

# CEPF FINAL PROJECT COMPLETION REPORT

## I. BASIC DATA

**Organization Legal Name:** The World Conservation Union (IUCN)

**Project Title (as stated in the grant agreement):** Long term system for Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE)

**Implementation Partners for this Project:** West African countries in the Upper Guinea Forest System: Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia and Togo.

**Project Dates (as stated in the grant agreement):** February 2001 – January 2005

**Date of Report (month/year):** March 2005

## II. OPENING REMARKS

*Provide any opening remarks that may assist in the review of this report.*

The result of the MIKE project is to measure, on a long-term basis, levels and trends in the illegal killing of elephants and to assess whether the causes of any observed trends are related to CITES decisions or to other factors. The data collected will be coordinated and interpreted to assist decision making at international and national levels, but there will be also many side benefits for those involved, e.g. capacity building for national and field staff, data about habitats and other important species, economic benefits for local people through sustainable use of biodiversity.

CEPF funds to this activity will essentially benefit West African Guinea Forest sites which sustain elephant populations, and are a priority ecosystem for CEPF. Funds from other sources will be concentrated to Savannah sites. The MIKE project will enhance national capacity to undertake data collection and use such data to guide wildlife resource management including habitat management.

This project has therefore assisted in establishing a baseline against which future trends can be measured.

## III. ACHIEVEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE

**Project Purpose:** African elephant populations and their ecosystems managed in sustainable and beneficial ways through the provision of reliable information and improved decision-making at the national, sub-regional and continental level.

### Planned vs. Actual Performance

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Purpose-level:</b>	
1. Population and patrol information produced by 27 range states from over 43 MIKE sites in regular monthly and annual reports by CoP12 (November 2002).	All the range states covered by the MIKE program are producing regular patrol information on the MIKE harmonized forms (patrol and carcass forms.) These 2 forms are the basis for monthly and annual reports. The MIKE database has been programmed so that the

	<p>production of monthly reports is easily generated. In November 2002, the data collated by the program was not enough for presentation at the CoP12. Nonetheless, with regular monthly reporting coming from many sites during 2003, the program presented a preliminary presentation of the data collated from 10 sites at the CoP13 in October 2004 to demonstrate the reality of the MIKE system.</p>
<p>2. National policies and management strategies evolved or developed by 2005 in 27 range states using, <i>inter alia</i>, the population and patrol/survey information produced in monthly and annual reports.</p> <p>3. Continental, Sub-regional and National information on population trends and causes available to all parties for guiding decisions in regard to proposals tabled at CoPs.</p>	<p>Several West African countries have developed and adopted their own elephant conservation strategy. Those that have not done it are currently looking for funding in order to fulfill this objective.</p> <p>The production of monthly reports are very important as they describe what has occurred in terms of patrol activities and carcasses found, even when no patrols have been undertaken or no carcasses found. This will facilitate making good comparisons between site activities and therefore will assist in deciding what interventions produce the best results re elephant protection.</p> <p>The analytical strategy of data was developed as the data started to come in during 2003. One key benefit of the data becoming available during 2003 is that it greatly assisted in the development and fine tuning of the analytical approach. With the analytical strategy now in place and actual data now being provided for testing the analytical strategy, data from several sites was analyzed and reported in the report provided to the Conference of Parties at the CoP 13 in October 2004.</p> <p>The program has achieved recent population estimates for most sites. This has been particularly important for West and Central Africa, where previous estimates were old or lacking. Civil strife has hampered such surveys in Liberia and 1 site in Cote D'Ivoire</p>

***Describe the success of the project in terms of achieving its intended impact objective and performance indicators.***

