

## 2ND MEETING OF THE STEERING COMMITTEE OF THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT FUND

11 – 13 March 2013, BANGKOK, THAILAND

N <sup>o</sup>	Discussion Items	Declarations and Agreements	Actions and Responsibilities
1.	<b>Welcome and Opening of the Meeting</b>	<p>The 2nd Meeting of the Steering Committee of the AEF convened on Monday 11 March 2013, to discuss matters related to the implementation of the activities under the Fund, as well as consider pending matters from the last meeting of the Steering Committee.</p> <p>The Chair, Ms. Thea Carroll (South Africa, set the stage with a few opening words, reminding participants about the challenges faced in the past by the AEF and its Steering Committee, as well as new developments concerning the role UNEP will play as the Secretariat of the African Elephant Fund.</p>	
2.	<b>Introduction of participants</b>	<p>Sub-regional representatives from Botswana, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Kenya, Congo, South Africa and Nigeria attended the meeting. Three donor States (Netherlands, United Kingdom and Germany) were also represented. Uganda, Rwanda, Central African Republic and Chad attended the meeting as observers. The absence of one sub regional member of the Steering Committee (Sudan) prevented the meeting from having the necessary quorum. The Rules of Procedure of the Steering Committee state that a quorum consists of eight representatives of the four sub regional members of the Steering Committee and one donor State in attendance. However it was agreed to proceed in informal basis and that agreements would be confirmed by written procedure. This was an item to be discussed and reviewed later during the meeting under Agenda Item 6.</p>	
3.	<b>Adoption of the agenda</b>	<p>The meeting considered the following agenda items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Working relationship between UNEP and the African Elephant Fund Steering Committee</li> <li>2. Budget items not eligible for funding under the Fund</li> <li>3. Status of implementation of activities under the AEF</li> <li>4. Criteria to determine the urgency of a proposal through the discretionary account</li> </ol>	

N°	Discussion Items	Declarations and Agreements	Actions and Responsibilities
		<p>5. Projects approved during the first meeting of the AEFSC</p> <p>6. Rules of Procedure</p>	
3 (1)	<p><b>Agenda Item 1</b> Working relationship between UNEP and the African Elephant Fund Steering Committee</p>	<p>On the first agenda item, UNEP reported on the official approval by the Executive Director to provide administrative support to the African Elephant Fund for an initial period of 18 months as an in kind contribution not attributable to the PSC, including details on staffing arrangements made within UNEP to support the work of the Steering Committee and the African elephant range States. This report was well received by the Members of the Steering Committee who expressed their appreciation for the support provided by UNEP.</p> <p>Some Member States reminded the Steering Committee that UNEP, in considering the finalization of the role it will play, needs to take into account the biggest challenge faced by the Member States to date - the issue of translation, including consideration of its funding from the 7% PSC. UNEP made it clear that translation could not be paid from the PSC which is meant for other purposes, but that UNEP would consider the issue and do its best to help. It was also mentioned that UNEP would consider translating some documents (depending on length) by the staff assigned to the AEF. In addition, The Netherlands expressed their appreciation of UNEP's support towards the Steering Committee and its work.</p> <p>This was also the chance to review the draft terms of reference of the Associate Administrative Officer who will support the Steering Committee. UNEP reminded the meeting that the TORs would need to be reviewed to fit the format and generic requirements of the UN, and that it was important to agree on the major aspects of the responsibilities needed for this position. UNEP also stated that the task described in the ToR might be undertaken by one or more part-time officials in a part-time basis. Rwanda and Botswana requested to be given more the time to review the draft and submit their comments the following day, while Burkina Faso expressed its concern that the requirements for the position were too heavy.</p>	

