



**SUMMARY MINUTES FOR THE 11<sup>TH</sup> AFRICAN ELEPHANT FUND STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING**

18 - 21 February 2019

G.S. Plaza Hotel, Accra, Ghana

**PRESENT:**

**Regional representatives from East Africa:**

1. Patrick Omondi- Kenya

**Regional representatives from West Africa:**

2. Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah-  
Ghana- Chair of AEFSC

**Regional representatives from Southern Africa:**

3. Mpho Tjiane- South Africa

**Donors:**

4. Miet Van Looy- Belgium  
5. Alexandre Foulon -France  
6. Samuel Jacquin- France  
7. Rudolf Specht- Germany-  
Observer

**CITES Secretariat:**

8. Thea Carol

**CMS Secretariat:**

9. Kanako Hasegawa

**UN Environment (AEF Secretariat):**

10. Arnold Kreilhuber  
11. Mamadou Kane  
12. Dorris Chepkoech

NO	AGENDA ITEMS	STATEMENTS AND DECISIONS
	<b>Introduction</b>	<p>The 11<sup>th</sup> African Elephant Fund Steering Committee (AEFSC) meeting was held at G.S. Plaza hotel in Accra, Ghana from 18 to 21 February 2019. The overall objective of the meeting was to review progress in the implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan, through the review of the operational and administrative mechanisms of the African Elephant Fund hosted by United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). The main agenda items discussed included, but were not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) The newly introduced UNEP procurement guidelines;</li><li>b) Way forward on 2018 approved projects;</li><li>c) Due diligence process in relation to African Conservation and Development Foundation;</li><li>d) Update and way forward on challenges encountered on certain projects;</li><li>e) Update on past and upcoming pledges from the donors;</li><li>f) Process for review of the African Elephant Action Plan;</li><li>g) Assessment and evaluation of eight project proposals;</li><li>h) Revision of project proposal template, selection and evaluation criteria for project approval, Terms of Reference and Rules of Procedure of the AEFSC and resource mobilization strategy for the fund.</li></ul>
1.	<b>Opening Remarks and adoption of the Agenda</b>	<p>The meeting was opened at 8:30 am on 18 February 2019 by the Chair of the AEFSC, Nana Kofi Adu-Nsiah, Executive Director of the Wildlife Division of the Forestry Commission of the Government of Ghana.</p> <p>Arnold Kreilhuber on behalf of UNEP thanked the Government of Ghana for hosting the meeting and the Steering Committee members for attending the meeting. He reiterated UNEP's commitment to a continued partnership with the Range States to implement the African Elephant Action Plan and engagement to improve the effectiveness of the Fund's operations.</p>



