

ASIAN ELEPHANT RANGE STATES MEETING

FINAL REPORT



**APRIL 18-20, 2017
JAKARTA, INDONESIA**

Hosted by:

Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Government of Indonesia



:

Facilitated by:

IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group



Supported by:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Asian Elephant Conservation Fund

European Union Indonesia Office



Organization and Technical Support by:

Regain Foundation, International Elephant Foundation, Forum Konservasi Gajah Indonesia





Asian Elephant Range States Meeting Delegates



Delegates signing “The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation”

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations	4
Acknowledgments	5
Executive Summary	6
Opening Ceremony	7
The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation.....	9
Country Presentations on Asian Elephant Conservation Status	13
Review of first Asian Elephant Range States Meeting held in Malaysia in 2006	23
Elephant Population Management: challenges of various landscapes and land use patterns.....	26
Human-Elephant Conflict Management	29
Initiative for an Asian Elephant Action Plan	36
Poaching and Illegal Trade of Elephant Ivory and Parts	38
Habitat Conservation	45
Captive Elephant Management.....	49
Elephant Population Management	54
Funding Schemes for Asian Elephant Conservation	61
Annex 1 – Pre-Meeting Survey Questions	62
Annex 2 - Agenda.....	63
Annex 3 – AsERSM Participant List.....	65

Acronyms and Abbreviations

AsESG – Asian Elephant Specialist Group

CITES – Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora

ETIS – Elephant Trade Information System (a CITES programme)

HEC – Human-Elephant Conflict

IUCN – International Union for Conservation of Nature

MER – Managed Elephant Range

MIKE – Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (a CITES programme)

MoU – Memorandum of Understanding

NGO – Non-Governmental Organization

NIAP – National Ivory Action Plan

NTFP - Non Timber Forest Product

PA – Protected Area

SMART – Spatial Monitoring and Regulatory Tool

SSC – Species Survival Commission (of IUCN)

TRAFFIC – The Wildlife Trade Monitoring Network

Acknowledgments

The Organizing Committee of the 2017 Asian Elephant Range States Meeting in Jakarta would like to thank the Government of Indonesia’s Ministry of Environment and Forestry (MoEF) for hosting this important meeting. We also thank all the officials from the Ministry’s Directorate of Natural Resources and Ecosystem Conservation (KSDAE) and Directorate of Biodiversity Conservation (KKH) for their assistance and participation.

We are grateful to all of the delegates from the Asian Elephant Range States for sharing their insights and experience and ensuring the meeting was successful.

We thank the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the European Union Indonesia Office for funding this meeting and making it possible for delegates from all range States to meet and continue working towards the conservation of Asian Elephants. The technical support from Regain Foundation, International Elephant Foundation, and Forum Konservasi Gajah Indonesia is gratefully acknowledged.

We are thankful to the facilitators who assisted in guiding the meeting: the Chair of IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group (AsESG), Mr. Vivek Menon, the past Co-Chairs of IUCN/SSC AsESG, Mr. Ajay Desai and Mr. Simon Hedges, as well as Mr. Widodo Ramono and Mr. Tonny Soehartono on behalf of the MoEF.

The diligent work of the two rapporteurs, Mr. Sandeep Kumar Tiwari, IUCN/SSC AsESG Programme Manager, and Mr. Gaius Wilson, Postdoctoral Research Scholar, is acknowledged and much appreciated.

Executive Summary

With a remaining population of approximately 40,000 individuals, the Asian elephant (*Elephas maximus*) is highly endangered and at risk of local extinction in some range countries. Threats such as habitat loss, fragmentation of elephant populations, the consequences of human-elephant conflict (HEC), and the illegal killing of elephants require significant efforts to find solutions to mitigate these threats and ensure the long-term sustainability of the Asian elephant.