N°	Discussion Items	Declarations and Agreements	Actions and Responsibilities
		<p>The Committee endorsed the contents of the Draft Decision submitted to CITES CoP-16 inviting UNEP to provide the Secretariat for the Fund.</p>	
3 (2)	<p><b>Agenda Item 2</b> Budget items not eligible for funding under the Fund</p>	<p>Discussions indicated that there was a general agreement reached at the last Steering Committee meeting that travel and Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA) for meetings of the Steering Committee would not be funded by the Fund. This was reiterated by the Chair of the Steering Committee, before giving the floor to the Member States to provide comments on the elements they deemed not eligible to be considered for financing.</p> <p>The Chair then formed a Working Group composed of Burkina Faso and Kenya and mandated it to work further on this issue and to report on its findings the following day.</p> <p>This Working Group the following day reported that the Steering Committee should make a clear difference between accommodation, DSA and food costs in its decision-making on funding allocation, as funding the latter in the case of workshops for instance could be warranted. The Chair noted the comments.</p> <p>Regarding the allocation of DSA for funds in the discretionary account, the Netherlands delegate mentioned that it would welcome the use the UN Rules guiding daily subsistence allowance. UNEP clarified that depending on the nature of the trust fund and what it is created for, DSA could be paid under contributions received, adding that trust funds are the main mechanism to incur expenses in UNEP, and that travel expenses are also paid from the same.</p>	
3 (3)	<p><b>Agenda Item 3</b> Status of implementation of activities under the AEF.</p>	<p>UNEP reported on the progress to date and updated the Steering Committee on the agreements signed with Benin, Nigeria and Malawi. The meeting was informed that Nigeria and Benin had confirmed receiving the funds and should be able to start on activities in best delays. However it was not clear when Malawi would start implementation.</p>	

N°	Discussion Items	Declarations and Agreements	Actions and Responsibilities
		<p>Congo, as one of the sub-regional representatives of the Central African sub-region was requested to follow-up with its own country as well as Gabon, to make sure that feedback is provided to the Secretariat. The Congolese representative explained that the situation in Congo was due to personal problems linked to the focal point in Congo, but that the issue should be resolved quickly.</p> <p>The Chair reminded the sub-regional representatives of the Steering Committee of their role of coordination and liaison with the range States to ensure that processes are followed and rules adhered to.</p>	<p>Congolese representative to liaise with Gabon representative to provide an update on the situation in Gabon</p>
3 (4)	<p><b>Agenda Item 4</b> Criteria to determine the urgency of a proposal through the discretionary account</p>	<p>A second Working Group was also formed to look at the criteria to determine the eligibility of projects to be funded under the discretionary account of the Fund. Those projects are considered "urgent" projects. The Working Group was composed of Botswana and Cameroon and was to report to the Steering Committee the following day.</p> <p>This second Working Group reported that in order to be eligible under the discretionary fund, the projects: (i) require immediate action within 6 months; (ii) be at least of 30% of the value of the discretionary account; (iii) require action that is linked to the vulnerability of species and requires criminal investigation; (iv) are replicable with other range States and demonstrate a quick-win for human-elephant conflicts and finally; (v) are endorsed by the sub-region as a priority area.</p> <p>The report of the Working Group raised many comments, especially regarding the sharing of the funding under the discretionary account and the requirement on the replicability of funded projects in other range States. Kenya pointed out that the replicability of projects in other range States might be tricky.</p> <p>One Donor Member (Netherlands) cautioned that the AEF needs to benefit all sub-regions, hence the suggestion not to have the 30% eligibility rule apply, as the four sub-regions could not all benefit from the urgent projects account. A few comments were made by Burkina and Botswana to clarify the 30%</p>	

N°	Discussion Items	Declarations and Agreements	Actions and Responsibilities
		<p>against 70% ratio. The Chair reminded participants that the ratio had been agreed to by all range States during an African Elephant range States meeting which took place in Nairobi in November 2010.</p>	
3 (5)	<p><b>Agenda Item 5</b> Projects approved during the First Meeting of the AEFSC</p>	<p>The meeting was informed that three other range States (Congo, Gabon and Ethiopia) had been requested at the last Steering Committee to review proposals they had submitted, which were to be re-submitted according to the recommendations of the Steering Committee, and they have not done yet.</p> <p>It was decided that sub regional members of the Steering Committee are to send out another call for proposals with information on format for the submission of proposals and that submission deadlines would be triggered once this has been done – would be worth mentioning here as a reminder – maybe ask Chair for clarification).</p>	<p>Congo, Gabon and Ethiopia were requested to speed up the re-submission of their proposals as they need to be operationalized in best delays.</p>
3 (6)	<p><b>Agenda Item 6</b> Rules of Procedure</p>	<p>The meeting reviewed new clauses proposed by the Chair on the subjects of quorum, procedures for approving a project submitted by a Member of the Steering Committee, the process to determine the time and date of meetings as well as deadlines for submission of projects revisions.</p> <p>Different views were expressed from the floor on the newly proposed rules of procedure, including by donor countries. The Chair requested Nigeria, Kenya and Burkina Faso to provide some text on the revision of the rules of procedure for consideration by the Steering Committee the following day. UNEP also mentioned it has proposals for amendments to be included.</p>	
4.	<p><b>Closure of Meeting</b></p>	<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.</p>	