cameroon (alternate representative of Francophone Africa), Kenya (alternate representative of Anglophone Africa), Saudi Arabia (representative of Asia), South Africa (Chair), United Republic of Tanzania (representative of Anglophone Africa), Thailand (alternate representative of Asia)	SC45 Doc. 22
MIKE-ETIS Subgroup			
CoP12 (2002)	SC49 (2003)	Cameroon, China, Malaysia, South Africa (Chair), United Republic of Tanzania, United States	SC49 summary report (Rev. 1)
CoP13 (2004)	SC53 (2005)	Cameroon, China, Germany, Kenya (Chair), Malaysia, Zambia	SC53 Doc. 20.2
CoP14 (2007)	SC57 (2008)	China, Japan, Kenya, United Kingdom, United States, Thailand, Zambia (Chair)	SC57 Com. 5
CoP15 (2010)	SC60 (2010)	Botswana (Vice-Chair), Democratic Republic of the Congo, Japan, Mali, Uganda (Chair), United Kingdom, United States, Thailand	SC60 summary record

7. Based on the existing Terms of Reference of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup (see Annex 1) and the outcomes of the latest meeting of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup held in the sidelines of CoP15 (see Annex 2), the MIKE Central Coordination Unit of the CITES Secretariat (MIKE CCU) proposes that the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup adopts and implements the following working programme:
- a) Review and update the existing Terms of Reference of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup, *inter alia* regarding membership, chairmanship and quorums for holding meetings, and provide advice and formulate recommendations as appropriate for consideration by the Standing Committee.
  - b) Examine and make recommendations to the Standing Committee as appropriate on proposals from ETIS and MIKE concerning:
    - the financial and operational sustainability of the programmes, and ongoing and planned fund-raising efforts of the ETIS and MIKE programmes;
    - the participation of elephant range States and Parties in the implementation of ETIS and MIKE;
    - the results of the evaluation of the current MIKE Phase II project in Africa; and
    - other matters which may arise in conjunction with meetings of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup.
  - c) Contribute to the implementation of Decision 15.74, calling for the Standing Committee to evaluate Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) on *Trade in elephant specimens* in consultation with African and Asian elephant range States and the Secretariat, by examining the sections in the Resolution concerning ETIS and MIKE (including policies regarding the collection, compilation, use and publication of ETIS and MIKE data, analysis and findings).

- d) Evaluate and comment upon the technical and scientific oversight provided to ETIS and MIKE through the Technical Advisory Group (TAG) by examining the outcomes of the regular TAG meetings (TAG9 in December 2010 and TAG10 in May 2011), and of workshops organized in December 2010 and May 2011 in the context of the development by the TAG and the ETIS and MIKE programmes of joint analytical and reporting frameworks for ETIS and MIKE.
  - e) Consider documents regarding ETIS and MIKE that are submitted to the Standing Committee, including the updated analyses of ETIS and MIKE data that TRAFFIC and the Secretariat are requested to prepare for the 61st and 62nd meetings of the Standing Committee in accordance with the implementation of Decision 14.78 (Rev. CoP15), and provide findings and observations to the Standing Committee.
  - f) Hold meetings and review progress made by ETIS and MIKE in the sidelines of the 61st and 62nd meetings of the Standing Committee in 2011 and 2012.
  - g) Report to the Standing Committee at its regular meetings.
8. Furthermore, the Secretariat invites the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup to consider and take action on the following statement of the MIKE Technical Advisory Group, agreed to at its 10th meeting (May 2011):

*The Technical Advisory Group:*

- *Supports the work that has been done to explore the linkages between MIKE, ETIS and the IUCN/SSC elephant monitoring systems and the ivory supply chain;*
- *Recognizes the progress made in recent workshops to identify specific opportunities for analytical, reporting, and operational engagements; and*
- *Expresses concern that the valuable momentum towards such linked MIKE/ETIS/AAED analyses - and on-the-ground implementation of MIKE - achieved in Phase 2 will be lost if there is a hiatus in funding before Phase 3.*

*The TAG therefore recommends that the CITES Secretariat and the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup of the Standing Committee work, in consultation with the TAG, to facilitate continued data collection and the further development of linked analytical models by pursuing vigorously all funding opportunities as a matter of urgency.*

9. In order to support the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup in addressing the issues mentioned in paragraphs 7 and 8 above, the MIKE CCU will provide relevant information to its membership well in advance of the present meeting, including details of fundraising efforts, the outcomes of the evaluation of the current MIKE Phase II project in Africa, the minutes of TAG9 and TAG10, and the reports of the workshops held in the context of the development of joint analytical and reporting frameworks for ETIS and MIKE.