The first Asian Elephant Range States Meeting held in Malaysia in 2006 brought together representatives from all 13 Asian Elephant Range States to conduct a threats assessment, identify limiting factors affecting population abundance in Asian elephants, and make recommendations for the species' conservation (Asian Elephant Range States Meeting, 14-16 January 2006, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, IUCN/SSC). The 2006 workshop identified five overarching factors limiting population abundance for Asian elephants. These were: 1) the lack of adequate status and threats assessment; 2) habitat fragmentation and loss; 3) Human-Elephant Conflict (HEC); 4) illegal killing and trade; and 5) the challenges of managing captive Asian elephants. High priority management actions were also identified for each factor.

In an effort to continue the work to conserve Asian elephants, all Asian Elephant Range States (with the exception of Nepal, which was unable to participate due to national elections) sent two high level delegates to the second Asian Elephant Range States Meeting to improve collaboration and cooperation amongst countries. This meeting, hosted by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Republic of Indonesia, took place in Jakarta, April 18-20, 2017. The meeting was facilitated by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC) Asian Elephant Specialist Group (AsESG), and supported by the Asian Elephant Conservation Fund of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and by the European Union Indonesia Office. Technical support was provided by Regain Foundation, the International Elephant Foundation, and the Forum Konservasi Gajah Indonesia.

The highest priority topics of discussion identified by the range State government delegates for the 2017 meeting included HEC, habitat, and trans-boundary issues. New topics highlighted were trans-boundary populations, growing local elephant populations, and captive elephant breeding programs. During the meeting, the delegates agreed to strengthen international collaborations, improve scientific monitoring to help restore the species' habitat, create transboundary corridors, and halt poaching and illegal trade of ivory.

The primary output of the meeting is "The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation" signed by all delegates at the conclusion of the meeting. This is the first time that all 13 Asian Elephant Range States have declared a common vision to promote Asian elephant conservation range-wide, affirming their intent to cooperate based on the principles of sustainable development, science, education and training, as well as other activities relevant to Asian elephant conservation and development within the range States. The delegates also declared their commitment to develop, where necessary, and implement National Elephant Action Plans.

Through the Jakarta Declaration, range State governments call upon the international community to join them in reversing the decline in Asian elephant population numbers and positioning the Asian elephant securely on the road to recovery. Preserving Asian elephants is a global challenge requiring strong government partnerships and a cohesive regional strategy.

Opening Ceremony

The Asian Elephant Range States Meeting (AsERSM) was held at the Shangri La Hotel in Jakarta, Indonesia, April 18-20, 2017. Delegates from all 13 Asian Elephant Range States were invited and each sent two high-level representatives. At the last minute, the delegates from Nepal had to cancel due to a scheduled national election during which government representatives were not allowed to travel.

Representing the AsERSM Organizing Committee of Regain Foundation, Mr. Wahdi Azmi welcomed the range State government delegates and officials, IUCN members, and other dignitaries to the Asian Elephant Range States Meeting. This meeting was held over a decade after the first Asian Elephant Range States Meeting hosted by Malaysia in 2006. Mr. Azmi emphasized the fact that the meeting would be a good opportunity to evaluate the actions taken since the previous meeting, foster a closer relationship among range States, and develop a joint declaration which would outline how range State governments envision the future of elephants in Asia as well as actions needed to achieve the goals.

The main objective of the AsERSM was to identify the priorities and challenges at a country and range-wide level, and to determine how they might best be addressed. It was also an opportunity to produce a document memorializing the meeting and demonstrating the range State governments' commitment to securing the future of elephants throughout Asia by means of "The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation".

Mr. Vivek Menon, Chair of the IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group (AsESG), gave the keynote address. He stated that today elephants in Asia are distributed across 13 countries with a total estimated population of about 45,826–53,306 elephants. Of these numbers approximately 6% are reliable estimates based on methods that stand up to scientific scrutiny. Almost 80-85% of the population numbers are possible estimates, and about 10-13% are doubtful estimates based on limited elephant signs, or guess estimates based on interviews/conversations with local communities. Only two countries (India and Sri Lanka) have over 5,000 wild elephants. Thailand, Myanmar, and Malaysia may have close to 3,000 wild elephants, Indonesia has over 1,000 wild elephants, and all other countries have less than 1,000 wild elephants. The Vietnam wild elephant population is highly endangered. The major threats to elephant conservation include habitat shrinkage, degradation, and fragmentation, an increasing human population (approx. 70,000 people per elephant across the range), increased Human-Elephant Conflict (HEC), illegal killing and poaching of elephants, disease, inadequate care and management of captive elephants, and at times unscientifically executed management strategies in elephant habitats. Mr. Menon also noted the close cultural and religious association between people and elephants across the range States.