The outputs and benefits of this project in the following important areas are :

a) in terms of capacity building, the MIKE National and Site Officers are trained and experienced in data collection, data entry and data management, and are competent to continue the MIKE monitoring program. The delivery of training on the use of MIKE field forms and GPSs was made by MIKE Sub-regional Officers during 2003 and recently in 2004, two further training workshops have been delivered on the use of the MIKE database and on data management. This has resulted in ensuring that all MIKE range State staffs are able to use the MIKE database and the importance of computer and data management which then ensures that the data collated meets MIKE's analytical objectives. More training work is required in regard to data quality control. Training of MIKE staff in population survey techniques was also achieved though there is a need for more of such training

b) in terms of field activities, population surveys have been undertaken in Kakum 2001, Mole in March 2002, in Gourma in April 2002, in Tai and Marahoué in July and August 2002 respectively, in W Ecosystem including 5 sites (W Benin, W Burkina Faso, W Niger, Pendjari, Keran) plus the Nazinga Ecosystem (site Nazinga) in April-May 2003. A survey team from Sapo has been trained

in Ghana in September 2002. The forest survey in Ziama (Guinea) has been recently completed, including the preparation of the survey report. Reports for Marahoué, Taï and W Ecosystem and Nazinga have been produced. All sites, except those affected by civil strife are delivering patrol and carcass data, though getting this data to flow regularly from the field is still problematic. Incidences of carcasses appear to be a very low level in West Africa compared to Central Africa

c) in terms of influencing the environmental policies of range states, this project has facilitated a standardized data reporting system to be put in place across the range States. The data analysis inter-relationships that MIKE will be particularly addressing are population trends, patterns of effort, patterns of illegal killing and patterns of influencing factors. The long term monitoring of trends in elephant populations and the factors influencing such trends can only take place once a baseline has been established. It is MIKE's objective to build the capacity to monitor in the wildlife agencies who should be responsible for undertaking such monitoring. The range States have shown increasing commitment to the MIKE process and there is increased interaction between the scientists in the field of population survey. While the baseline is not yet in place, the Project is having significant impact on trade decisions, namely that the pending ivory sales from Southern African range States remain embargoed until the baseline is in place. In the meantime, the Project is fostering a mutual understanding and cooperation between the African range States participating in MIKE.

***Were there any unexpected impacts (positive or negative)?***

The project momentum is at risk as the gap between the previous EC project funding and the future EC project funding lengthens. There is a real risk that a lack of bridging funds brings a temporary cessation of activities and a consequent loss of continuity.

One unexpected positive impact is the increasing demand of local NGOs, who are operating in other protected areas not included in the MIKE system, to actively participate and contribute in the MIKE training workshops.

One obstacle to the implementation of the Project has been dealing with high turnover of Site Officers. These problems cut across all sub-regions for the MIKE project. To overcome this problem, the MIKE CCU have held Sub-regional Steering Committees and flagged these issues with the respective Wildlife Directors. Many wildlife agencies plan to introduce MIKE systems to all areas under their jurisdiction as a means of mitigating the impact of routine internal transfers . The MIKE Sub-regional Support Officers are revisiting the sites in order to re-train the newly appointed field staff in the areas of LEM, GPS and database management. The creation of a MIKE training module to be incorporated as part of the wildlife agency training program is also being planned. Such moves help to mitigate the problem at lower levels, but the higher ones goes in the hierarchy, the harder it is to find suitable replacements.

**IV. PROJECT OUTPUTS**

***Project Outputs:*** Enter the project outputs from the Logical Framework for the project

**Planned vs. Actual Performance**

Indicator	Actual at Completion
<b>Output 1:</b> MIKE Central Co-ordination Unit, the Sub-regional Support Units and the Technical Advisory Group established and operational	

