

**3RD MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT FUND**  
**25 -27 SEPTEMBER 2013, OUAGADOUGOU, BURKINA FASO**

| NO | AGENDA ITEM                               | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS   | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY |
|----|---|--|--------------------------|
| 1. | <b>Welcome and Opening of the Meeting</b> | <p>The 3rd Meeting of the Steering Committee of the AEF convened on Wednesday 25 September 2013 to discuss matters related to the implementation of the activities under the Fund, as well as consider proposals from range states submitted for funding as well as modalities for the same.</p> <p>The Chair, Ms. Thea Carroll (South Africa), set the stage with a few opening words, thanking the host Burkina Faso for the warm welcome extended to the SC members and for making all arrangements for visas as well as hotel accommodation.</p> <p>Netherlands also thanked BF for their warm welcome and went on to note that 80 elephants were killed in Zimbabwe during that week. He therefore emphasized that there is indeed an urgent need that this fund gets the full attention of those who can change the fate of the elephants by addressing this matter urgently. He added that there is currently great political attention being paid to the fate of elephants and hence a great opportunity for us to ensure that this fund also utilizes this opportunity. He cited examples of global tiger initiative which became a major success out of very high political attention and funds began to flow.</p> <p>UNEP explained that being the UN arm mandated with environment, was now playing role of coordinator for the AEF and doing its best to facilitate the range states. UNEP's role therefore is to administer the fund that is hosted by UNEP, as well as to monitor the funds and report on activities implemented under the fund. UNEP highlighted the need to come up with fund raising strategies as indicated on the agenda for discussion noting that the fund is currently not where it ought to be – currently with only 700,000 out of the committed 5 m.</p> |                          |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM  | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS   | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY |
|----|--|--|--------------------------|
| 2. | <b>Attendance and Apologies</b>                              | <p>Sub-regional representatives from Botswana, Burkina Faso, Congo, Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa attended the meeting. Two donor States (Netherlands and Germany) were also represented as well as CITES Secretariat.</p> <p>Apologies were received from Sudan who was not able to raise funds for attendance.</p>   |                          |
| 3  | <b>Adoption of the Agenda</b>                                | <p>The Chair went through the agenda and asked for proposals to add or amend items. It was agreed that some items be reorganized so that the core business of the agenda, the evaluation and funding of the proposals submitted is thereby allocated enough required time.</p> <p>The agenda was then adopted.</p>   |                          |
| 4. | <b>Matters arising from the 2<sup>nd</sup> AEFSC meeting</b> | <p><i>Minutes from the last meeting:</i><br/> Comments were received from the table with the chair clarifying the issue raised by Netherlands on the 30% and 70% of funds allocation criteria. It was also agreed that proponents should in future endeavor to translate the executive summaries of proposals in both working languages.</p> <p>The Chair then adopted the minutes.</p> <p><i>Report on availability of funds and project implementation to date:</i><br/> UNEP presented the status on the funds and also explained the process UNEP uses to enter into the agreements with the range states through the SSFA (Small Scale Funding Agreement). He noted that despite requests, Nigeria, Malawi and Benin had still not submitted their progress reports on funds earlier disbursed to them.</p> <p><i>Adoption of the rules of procedure as developed in Bangkok:</i><br/> On Rule 10, UNEP will translate the Rules of Procedure into French. UNEP confirmed they are currently working at getting a bi lingual person to support the translation tasks and provide such other required services in the future. UNEP also explained how the Program Support Cost (PSC) which</p> |                          |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS   | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY  |
|----|-------------|--|---|
|    |             | <p>has now been reduced operates, and that there is no separate PSC account for the AEF. It was also noted that this was a resolution adopted at the CITES COP in March 2013.</p> <p>Rule 13 on Quorum was amended to read that 6 representatives can now form a quorum for future meetings (with each of the 4 sub regions represented and one donor state).</p> <p>On Rule 10 a it was agreed to change 'RECUSE' to excuse</p> <p>All in all, there was a suggestion that the Rules of Procedure document remains an open one to accommodate any possible edits/changes that may need to be accommodated in the document as the next few meetings take place.</p> <p><i>Adoption of criteria for the review of urgent proposals:</i><br/> Botswana, supported by Kenya noted that Human Elephant Conflict really has no permanent solutions as seen in past experiences. Kenya also noted that erecting fences and beehive chilly fences have also not worked completely before. Suggested therefore the need to focus on real remedial work and look for workable solutions, noting that Human elephant conflict needs to be scoped in the budget. Burkina Faso added that there are some situations that are indeed to be classified as emergency and which cannot always wait for the SC to meet and evaluate in form of proposals.</p> <p>The Chair clarified that these can always be dealt with as postal procedures. She added the need to reconsider exactly what should be used as criteria for urgency noting that each sub region must agree on what is really priority and urgent.</p> | <p>The Chair to write a letter to the UNEP ED to fast track this issue of the recruitment of a bilingual person. The Chair also to assist in the development of the JD for this person.</p> |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM  | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS   | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY   |
|----|--|--|--|