Common constraints for elephant conservation in Asia include a lack of reliable population estimates and distribution, a lack of specific elephant conservation/management policies in most range States, a lack of viable and well-tested solutions especially for mitigating HEC, a lack of trans-boundary cooperation among range States, a lack of political will for elephant conservation with conflicting policies and laws, low capacity to manage/conservate elephants and minimize HEC in some range States, limited monitoring mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of conservation initiatives and techniques, and limited resources to undertake conservation actions.

Mr. Menon noted that the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) is the world's largest and most diverse environmental network, harnessing the knowledge, resources, and outreach of more than 1,300 member organisations and some 16,000 experts. The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) undertakes assessments of the status of species, develops species conservation action plans and strategies, prepares technical guidelines, and formulates IUCN policy statements. The IUCN/SSC

Asian Elephant Specialist Group (AsESG) has 91 members from 19 countries with diverse skill sets that could be of great help to the range State governments in scientific and technical conservation planning. The AsESG is also working towards expanding the membership to include more experts from all range States.

In conclusion, Mr. Menon stated that the following outputs are expected from this meeting:

- Sharing experiences and learning;
- Identifying opportunities for bilateral and multilateral discussions;
- Stating a common vision in “The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation”;
- Prioritizing the needs of range State governments for action;
- Beginning to compile National Elephant Action Plans and a Range-wide Action Plan which could also result in funding opportunities to assist the conservation efforts of the range States; and
- Proposing agenda items for the planned Ministerial level Asian Giants Summit to be held in 2018 in Sri Lanka.

Following this speech was a message from the Honorable Minister of Environment and Forestry, Republic of Indonesia, which was presented by Mr. Bambang Hendroyono, Secretary General of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, and acting Director General of Nature and Ecosystems Conservation, Republic of Indonesia.

On behalf of the Minister Mr. Hendroyono welcomed the delegates from the range State governments and other dignitaries. Mr. Hendroyono stated that the Government of Indonesia was happy to host the second Asian Elephant Range States Meeting in Jakarta to enhance and support elephant conservation within the Asian Region, and expressed confidence that the 50 delegates from the 12 range States would significantly debate and work towards a combined strategy for the conservation of elephants in Asia.

Indonesia has adopted supportive policies and initiatives for the conservation of elephants involving various stakeholders. Habitat loss, human-elephant conflict, and poaching are significantly increasing across Asia. Mr. Hendryono indicated that Indonesia has curtailed the development of new plantations in forested areas to safeguard elephant habitats, and involved local experts and organizations in Indonesia’s efforts towards empowering communities to conserve elephants (captive and wild) through a National Elephant Strategy and Action Plan developed in 2007. This Action Plan is currently being updated.

Mr. Hendroyono stressed that it is important to collaborate and develop partnerships among range State governments to address the various challenges confronting elephant populations in Asia. He expressed hope that the meeting would highlight possible avenues for cooperation between countries and also develop beneficial, cutting-edge resolutions, which will positively impact elephant conservation across Asia.

Mr. Hendroyono thanked the Regain Foundation for its efforts in planning and organizing the meeting, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and European Union Indonesia Office for their funding support, and the IUCN/SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group for their help in facilitating this meeting. He also thanked the Forum Konservasi Gajah Indonesia and International Elephant Foundation for their technical support of the meeting.

The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation

The Asian Elephant Range States Meeting provided an important opportunity to produce by consensus a declaration for Asian elephant conservation supported by all range State governments as signatories. Therefore the meeting received attention from the appropriate level of government representatives; a few countries changed or added participants to include the attendance of higher-level officials at the meeting.