Recommendations

10. The Secretariat proposes that the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup convene during the present meeting and report to the Committee. It further recommends that the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup address the issues outlined in paragraphs 7 and 8.
11. The Secretariat invites the Standing Committee to consider the report of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup at its present meeting.



TERMS OF REFERENCE  
FOR THE MIKE-ETIS SUBGROUP OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

SEPTEMBER 2008

In the context of the implementation of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) on *Trade in elephant specimens*, the Standing Committee may establish under its direction a MIKE-ETIS Subgroup to oversee the further development, refinement and implementation of the systems known as Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) and the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS).

The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup would normally be reconstituted at the first regular meeting of the Standing Committee following a meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

**Tasks of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup**

The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup will:

- a) regularly review the institutional and administrative arrangements of ETIS and MIKE, and provide advice and formulate recommendations as appropriate;
- b) review policies regarding the collection, compilation, use and publication of MIKE and ETIS data, analysis and findings;
- c) examine and make recommendations to the Standing Committee as appropriate on proposals from MIKE and ETIS concerning:
  - the financial and operational sustainability of the programmes;
  - the participation of elephant range States and Parties in the implementation of MIKE and ETIS; and
  - other matters which may arise in conjunction with meetings of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup.
- d) when necessary examine Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) on *Trade in elephant specimens*, including the framework outlined in its Annex 1 for ETIS and in Annex 2 for MIKE, to ensure that it remains valid and pertinent;
- e) be kept informed about the technical and scientific oversight provided to MIKE and ETIS through the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group;
- f) consider documents regarding MIKE and ETIS that are submitted to the Standing Committee;
- g) review progress made by MIKE and ETIS when it meets in the sidelines of the meetings of the Standing Committee, and appraise any intersessional reporting; and
- h) report to the Standing Committee at its regular meetings.

**Composition**

- a) The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup will normally consist of six members of the Standing Committee: two from Anglophone Africa, one from Francophone Africa, two from Asia and one from Europe or North America.
- b) The members of the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup should be Parties that are: a) involved in the on-the-ground implementation of the MIKE programme; b) funding or otherwise actively supporting MIKE or ETIS; or c) showing a particular interest in the implementation and developments of MIKE and ETIS.

**Modus operandi**

- a) Once constituted, the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup should elect a chairman amongst its membership.

- b) The MIKE-ETIS Subgroup should convene at the meetings of the Standing Committee in years when there is no meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and should work intersessionally principally through email.
- c) The CITES Secretariat, through its MIKE programme, shall serve as the secretariat for the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup.

REPORT OF THE MIKE-ETIS SUBGROUP  
MARCH 2010

At its fifty-ninth meeting (SC59), the Standing Committee agreed that the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup meet in the sidelines of the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP15) to discuss the issues in paragraph 3 of document SC59 Doc. 19 (the Standing Committee recognized that time had been too limited for the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup to meet before SC59).

As announced at SC59, the MIKE-ETIS Subgroup convened on 13 and 17 March 2010 in Doha. Those present during the meeting (or attending one of the two sessions) were China, Japan, Kenya, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Zambia (Chair); four members of the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group (TAG); the ETIS Director (TRAFFIC); and the CITES Secretariat, including five MIKE Subregional Support Officers (Central Africa, East Africa, West Africa, Southern Africa and Southeast Asia).