		Miet Van Looy (Belgium) on behalf of donor States expressed sincere gratitude to the Government of Ghana for hosting the meeting. She acknowledged the great work done by the Fund to protect the African Elephant and renewed the donors support to continue to work together with the Range States to safeguard the African Elephant.
2.	<b>Quorum</b>	The Steering Committee members present were East Africa represented by Kenya, West Africa represented by Ghana and Southern Africa represented by South Africa. The donors were represented by Belgium and France. <i>Ex-officio</i> members were represented by UNEP and the CITES and CMS Secretariats. Germany attended the meeting as an observer. As Central Africa was not present, Gabon transferred their voting rights to Kenya through a letter to the Chair of AEFSC, copied to the AEF Secretariat. With the absence of Gabon, one sub-regional representative was not in attendance, therefore a quorum could not be established.
3.	<b>Secretariat Presentation</b>	The AEF Secretariat presented to the Steering Committee an updated financial report. Since its inception, a total of 3,657,868.62\$ have been received and 1,974,412.14\$ has been spent as at 31 December 2018. The Secretariat also presented progress reports on ongoing and completed projects in Ghana (2), Gabon (2), Kenya, Ivory Coast, Uganda, Botswana and Mali. The Secretariat also briefed the Steering Committee on the eight project proposals being submitted for considerations by the AEFSC.
4.	<b>UNEP Procurement Guidelines</b>	<p>The AEF Secretariat presented a proposed way forward on the implementation of the delayed projects approved in Kasane in 2018. A procurement module was presented to the Steering Committee as a way to assess Range States procurement capacities in the future.</p> <p>The Steering Committee agreed to consider UNEP procurement assessment for the AEF legal instruments. A procurement plan will be added as an annex to the Small-Scale Funding Agreement which will serve as a procurement monitoring plan between UNEP and the implementing partners. The due diligence on the procurement process is expected to take an average transaction time of two weeks maximum.</p> <p>This procurement scheme will be implemented according to different procurement budget thresholds as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For procurement budgets below USD 10,000 which comprise of single acquisitions each of less than USD 4,000. No assessment needed. Procurement report required.</li> <li>• For procurement budgets below USD 20,000 which comprise of single acquisitions each of less than USD 4,000. No assessment needed but should ensure Low Value Procurement procedures are in place. Procurement report required. Post review monitoring only for selected cases.</li> <li>• For procurement budgets below USD 40,000 which may include single acquisitions above USD 4,000: Project level assessment only is required.</li> <li>• For Procurement budgets above USD 40,000. Assessments is required. Full monitoring programme required.</li> </ul>



5.	<b>2018 Small Scale Funding Agreements</b>	The AEF Secretariat updated the Steering Committee on the status of the 2018 Small Scale Funding Agreement (SSFAs) for the seventeen (17) projects. For these 17 SSFAs already drafted, a procurement plan will be added to the SSFAs as an annex in order to proceed with their implementation. The Secretariat will share with the Range States the procurement templates to be used for this purpose.
6.	<b>The African Conservation and Development Foundation (ACDEF)</b>	As per regular practice, UNEP conducted a due diligence process for ACDEF which resulted in the non-eligibility of the Foundation to be a project partner under the SSFA scheme for UNEP. As a result, the Steering Committee took a decision to request the Government of Guinea and Cameroon to implement the two projects originally proposed by ACDEF if they so wish.
7.	<b>Challenging Projects</b>	The AEF Secretariat is still experiencing problems with certain Range States regarding reporting on selected projects. These Range States included: Congo, Botswana, Angola, Ethiopia and Mali. The four sub-regional representatives of the Range States were requested by the Steering Committee to follow-up with the respective Range States to submit satisfactory narrative and expenditure reports to the Secretariat as per the funds disbursed and the legal instruments signed.
8.	<b>Pledges</b>	<p>Pledges for the year 2019 were made as follows: the Netherlands pledged 120,000 Euros and France pledged 50,000 Euros. Germany gave a pledge which amount is to be determined in the next few weeks and Belgium pledge will be determined as soon as the new government is formed.</p> <p>Regarding 2018 pledges, the Netherlands contributed 120,000 euros, Belgium and France contributed 50,000 euros respectively. It is important to note that the 2018 pledge from France was at the time of the meeting yet to be identified in UNEP accounts. The AEF Secretariat has followed up with Corporate Service Division of UNEP and France's contribution for 2018 has been identified and transferred to the AEF account.</p> <p>CITES and CMS will continue to support the Range States in implementing the African Elephant Action Plan by providing technical guidance and support to the Fund.</p> <p>UNEP will continue supporting the Fund through its administrative support and secretariat services as the operational arm of the Fund.</p>
9.	<b>Process for Review of the African Elephant Action Plan (AEAP)</b>	<p>A proposal to start a process for the revision the African Elephant Action Plan (AEAP) was introduced in 2018 through a project submitted by IUCN entitled "<i>Preparing Technical Inputs for Updating the African Elephant Action Plan</i>" that will gather knowledge for the revision of the AEAP. The AEFSC was called to deliberate on the way forward related to this project.</p> <p>An African Elephant Specialist Group ( AfESG) workshop is already scheduled for 15-19 July 2019 which will be attended by 22 African Countries. The AEFSC decided to build on the planned workshop to start the process of revision of the AEAP. The AEF will fund the participation of the African Elephant Range States and francophone AfESG members from West and Central Africa to attend the workshop and also cover</p>