The creation of “The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation” is an important tool to raise awareness amongst range State governments while providing specific, tangible goals that would contribute to the success of the meeting and make the experience more informative and memorable. It is also expected that the Jakarta Declaration will receive attention from the donor community, as the dialogue about Asian elephant conservation is extended to a wider audience after the meeting.

Prior to the meeting a draft Declaration was shared with all delegates. Negotiations were conducted during the meeting between key representatives from range States, and facilitated by the IUCN/SSC AsESG. With minimal debate, the delegates reached a consensus on the wording of the Declaration. As the delegates from Nepal were unable to attend the meeting, during the discussions they were contacted and agreed to the final language of the Declaration.

“The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation” was signed by all delegates at the conclusion of the meeting during a special Signing Ceremony on April 20, 2017. This is the first time that all 13 Asian Elephant Range States have declared a common vision to promote Asian elephant conservation range-wide, affirming their intent to cooperate based on the principles of sustainable development, science, education and training, fund raising, as well as other activities relevant to Asian elephant conservation and development within the range States. The delegates also declared their commitment to develop, where necessary, and implement National Elephant Action Plans. Through the Jakarta Declaration, the range States also call upon the international community to join them in reversing the decline in Asian elephant population numbers and positioning the Asian elephant securely on the road to recovery. Preserving Asian elephants is a global challenge requiring strong government partnerships and a cohesive regional strategy.

THE JAKARTA DECLARATION FOR ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION JAKARTA, INDONESIA April 20, 2017

We, the representatives of the relevant agencies from Asian Elephant Ranges States including the Kingdom of Bhutan, People’s Republic of Bangladesh, Kingdom of Cambodia, People’s Republic of China, Republic of India, Republic of Indonesia, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Federal Democratic Republic of Nepal, Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka, Republic of the Union of Myanmar, Malaysia, Kingdom of Thailand, and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, declare our common goal to conserve the Asian Elephant in all Asian Elephant Range States, and:

Recognize that the Asian Elephant, a seriously endangered species and one of Asia’s most charismatic animals, faces a challenging future with the loss of its habitat, fragmented populations, high levels of

human-elephant conflict, poaching, as well as other factors that have resulted in serious population declines in most of the Range States;

***Note** that compared to the more frequently publicized African Elephant there are ten times fewer Asian Elephants, and like the African Elephant, some Asian Elephant Range States face the loss of their elephant populations;*

***Acknowledge** that the Asian Elephant is a keystone species and an umbrella species whose conservation helps ensure the conservation of myriads of other species. Asian Elephants are also culturally significant across Asia. A failure to protect Asian Elephants and their habitat will therefore not only result in the loss of elephants but also the loss of biological and cultural diversity and the tangible and intangible benefits provided by elephants and the ecosystems they inhabit;*

***Note** that while elephant conservation is primarily a national responsibility, there is an urgent need to synergize national actions with international cooperation amongst the Range States for the long-term conservation of Asian Elephants. The reversal of the crisis facing Asian Elephants is additionally dependent upon political, financial, and technical support from the international community;*

***Understand** the role of international agreements on the conservation of biological diversity and protection of rare and endangered species, including the Asian Elephant, such as the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS);*

***Acknowledge** the presence and support of other governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, and other supporters of Asian Elephant conservation.*

Thus We declare:

- We have a common vision to promote Asian Elephant conservation;*
- Affirm our intention to cooperate based on the principles of sustainable development and through research and development, education and training, fund-raising, as well as other activities that are relevant to Asian Elephant conservation and development within the Range States;*
- Commit to develop where necessary, and implement our National Asian Elephant Action Plans that include, but are not limited to, the priorities listed in the annex to this Declaration.*

***And call upon** the international community to join us in reversing the decline in Asian Elephant numbers and positioning the Asian Elephant securely on the road to recovery.*

Annex: Priorities

- Maintain large Asian Elephant conservation landscapes where no unregulated, economic or commercial infrastructure development or other adverse activities are permitted, and create connectivity between such landscapes where all permitted developmental activities are elephant- and biodiversity-appropriate;*
- Work collaboratively on transboundary issues to allow uninhibited movement of wild Asian Elephants in and between Range States through appropriate corridors and transboundary protected areas;*