1. The agenda of the meeting, based on the one presented in document SC59 Doc. 19, was agreed.

MIKE and ETIS analysis for CoP15

2. The MIKE Data Analyst presented an updated version of the MIKE analysis for CoP15 (with reference to documents CoP15 44.2 (Rev.1) and CoP15 Inf. 41), and the ETIS Director provided the latest information on the ETIS analysis. He confirmed that, based on the limited evidence available, no relationship can be inferred between CITES decisions and levels and trends of poaching as estimated by the Proportion of Illegally Killed Elephants (PIKE). Kenya remarked that such a relationship could also not be disproved.
3. Kenya noted that MIKE's site-based design should provide for analysis at the site level. The MIKE programme should analyze local drivers of poaching that operate in individual sites. In this regard, Kenya questioned the relevance of using national-level covariates in the analysis. Kenya was of the opinion that the conclusion of the MIKE analysis concerning the absence of linkages between trends in the levels of PIKE over time and the most recent CITES-authorized ivory sales were premature and misleading. Kenya believed that its practice in collecting data relevant to MIKE could be used as a model.
4. One of the TAG members clarified that PIKE trends and the general MIKE analysis gave an overall and averaged picture of the situation in the 70 MIKE sites in 38 range States included in the analysis, and that it was not designed to reflect the specific situation of individual sites or countries. It was also mentioned that the objectives of MIKE were to provide overall trends in levels of illegal killing of elephants, and do not specify requirements to provide analysis at site or national levels. The MIKE Data Analyst clarified that PIKE was at the moment the best available proxy for measuring and comparing elephant poaching, but that further research and refinement were ongoing. As an example, he indicated that a multinomial analysis of elephant mortality instead of the current binomial one would take care of mortalities caused by extreme weather conditions.
5. The MIKE Coordinator pointed at the case study of Laikipia-Samburu included in document CoP15 44.2 (Rev. 1) that gave a site-specific analysis. In response to questions about the reasons for selecting this particular site as opposed to more "typical" MIKE sites, the MIKE Coordinator clarified that this specific analysis had been possible because the site had abundant and detailed information on elephants, land use and many other significant local influencing factors. Such data was more limited or unavailable for many other sites. Furthermore, Laikipia-Samburu is a site consisting of a mosaic of different land uses and elephant protection situations, and therefore an interesting model to examine relationships between PIKE and various local factors. The US nevertheless encouraged MIKE to undertake similar detailed site analyses, where feasible and sufficient MIKE and efforts data were available, to give a better representation of differences in data collection and analysis across the spectrum of MIKE sites.
6. The ETIS Director clarified that the Annex to document CoP15 44.1 (Rev. 1) with the ETIS data would not be revised but that an information document was under preparation that provided ETIS analysis for four subregions in Africa and two in Asia, allowing for comparison and linkages with the MIKE analysis. The ETIS Director confirmed that CITES decisions concerning ivory trade do not appear to be a principal driver

of illicit ivory trade according to the trends analysis of seized ivory presented in document CoP15 Doc. 44.1 (Rev. 1).