		translation and interpretation for the meeting. UNEP and MIKE are called to attend the workshop.
10.	Assessment and Evaluation of Project Proposals	<p><b>1. Chad- Projet d'Appui aux Acteurs de la Mise en Œuvre de la Stratégie Nationale de Conservation des Eléphants/ Project to Support Stakeholders in the Implementation of the National Elephant Action Plan- \$158,047- 24 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chad's project proposal was not approved.</li> <li>The Steering committee acknowledged the crisis of elephant population in Chad and recognized that therefore urgent measures were needed.</li> <li>The Steering Committee noted that the project intentions were good, however it lacked focus. The aspect of collaring elephants and capacity building was missing in the proposal. The Steering Committee further noted that the technical capacity and law enforcement were important to conserve the African elephant population for this proposal.</li> <li>The Steering Committee noted that the budget requested did not match the total budget items on the budget template due to US dollar and local currency conversion.</li> <li>The Steering Committee requested the AEF Secretariat and Range States to assist Chad to draft a proposal. This proposal will be treated as an urgent proposal to be circulated via email and will be assessed as an exceptional case.</li> <li>The European Commission funds for drafting proposal will be used to fund travel for assisting Chad to draft a proposal.</li> <li>The Steering Committee further requested Gabon (Central African sub-regional representative) and the AEF Secretariat to communicate to Chad the final results of the proposal with recommendations from the Steering Committee.</li> <li>Chad proposal scored 17/50 and therefore did not meet the eligibility criteria for funding the project.</li> <li>The Steering Committee suggested that a new project proposal be submitted all together</li> </ul> <p><b>2. Cameroon- Renforcement de la Protection des Populations D'éléphants dans le Parc National de Boumba Bek/ Strengthening the Protection of Elephant Population in Boumba Bek National Park- 132,526\$- 15 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project proposal was conditionally approved.</li> <li>The Steering Committee noted that per diems cannot be funded and the flyers costing 20,000\$ were too expensive and need to be revised.</li> <li>MIKES and IUCN were requested to refocus the proposal to address issues of per diems and long-term sustainability.</li> <li>This project proposal scored of 42/50.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Cameroon- Strengthening the Protection of Elephant Population in Waza National Park- 79,550\$ -12 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This project proposal was conditionally approved.</li> <li>The Steering Committee noted that the budget cost on staff time and per diems were expensive and should be revised.</li> </ul>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Steering Committee also requested the project proponent to clarify the measures to be taken for sustainability of the project. Will the patrolling after project completion stop or will it continue?</li><li>• This project scored 33/50.</li></ul> <p><b>4. Gabon- Elephant Inventory in Gamba Protected Area Complex (CAPG)/ Inventaire des Éléphants dans le Complexe d'Aires Protégées de Gamba (CAPG)- 109,049 \$-7 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This project proposal was conditionally approved.</li><li>• The Steering Committee noted that the budget was not clearly outlined and activities to be carried out and payments to be made were not linked.</li><li>• The Steering Committee requested World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) to revise the budget and outline clearly the budget items in relation to the activities. The co-funding also needs to be indicated.</li><li>• The Steering Committee further requested WWF to submit an endorsement letter from the Competent Authority of Gabon</li><li>• This project scored 29/50.</li></ul> <p><b>5. Ex Congo- Conservation de l'éléphant de forêt dans la zone forestière des Plateaux Batékés Congo-Gabon/ Conservation of Forest Elephant in the Forest Area of Batéké-Plateau Congo-Gabon- 99,710 \$-12 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This project proposal was conditionally approved.</li><li>• The Steering Committee requested that the project to be officially resubmitted by Gabon with Gabon's project proponent contact details.</li><li>• The Steering Committee noted that the budget was too aggregated and not clearly broken down in relation with the activities. The budget items lacked unit pricing.</li><li>• The Steering Committee further requested Congo to submit an endorsement letter highlighting that Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) will be implementing the project on their behalf.</li><li>• The Steering Committee further requested the AEF Secretariat to inform Congo on the new developments regarding the project proposal.</li><li>• This project scored 31/50.</li></ul> <p><b>6. Uganda- Strengthening Elephant Conservation Through Law Enforcement and Stakeholder Engagement in Queen Elizabeth National Park- 95,597.56\$ - 5 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This project proposal was conditionally approved.</li><li>• The Steering Committee requested for clarification on the project duration of 5 months.</li><li>• The Steering Committee also requested Uganda Wildlife Authority to Work with Uganda Wildlife Research and Training Institute to ensure all relevant stakeholders are involved.</li><li>• The project proposal scored 40/50.</li></ul>
--	--