- *Minimize the negative impacts of humans on Asian Elephants and their habitats, address the root causes of human-elephant conflict and develop long term solutions to minimize such conflict; engage with local communities to gain their participation in biodiversity conservation and land-use planning; and provide sustainable and alternative livelihoods through financial support, technical guidance, and other measures;*
- *Ensure effective enforcement of existing national laws and regulations across the species' range to prevent illegal killing of Asian Elephants and the illegal trade in live Asian Elephants, ivory, and other elephant body parts.*
- *Strengthen international collaboration, coordination, and communication where relevant, involving specialized expertise from international organizations, including but not limited to, CITES, INTERPOL, and UNODC;*
- *Cooperatively develop captive Asian Elephant registration programs, including where appropriate microchipping and/or DNA-based systems, and ensure cross-border movements of captive Asian Elephants are in compliance with all national and international laws and regulations;*
- *Ensure the welfare of captive elephants is maintained at all times;*
- *Develop where necessary National Asian Elephant Action Plans and a Range-wide Asian Elephant Conservation Plan and ensure their timely implementation.*

***DONE** in Jakarta, Indonesia on the Twenty Day of April in the Year Two Thousand and Seventeen, in a single original copy in the English language.*

<i>For The Delegation of The People's Republic of Bangladesh</i> <i>(Md. Ali Kabir)</i> <i>Cox's Bazar South Forest Division</i>	<i>For The Delegation of The Kingdom of Bhutan</i> <i>(Dorji Rabten)</i> <i>Department of Forest and Park Services</i>
<i>For The Delegation of The Kingdom of Cambodia</i> <i>(Meas Sophal)</i> <i>Directorate of Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection</i>	<i>For The Delegation of The People's Republic of China</i> <i>(Jin Kun)</i> <i>Ministry of State Forestry Administration</i>
<i>For The Delegation of The Republic of India</i> <i>(R.K. Srivastava)</i> <i>Inspectorate General of Forests</i>	<i>For The Delegation of The Republic of Indonesia</i> <i>(Bambang Dahono Adji)</i> <i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry</i>

<i>For The Delegation of The Lao People's Democratic Republic</i> <i>(Sangvane Bouavong)</i> <i>Ministry of Environment and Forestry</i>	<i>For The Delegation of Malaysia</i> <i>(Abdul Kadir bin Abu Hashim)</i> <i>Department of Wildlife and National Parks</i>
<i>For The Delegation of Republic of The Union of Myanmar</i> <i>(Maung Maung Naing)</i> <i>Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation</i>	<i>For The Delegation of The Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka</i> <i>(W.S.K.Pathirathne)</i> <i>Department of Wildlife Conservation</i>
<i>For The Delegation of The Kingdom of Thailand</i> <i>(Supagit Vinitpornsawan)</i> <i>Wildlife Conservation Office</i>	<i>For The Delegation of The Socialist Republic of Vietnam</i> <i>(Nguyen Vu Linh)</i> <i>Department of Nature Conservation</i>

Country Presentations on Asian Elephant Conservation Status - Presented by Range States

Range States were asked to give a short presentation about the status of elephants in their country. They were requested to provide the following information:

- Status of wild elephants (numbers over the past five (5) years and how the number was determined);
- Status of captive elephants (numbers over the past five (5) years and how the number was determined);
- Main elephant conservation issues within their country;
- Main threats and elephant mortality causes within their country;
- Country specific protocols, guidelines, or National Elephant Action Plan; and
- Elephant conservation challenges or initiatives within their country.

Bangladesh

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 268 resident (range is 210-330) individuals (IUCN 2017 estimate). The country also estimates it has 93 nonresident elephants.

Captive elephant population: there are 96 captive elephants, primarily (82 individuals) privately owned.