#### The future of the MIKE programme beyond mid-2011

7. A MIKE gap-analysis and needs assessment, based on research conducted by the MIKE programme for reporting to CoP15, was briefly introduced. It was suggested that an analysis be performed to look for correlations between the MIKE and ETIS covariates at the national level.
8. With regard to the future of the MIKE programme, the Subgroup was informed that discussions with the MIKE Technical Advisory Group continued on further improvements and scientific and technical developments of the MIKE programme so that it could continue meeting its objectives in as effective and meaningful a manner as possible. These discussions were helping to elucidate the organizational and scientific design, and the corresponding requirements of a well-functioning MIKE programme. The EU Commission was committed to support MIKE in Africa until the end of 2011. Additional external funding would be required after 2011 to ensure the continuation of the programme in its current format (neither MIKE nor ETIS are included in the Secretariat's regular budget proposals for CoP15).
9. The MIKE Coordinator explained that at the moment, no overall fundraising activities had been initiated for post-2011 (there was agreement that the timelines for implementing Phase II in Africa could be moved from March 2011 to December 2011). He noted that several smaller, targeted fundraising activities to support elephant population surveys in Africa and MIKE work in Southeast and South Asia were being undertaken. The Subgroup requested the MIKE and ETIS programmes to be kept informed about ongoing and planned fundraising efforts.
10. In Kenya's view, there were still gaps in the running of the MIKE programme that would require external funding. It reiterated that the elephant range States should become independent from external funding for implementing MIKE. In response to Kenya's suggestion to call for a review of the entire MIKE programme, it was explained that the current Phase II in Africa was already contractually bound to be reviewed at mid-term (before summer 2009) and at the end (in 2011/12). The Subgroup agreed that this was an appropriate way of evaluating the African component of the programme. It suggested that funding source countries have been limited and that funding could be sought from other sources to support MIKE in both Asia and Africa.
11. China explained that it was in the process of working with partners to establish an elephant fund that could serve to support programmes such as MIKE and ETIS in Asia. This was welcomed by the Subgroup.
12. The Subgroup was informed about the considerable MIKE work being undertaken in Southeast Asia by WCS. It was clarified that for effectively assisting the 13 MIKE sites in the 8 Southeast Asian range States of the Asian elephant, around USD 400,000 per year is required. This would allow reinforcing and building effective structures for elephant data collection and analysis; training in law enforcement monitoring and MIKE routines; equipping rangers, sites and range States; conducting population surveys; and providing the necessary regional technical and operational support. The annual costs for running a similar support programme in South Asia would be less.
13. The ETIS Director gave an account of the financial situation of the ETIS programme, which was currently experiencing a shortfall of USD 46,000. But he stated that the situation had improved since the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee in 2009 owing to a grant from the UK Government (DEFRA) through its Darwin Initiative. The ETIS Director signalled his intention to circulate an update of the financial situation of the ETIS programme, detailing funding needs between CoP15 and the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

#### Potential revisions concerning MIKE and ETIS in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) (Trade in elephant specimens)

14. The Subgroup generally agreed with the approach to revise certain aspects of MIKE and ETIS in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) (*Trade in elephant specimens*), as proposed by the Secretariat in document CoP15 Doc. 18, Annex 7. Kenya felt that such a revision should involve the elephant range States and all other interested groups and countries, noting that communication challenges existed in gaining inputs from the range States. The Subgroup took note of the fact that ETIS was a global programme involving many more than just elephant range States. The majority of the Subgroup supported the view that the Standing Committee, as the representative body of all CITES Parties, would be an

adequate forum for implementing such a review in consultation with the Secretariat and TRAFFIC, and that it could be tasked with presenting its proposals at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 2013.

15. The MIKE coordinator explained that the issue of ETIS and MIKE data handling policies could be discussed in connection with the proposed revision of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP14). He indicated that the policies could be explored that govern other types of data that CITES Parties are submitting on a regular basis in the context of compliance with CITES provisions, such as CITES trade data. These become available in the public domain when they are submitted by the Parties to the CITES Secretariat and published by UNEP-WCMC. The Subgroup recognized the importance of peer review in the scientific literature of the analytical methods applied by MIKE and ETIS.

#### The MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group

16. The Subgroup was informed about the 8th meeting of the MIKE Sub-TAG and the 3rd meeting of the ETIS Sub-TAG which had taken place in Nairobi on 14-15 and 16 December 2009 respectively. It expressed its appreciation for the work of the TAG, which was conducted by scientists mainly on a voluntary basis. It took note of the Terms of Reference for the MIKE and ETIS TAG that had been communicated in Notification to the Parties No. 2009/049 of 26 November 2009.

#### Any other business

17. The Subgroup was reminded that the Standing Committee had agreed at SC59 to re-appoint a MIKE and ETIS Subgroup at its 60th meeting on 25 March 2010. Of the current Subgroup members, China, Japan, Kenya and Zambia were expected to rotate off the Standing Committee after their two terms. In order to maintain a normal composition of the Subgroup as laid out in its Terms of Reference, they should be replaced by two (Anglophone) African elephant range States and two Asian Parties (one or two range States of the Asia elephant if possible).