1.1. CCU and SSU staff in post with good communication systems in place supporting the range states implementation process	The CCU and SSU staff were in post since 2001. They are equipped with good communication systems. Two officers supported the range states implementation process in West Africa.
1.2. TAG actively reviewing, harmonizing and updating protocols and survey techniques	The TAG held four meetings. As a result of these meetings, a series of important decisions on the MIKE database development and the GIS component, as well as data analysis strategy and population survey methodologies have been reviewed and produced.  MIKE and ETIS now share the TAG. The normal modus operandi will be to have a Sub-TAG for MIKE and a Sub-TAG for ETIS. This does not preclude having a full TAG meeting for MIKE and ETIS, when required.
<b>Output 2:</b> National Officers, Site Officers and Site teams established and fully operational in all clearly demarcated sites	
2.1. N.O.s (27), S.O.s (43+) and Site teams (c.300 persons) in position with good communication systems in place	National Officers, Site Officers and site teams are in place with satisfactory communication systems in all countries since 2002.
2.2. Site boundaries agreed and maps available	Site boundaries agreed in all 11 countries and all 19 sites. Base maps with grid square for each site are available in digital and hard copy form.
2.3. Equipment procured and delivered	Equipment have been procured and delivered to all the sites. For example, three GPS per site have been delivered in all sites. Some GPS have been replaced by more powerful ones in some forest sites. In addition, One computer system (including printer and UPS) and software have been delivered to each NO and SO.
2.4. Sub-regional training workshops held and national training delivered in site for carrying out survey work	The NO and SO of 11 countries have been trained as follows: - LEM/GIS training in February 2002 in Niger - Using the MIKE Database in Accra and in Ouagadougou in May and June 2003 (module 3). - MIKE Database Refresher training (module 5) occurred in Niamey in January-February 2004.  A survey team from Sapo (Liberia) has been trained in Ghana in September 2002 but it was not possible to carry out the survey in Sapo National Park because of civil strife. Staff from Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Mali, Benin, Burkina Faso, Niger and Guinea have been trained on survey methodologies prior to the surveys conducted in these countries.
<b>Output 3:</b> Surveys undertaken on a regular and systematic basis from all sites	
3.1. Law enforcement patrols active and delivering monthly reports from 43 sites or more	Law enforcement patrols are active in all 19 sites and delivering monthly reports from all countries but with gaps for all countries. A regular flow of reports from sites and national officers is still a problem. In particular, data quality improvement is still required in some countries.
3.2. Population surveys undertaken in savanna and forest ecosystems and information supplied in survey reports	Population survey undertaken in Kakum 2001, Mole in March 2002, Gourma in April 2002, Taï and Marahoué in July and August 2002 respectively, W Ecosystem including 5 sites (W Benin, W Burkina Faso, W Niger, Pendjari, Keran) plus the Nazinga Ecosystem in April-May 2003 and Zياما from June 2004 to January 2005. All the reports of these surveys are available.
<b>Output 4:</b> Information consistently produced at site, national, sub-regional and continental level	

4.1. Information IT systems procured and positioned at site, national, sub-regional and central levels	Information system has been delivered to all sites (Computers, software). Several problems occurred on computers received by several States. Local IBM dealer has solved the problem. Version 1.02 of the MIKE Database has been dispatched. The improved version 1.05 is available but not dispatched to all the sites yet.
4.2. Site and monthly reports delivered to National Officers	The regular flow of reports from sites to national officers is still a problem.
4.3. Analysis system developed and harmonized	The analysis system is not yet fully developed, but version 1.05 of the MIKE Database has the Access/GIS linkage and some simple analytical queries.
4.4. Annual reports delivered to Sub-regional Support Officers and Director	The regular flow of reports from sites and national officers to the Sub Regional Support Officers and the Director is still a problem.
<b>Output 5:</b> Information made available to CITES CoPs	
5.1. Report delivered by Director to Secretariat and to CoP	Progress reports adopted by the range states were made available to the CITES Secretariat and to CoP 12&13. The CoP 13 report highlighted the extent of the carcass database (over 1000 records); a proven method for doing the baseline analysis; and an indication of the poaching problems being faced in Central Africa in particular

***Describe the success of the project in terms of delivering the intended outputs.***

This project is still in development mode and has achieved the expected outputs in the short term impact areas, but the project momentum is at risk in face of the lack of bridging funds.

***Were any outputs unrealized? If so, how has this affected the overall impact of the project?***

A survey in Sapu National Park of Liberia was planned but not carried out because of the civil strife. This has not affected the overall population baseline requirement, There are plans to conduct a survey in each MIKE site every two to three years when funding permits. Civil conflicts in Cote d'Ivoire, Liberia and Sierra Leone have hampered data flow from the MIKE sites in these countries. However, the delivery of training to the field staff in LEM, GPS and database management from these countries were made as scheduled.

**V. SAFEGUARD POLICY ASSESSMENTS**

***Provide a summary of the implementation of any required action toward the environmental and social safeguard policies within the project.***

Not applicable as the project has environment enhancing objectives. Collaboration with the IUCN SSC African Elephant Specialist Group may see more attention being given to the mitigation of human/elephant conflict

**VI. LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE PROJECT**

***Describe any lessons learned during the various phases of the project. Consider lessons both for future projects, as well as for CEPF's future performance.***

The requirement to visit sites on a reasonably frequent cycle by the SSOs was underestimated. The high degree of field staff turnover and the expectation of financial incentives from wildlife agency staff initially hampered the regular flow of reports. These problems were largely overcome

by holding meetings with the Sub-regional Steering Committees and flagging these issues with the respective Wildlife Directors.