		<p><b>7. Zimbabwe- Enhancing the Capacity of Sengwa Wildlife Research Institute to Deliver Training in SMART Ranger Based Monitoring (RBM) System in the Sebungwe and other Elephant Range Areas in Zimbabwe- 53,800\$- 24 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project proposal was approved for implementation.</li> <li>• The Steering Committee agreed that the project proposal was well drafted.</li> <li>• The project proposal scored 42/50.</li> </ul> <p><b>8. Niger- Eco ethology of Savannah Elephant (Loxodonta Africana, Blumenbach 1797) Facing Climate Change in W National Park of Niger- \$3,726 - 17 months</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project proposal was conditionally approved.</li> <li>• The Steering Committee requested the project proponent for clarification regarding the technique used. i.e. why the use of dung decay in savanna elephants instead of other techniques such as aerial survey?</li> <li>• The Steering Committee also requested for more information regarding the project location. i.e. Will the project cover only Southeast Niger or the entire W. National Park?</li> <li>• The project proposal scored 38/50.</li> </ul>
11.	<b>Final Results</b>	Of the eight (8) project proposals resubmitted, seven projects were approved from Gabon (2), Cameroon (2), Uganda, Zimbabwe and Niger. The total amount of funds approved was \$ 573,958.56.
12.	<b>Project Proposal Template, Selection and Evaluation Criteria</b>	<p>The Steering Committee drafted a new project proposal template and selection and evaluation criteria for project proposals. The criteria to be scored in the project proposal are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Conservation benefit:</b> Does the Proposal demonstrate a clear long-term conservation benefit to elephant populations of the range State?</li> <li>• <b>Conservation benefits trans-boundary:</b> Does the Proposal demonstrate a clear conservation benefit to elephant populations of another range States?</li> <li>• <b>Sustainability:</b> Does the project demonstrate ability to sustain activities beyond project period?</li> <li>• <b>Transparency:</b> Does the proposal demonstrate stakeholder involvement (communities, NGOs, technical partners).</li> <li>• <b>Transparency trans-boundary:</b> For trans-boundary projects, does the proposal demonstrate other Range States involvement?</li> <li>• <b>Quality:</b> Has the mandatory fields been completed, project proposal template, feasibility of proposed activities established, relevance of project partners assessed, clarity of expected outputs and links with AEAP objectives established.</li> <li>• <b>Budget:</b> Quality of overall budget, clarity of budget items, realistic budgets, proper budget templates used.</li> <li>• <b>Monitoring and Evaluation:</b> Does the project proposal demonstrate that project proponent have a clear plan for assessing planned activities, identify clear milestones and indicators of achievements as well as interim technical and financial reporting?</li> </ul>