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Preparing ex-gratia schemes for victims of elephant conflict
- Forming elephant response teams
- Attaining 10% of forest under PA network
- Bilateral agreement with India to work on trans-boundary issues. A major path has been identified for migration between India and Bangladesh via the state of Meghalaya. Elephant movements to India also occur through the states of West Bengal and Assam

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Habitat fragmentation and loss
- Increased human-elephant conflict
- Food scarcity and direct loss of elephants
- About 15-25 people and 3-5 elephants are killed every year due to conflict

Protocols, Guidelines or Action Plan in place: A Bangladesh Elephant Conservation Action Plan is in preparation.

Conservation challenges:

- Limited research and knowledge base
- Institutional weakness
- Policy conflict, lack of collaboration and support of conservation to undertake work

Conservation Initiatives:

- Protected Area declaration
- Wildlife (Protection and Security) Act
- Establishment of Wildlife Centre and Wildlife Crime Control Unit
- Compensation Support for Elephant Victims

- Research, Monitoring and Knowledge Base: Status Survey, Corridor Mapping and Route Mapping Completed
- First Bilateral Meeting with India held in 2015; a draft Protocol is waiting for approval

Bhutan

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated to be about 513 elephants with a density of 0.641 elephants/km² spread over 800 km² (dung transect survey, 2010). A nation-wide survey was conducted in 2016 using the genetic capture-recapture method and photography (camera traps) and the data are being analyzed.

Captive elephant population: there are 9 captive elephants, all used for forestry work.

Main elephant conservation issues:

Wild population

- Human-elephant conflict
- Habitat degradation and fragmentation
- Occasional poaching for ivory

Captive elephants

- No wildlife vet for captive elephants
- Mahouts have no formal training in elephant care

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

Wild population

- Human-wildlife conflict and crude methods to prevent it, i.e. illegal electric fences
- Falling off steep cliffs (5 elephant deaths in last five years)
- Habitat degradation

Captive elephants

- Lack of wildlife veterinarians and veterinary care program

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: Bhutan does not have an Elephant Action Plan.

Conservation initiatives:

- Completed first DNA-based capture-recapture population study in 2016
- Have radio-collared 5 elephants to look at migration pattern and identify corridors.
- Working on habitat improvement and plantations, creation of water holes, artificial enrichment via natural salt licks (undertaken through project funding), and HEC mitigation.
- An important effort of HEC mitigation is providing crop insurance. Plans are to expand this to larger elephant areas

Cambodia

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 400-600 individuals (via DNA-based surveys, camera trap based surveys, and interviews).

Captive elephant population: there are 70 captive elephants however there are no breeding facilities. In Cambodia it is illegal to capture wild elephants for any purpose. There is no formal government registration system for captive elephants, and no monitoring of transfer of ownership.

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Small fragmented populations (due to habitat loss and historical hunting)
- Hunting of remaining populations
- Continued fragmentation across existing elephant pathways (infrastructure/development, encroachment/change of land use)
- Increased human-elephant conflict (involving both wild and captive elephants)
- Population decline of transboundary populations

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

Wild population

- Illegal killing for trade (ivory) and medicinal purposes
- Human-elephant conflict

Captive elephants

- Low capacity for managing captive elephants
- No regulations
- Concern about disease transmission

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: a Draft National Elephant Action Plan has been prepared but is pending approval. CITES MIKE Dung Survey Standards are used for monitoring wild elephant populations in country.

Conservation challenges:

- No robust estimates of population
- Improvement needed on internal and transboundary mechanism to crack down on illegal trade
- Limited presence of wildlife trade monitoring organizations (TRAFFIC)
- Few resources (rangers, equipment, capacity)
- Increased hunting, habitat fragmentation, land conversion, and habitat loss.
- Few facilities and low capacity for wildlife rescues, veterinary care, and disease investigations
- Working towards expanding PAs and strengthening corridors

China

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 300 individuals spread over 37,849 km² of land territory.

Captive elephant population: there are 243 captive elephants in China.