| 5. | <b>Review of submitted proposals for the next round of funding</b> | <p>The meeting agreed to approach the evaluation process by reviewing each and every submitted proposal, sub region by sub region. The Chair noted there was USD88,000 available per sub region at the time in Bangkok. The Chair also went through the evaluation criteria which was in English only but translation services were readily available. Thereafter the work to review and evaluate the proposals began and discussions ensued on the quality and scoring of each proposal.</p> <p>Netherlands emphasized that it is important to also look at impact as importantly as scores and moreover, money should not remain in the bank if it was needed to be put to work.</p> <p>In the end after over one full day of deliberations, funding was approved for the requested amounts for proposals by Burkina Faso, Burkina Faso-Benin-Niger, Malawi, Ethiopia, Tanzania (2 proposals), Uganda and Kenya. No proposals had been submitted from one region, Central Africa and it was not clear why nothing at all had been presented from there. It was agreed that this is an issue that needed to be addressed.</p> | <p>The chair in liaison with the Central Africa sub region representative to follow up on what the problem might be and whether it is a communication problem or that they no longer required funding.</p> |
| 6. | <b>Fund raising matters</b>  | <p><i>Review and adoption of a Budget for the AEAP for the next 10 years for Range states.</i></p> <p><i>Review and adoption of a Budget</i><br/>The committee noted that the draft indicative budget that had been prepared by Burkina Faso was too detailed and could not be reviewed thoroughly at the meeting. It was therefore decided that .....</p> <p><i>Modalities for fund raising</i><br/>Discussions regarding fund raising strategies ensued. Netherlands noted that it was important for the fund to remain more visible and more importantly, tap into the current high political attention that is currently being paid to the fate of elephants all over the world.<br/>Germany presented a number of upcoming high level events on elephants</p>   | <p>The budget to remain as indicative still and be re-considered and re-done in a summary form with much fewer details.</p>  |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM      | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS  | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY  |
|----|------------------|---|---|
|    |                  | <p>conservation and illegal wildlife trade – the E50:50 elephant conference in India November 2013; The IUCN high-level African elephant summit (2-4 December 2013, BOTSWANA; and the London summit on illicit wildlife trafficking (UK/Prince of Wales Initiative February 2014. Germany confirmed they would be happy to support some of these actions and the fund should come up with concrete actions and activities for the fund. It was agreed that these kinds of events presented a good opportunity to market and sell the action plan and the members should look for a window in some of the sessions to present the fund, and in a transparent way, have a united African voice to save elephants. The meeting discussed further aspects of the Botswana meeting and what the concrete actions should be. It was unanimously agreed that invitations for the Botswana meeting are key for key ministers from the range states and should be addressed in a timely manner. In addition, Kenya cautioned that routing of invitations is key and copying and keeping certain people in the loop very crucial. Since Botswana will be handling the issues of the agenda and are currently working on invitations, they would take back the message from the fund and ensure the relevant ministers/heads of state get invited, and ensure that the agenda gets to put the issue of the fund in the right place. The Chair reminded that Botswana would also draft the speech for the fund at this event.</p> <p>Netherlands also tabled a discussion on the need for marketing and awareness raising materials such as a fund logo, brochures and press releases to be used at all times to showcase the work of the fund. The press release and other materials will be the flag any ministerial employee or other entities can use for aggressive marketing of the fund. UNEP on the other hand can sensitive the perm reps, embassies, governing council on this pan African initiative on illegal trade, poaching.</p> | <p>Botswana to work on the modalities for invitations to the fund and the key high level persons from the range states. Botswana to draft speech for the fund for the event.</p> <p>UNEP to liaise with Netherlands and the Chair to prepare a press release immediately after the meeting in Burkina Faso.</p> |
| 7  | <b>Update on</b> | CITES Secretariat presented the list of decisions arising from the CITES  |   |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM  | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS   | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY  |
|----|--|--|---|
|    | <b>decisions on elephants taken at CoP16 - CITES Secretariat</b> | COP 16.....  |   |
| 8  | <b>Conclusions and Recommendations</b>                           | <p>Conclusions and Recommendations:</p> <p>Immediately after the meeting, UNEP in liaison with the Chair Netherlands and CITES would prepare a Press Release for circulation and approval to members of the Steering Committee. This will be the first step to addressing the dire need as agreed at the meeting, of the much required visibility and communication strategies. Other marketing and visibility materials including a logo for the Fund will be prepared as soon as possible.</p> <p>The Chair would write a letter to the UNEP Executive Director, highlighting achievements from AEF last meeting, and to seek support from UNEP on translation, development of logo and website.</p> <p>Botswana would in view of very little planning time left, embark on inclusion of AEF presentation on the agenda of the High Level Meeting (African Elephant Summit) scheduled to take place in December in Botswana.</p> <p>Germany and South Africa would send their letter(s) of Intent to donate funds to the AEF (Germany USD50, 000 and South Africa USD10, 000).</p> <p>The indicative budget presented at the meeting by Burkina Faso will be revised by sub regional representatives.</p> <p>UNEP, upon consultation with relevant Range states for required data will</p> | <p>UNEP<br/>South Africa<br/>Netherlands</p> <p>Chair, South Africa</p> <p>Botswana</p> <p>Germany<br/>South Africa</p> <p>Sub regional reps</p> <p>UNEP-with</p> |

| NO | AGENDA ITEM               | STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS  | ACTIONS & RESPONSIBILITY   |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|
|    |                           | <p>embark on the preparation of Agreements (SSFAs) for funding of the eight (8) new proposals.</p> <p>The situation in the Central Africa in terms of communication gaps/reasons for not submitting proposals will be addressed so that challenges experienced in the development and submission of project proposals for that region can be addressed.</p> | <p>consultation with range states</p> <p>South Africa<br/>UNEP<br/>Congo</p> |
| 10 | <b>Closure of Meeting</b> | <p>The Chairperson thanked the members for their valuable contributions and their participation in the meeting; she wished them good return to their respective countries. Germany, Netherlands and UNEP also thanked the Chair for a job well done in guiding the meeting and also thanked Burkina Faso for their hosting the meeting.</p>                 |  |