		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Other sources of funding:</b> Does the proposal identify other sources of funding?</li> </ul> <p>The scoring of projects shall be undertaken on a scale of 0 to 5: 0-unsatisfactory; 1-poor; 2-partially satisfactory, 3-satisfactory, 4-very satisfactory and 5-excellent.</p> <p>The following bonus points shall be added to the overall score, where applicable. Either 0 or 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Uniqueness and innovation:</b> Does the proposal indicate use distinctive and novel methodology to address specific objectives of AEAP?</li> <li>• <b>Replicability:</b> Could the project be repeated in other range States?</li> </ul> <p>The Steering Committee agreed to change the current budget template to Umoja budget template used by UNEP. The Secretariat was requested to circulate the revised project template and budget template. The Secretariat will also assist project proponents in filling the template upon request.</p>
13.	<b>Terms of Reference</b>	The Steering Committee drafted new terms of reference for the African Elephant Fund. The draft Terms of Reference will be circulated immediately to all the thirty-eight Range States for inputs and comments. African Elephant Range States will have a chance to finalize the Terms of Reference tentatively in the margins of CITES COP 18.
14.	<b>Rules of Procedure</b>	The Steering Committee drafted new rules of procedures for the African Elephant Fund. The draft rules of procedures will be circulated immediately to all the thirty-eight Range States for inputs and comments. African Elephant Range States will have a chance to finalize the Rules of Procedures tentatively in the margins of CITES COP 18.
15.	<b>Resource Mobilization Strategy</b>	The Steering Committee tasked the AEF Secretariat to prepare a draft outline of a resource mobilization strategy for the fund and share it with the Steering Committee members for review.
16.	<b>Communication</b>	The AEF Secretariat presented a prototype of the new AEF website with enhanced new features and more functionalities. The Steering Committee recommended to adopt the new AEF website. The AEF Secretariat was requested by the Steering Committee to consult Corporate Service Division regarding the donation button. The Steering Committee further recommended to highlight AEF achievements on the header and requested the AEF Secretariat to proceed to launch it and migrate the content from the old website.
17.	<b>A.O.B</b>	<p><b>1. Funding Range States to attend Steering Committee meetings</b></p> <p>The Steering Committee requested the AEF Secretariat to write a correspondence to all the donor States to request them to fund Range States to attend future AEFSC meetings in order to ensure a quorum is reached in future AEFSC meetings.</p> <p><b>2. AEF side event during CITES COP 18 to be held in Colombo Sri Lanka</b></p> <p>The Steering Committee acknowledged the need to have a side event in the margins of the CITES COP 18 to be held in May 2019 in Colombo, Sri Lanka. The side event will serve as a platform to highlight AEF achievements and milestones made in the</p>



	<p>implementation of the African Elephant Action Plan and also a platform to fundraise. The AEF Secretariat was tasked to prepare for the side event including all logistical aspects.</p> <p><b>3. Translation of revised documents</b> CITES and CMS Secretariat volunteered to assist in translating the key draft documents for the Range States. The AEF Secretariat will follow-up with CMS and CITES Secretariat on way forward regarding translation.</p> <p><b>4. African Elephant Range States contact details</b> The Steering Committee requested sub-regional representatives of the African Elephant Range States to share with AEF Secretariat all the contact details of the range states in their respective sub-regions. This will facilitate the sharing of the draft terms of reference and rules of procedures with all the thirty-eight Range States for their review and comments.</p> <p><b>5. 12<sup>th</sup> African Elephant Fund Steering Committee Meeting</b> As a common practice, the organization of the AEFSC meeting is rotational. East Africa is scheduled to host the next meeting. The Steering Committee proposed Uganda to host the 12<sup>th</sup> AEFSC meeting. Kenya, the East African sub-regional representative and the AEF Secretariat were tasked to follow up with Uganda on the modalities of hosting the 12<sup>th</sup> AEFSC meeting. The steering committee meeting is to be held tentatively in the first quarter of 2020.</p> <p>There being no other business, the Chair declared the meeting closed at 2:00 pm on 21 February 2019.</p>
--	---