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Established 3 National Nature Reserves and 8 Local Nature Reserves to conserve elephants
- Since 2007 has a compensation program as relief for victims of HEC
- Built an Asian Elephant Breeding Center in 2006, and is working towards international cooperation and communication with management staff from the Lao PDR and Myanmar
- Curbing poaching, prohibiting illegal ivory trade, and enhancing public conservation awareness

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Current habitat size not able to meet elephant population expansion needs - about 300 Asian elephants live in a 4,253 km² area
- The tensions between protection and local economic development has become increasingly acute
- High density of settlements and human population, large areas of rubber plantations and cultivated land, infrastructure construction such as railway, roads, reservoirs

- The local protection and management capacity is still low and weak, understaffed, low quality of rangers and poor equipment

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: in a landmark action China issued a notification titled “Stopping Activities of Commercial Processing and Sales of Ivory and Related Products” at the end of 2016. According to the notice, designated ivory processing units will be closed, while a range of specific ivory processing and sales activities in designated trading locations are banned by 31st March 2017. A comprehensive ban will be in place on 31st December, 2017.

Conservation initiatives:

- Established 9 nature reserves and ecological corridors linking key habitats, expanding the area of suitable habitat to 9,000 km² to allow the wild population to grow by up to 390 individuals
- Built elephant prevention trenches and isolation belts, developed eco-friendly mode of production and community co-management for HEC mitigation
- Working towards increasing capacity
- Preventing poaching of elephants and illegal ivory trade
- Enhancing the establishment of a national wildlife protection foundation

India

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population numbers about 29,391-30,711 individuals. This represents almost 60% of the entire Asian elephant population, and the Indian population shows an increasing population trend.

India has 29 Elephant Reserves spread over 10 elephant landscapes in 14 States covering 65,814 km². It has also identified 88 elephant corridors in 2005, and that number has increased to about 101 corridors currently. A synchronized nationwide survey to estimate elephant numbers and distribution is in process.

Captive elephant population: there are 3,467-3,667 captive elephants; most of them were micro-chipped beginning in 2002. Commercial trade in captive elephants is prohibited by law. Transportation of elephants from one state to another requires a transportation permit to be issued. Captive Elephant Welfare Committees have been formed by various States.

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Elephant Reserves and Elephant Corridors do not currently have legal protection
- HEC is one of the most serious conservation challenges faced by the country
- Elephant population in the country is on the rise and elephants are moving out to new areas
- A significant number of private elephants are still without ownership certificates and/or microchips
- As per a recent estimate, the number of elephant corridors in the country is 101

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Degradation and fragmentation of elephant habitats
- Retaliatory killing of elephants, by villagers and farmers, through poisoning and electrocution is on the increase
- Live trade of elephants is still reported in spite of a prohibition on commercial trade of live elephants
- Recent cases of elephant poaching and ivory trade
- Elephant mortality due to train collisions and electrocution

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: the report of the Elephant Task Force (2010) titled 'Gajah' gives detailed recommendations on matters relating to the conservation of elephants in India. Elaborate guidelines exist for the management of captive elephants. Guidelines on human-elephant conflict are in process. Elephant Reserves are the basic management units for the conservation of elephants in India and have scientifically prepared Management Plans.

Conservation initiatives:

- Immuno-contraception of elephants is being considered to limit population growth
- National Ivory Inventory Protocol in development
- Collection and compilation of data under CITES/MIKE stopped in 2006 but has been revived and data was collected for 2014 and 2015
- Indo-Bangladesh dialogue on Trans-boundary Conservation of Elephants has been strengthened

Indonesia

Wild elephant population: the Sumatran elephant is Critically Endangered (IUCN Red List 2012) with an estimated 1,724 individuals, and a population declining by 28% (from 2400-2800) since 2007. There are also approximately 60-80 elephants in Kalimantan (island of Borneo), mainly as a transboundary population with Sabah.

Captive elephant population: there are 467 captive elephants in Indonesia.

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Habitat loss and habitat degradation
- Habitat fragmentation
- Human-elephant conflict
- Land use change and lack of spatial planning
- Developmental activities such as roads, railway lines, dams, housing, and agriculture
- Poaching for ivory

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Habitat loss and degradation
- Fragmentation of habitat leading to loss of genetic diversity in small populations
- Poaching and illegal killing of elephants (poisoning)
- For captive elephants, diseases such as EEHV are a problem

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: Indonesia developed the Indonesia Strategy and Action Plan for the Conservation of Sumatra and Kalimantan Elephants (2007-2017) which is currently being updated.