***Project Design Process: (aspects of the project design that contributed to its success/failure)***

The institutional arrangements comprising the Sub-regional Steering Committee, the national Officer and Site officers ensured good engagement at the different staff levels. Getting patrols to fill in forms whilst in the field, particularly patrol movements requires the process to be made as simple and as automatic as possible. Installing computer systems at the site level is beneficial and motivational, but the logistics of maintaining such systems in good working order has been underestimated. Training in computer management is essential

***Project Execution: (aspects of the project execution that contributed to its success/failure)***

The situation of conflicts in West Africa (Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire) did not facilitate the implementation of the program in those countries. The one year extension we received from the donor did contribute in achieving the project outputs. Field visits and training have also contributed much in the resolution of misunderstandings between patrol guards and the Site Officer (The guards had the perception that site officers were receiving extra remuneration for MIKE work), but a greater frequency of site visits would have added greater value. .

**VII. ADDITIONAL FUNDING**

***Provide details of any additional donors who supported this project and any funding secured for the project as a result of the CEPF grant or success of the project.***

<b>Donor</b>	<b>Type of Funding*</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Notes</b>
European Commission	A	\$252,305	Pro-rated regional contribution to the 6 Upper Guinean Forest Sites
Government of USA	B	\$18,222	To advance the NO's and SO's understanding and competence in updating MIKE Databases, use AVG & DLA software and understand how the GIS will be used to link the MIKE Database and view data. (Module 5)
Government of USA	B	\$ 27,632	To Advance Forest Survey methods & Elephant Population estimates

***\*Additional funding should be reported using the following categories:***

- A*** Project co-financing (Other donors contribute to the direct costs of this CEPF project)
- B*** Complementary funding (Other donors contribute to partner organizations that are working on a project linked with this CEPF project)
- C*** Grantee and Partner leveraging (Other donors contribute to your organization or a partner organization as a direct result of successes with this CEPF project.)
- D*** Regional/Portfolio leveraging (Other donors make large investments in a region because of CEPF investment or successes related to this project.)

***Provide details of whether this project will continue in the future and if so, how any additional funding already secured or fundraising plans will help ensure its sustainability.***

After two and half years of implementation, the Project is still very much in a developmental mode. Considering the political and logistical challenges inherent in establishing a standardized system across a huge, poorly developed and multilingual continent, the first phase of development has been remarkable. However, for the project to advance in terms of data collection, management, and analysis, frequent on-the-job training with regular checking, advising and mentoring is essential for both LEM and for field surveys. In this respect, the additional EC funding being secured for the next phase will need to ensure that MIKE Sub-regional Support units will be better resourced to fulfill this need in the next phase.

All surveys due in the project's next phase that have no apparent alternative source of funding will be budgeted for in the next phase of funding. However, it is imperative that steps are taken to get full range State compliance that after a period of external support, MIKE activities must be covered by each country's own financial provisions

## VIII. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This baseline for the project would have been complete if surveys were conducted in Liberia, Sierra Leone and the Park Fazao part of Togo.

## VIII. INFORMATION SHARING

CEPF aims to increase sharing of experiences, lessons learned and results among our grant recipients and the wider conservation and donor communities. One way we do this is by making the text of final project completion reports available on our Web site, [www.cepf.net](http://www.cepf.net), and by marketing these reports in our newsletter and other communications. Please indicate whether you would agree to publicly sharing your final project report with others in this way.

Yes

No

If yes, please also complete the following:

**For more information about this project, please contact:**

Name: Nigel Hunter or Massalatchi M. Sani

Mailing address: P. O. Box 68200, Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: +254 0 20 570522

Fax: +254 0 20 570385

E-mail: [nigelhunter@citesmike.org](mailto:nigelhunter@citesmike.org) or [massalatchisani@citesmike.org](mailto:massalatchisani@citesmike.org)