Conservation initiatives:

- SMART patrols initiated in protected areas; Indonesia also formed Wildlife Crime Units and they are undertaking joint patrolling
- Undertaken measures for conflict mitigation
- Undertaken habitat and population management
- Collaboration with local stakeholders
- Improved legal monitoring and verification system (land use for mining, plantation, etc.)
- Developing wildlife sanctuaries and PAs to improve protection
- Implementing education campaigns and social awareness

Lao PDR

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 600-800 individuals.

Captive elephant population: there are 454 captive elephants (2012 survey).

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Forest encroachment of elephant habitat, poaching and hunting by local villagers
- Illegal wildlife trade
- Widespread hunting throughout the PAs
- Agricultural encroachment, shifting cultivation, and NTFP collection
- Increased human-elephant conflict

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Habitat loss and fragmentation
- Poaching
- Human-elephant conflict

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: a draft National Elephant Action Plan has been prepared. A National Ivory Action Plan was prepared in 2015. CITES/MIKE Guidelines are used for monitoring the elephant population.

Conservation challenges:

- Insufficient funding and limited staff
- Lao PDR is a transit point for many wildlife specimens originally obtained from neighboring countries, this makes cross-border wildlife trade control very difficult
- Increase in wildlife crime with low capacity for wildlife law enforcement

Malaysia

Peninsular Malaysia

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 1,223 - 1,677 individuals (based on biodiversity inventories and dung count surveys).

Captive elephant population: there are 92 captive elephants (29 males and 63 females).

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Dearth of funding to sustain the elephant population. At least RM7 million/year is needed to operate elephant management programs
- Lack of people's tolerance towards elephant conservation
- Challenges to manage elephant habitat in MERs

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Habitat loss and fragmentation mainly due to land conversion for development projects (e.g. electric-hydro dams and road system) and for agriculture e.g. oil palm and rubber plantations
- Retaliatory killing of elephants due to human-elephant conflict

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: a National Elephant Conservation Action Plan (2013) has been developed.

Conservation challenges/initiatives:

Challenges:

- Human-elephant conflict
- Enforcement issues (illegal killing of elephants and ivory smuggling)
- Habitat connectivity

Initiatives:

- Restoring connectivity between main forest complexes in Peninsular Malaysia by implementing the *Central Forest Spine (CFS): Master Plan for Ecological Linkages*
- Sistem Pagar Elektrik Gajah (SPEG) Initiative (Electric Elephant Fences Initiative). From 2008 to 2015, a total of 20 SPEG projects were completed covering a total length of 282 km for villages adjacent to main elephant habitat with a cost of RM13.6 million
- Develop and implement the 2013 National Elephant Conservation Action Plan (NECAP) for a more comprehensive and holistic approach on elephant conservation efforts in Peninsular Malaysia
- Strengthen science-based management approach by working with the Management and Ecology of Malaysian Elephants (MEME) Project. This collaborative research project between the Department of Wildlife and National Parks Peninsular Malaysia (DWNP) and University of Nottingham Malaysia Campus (UNMC) was developed in 2013 to assess the effectiveness of the current elephant management strategies and produce a scientifically sound elephant conservation strategy based on the understanding of elephant ecology and behavior, as well as the human dimensions of HEC

Malaysia Sabah

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 2,040 individuals (2010 survey).

Captive elephant population: there are 23 captive elephants, most of these were calves abandoned by herds.

Main elephant conservation issues:

Wild population

- Habitat loss and fragmentation
- Low genetic diversity
- Poaching, illegal killing, and snare trapping
- Poor public awareness
- Increased human-elephant conflict

Captive elephants

- Not enough qualified handlers
- Dearth of funding for food costs
- Breeding in limited space
- Management of bulls in musth
- Emerging diseases and cost of medications

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: the Sabah Elephant Conservation Action Plan (2012-2016) has been developed to undertake conservation initiatives in the region; it is now being updated.

Myanmar

Wild elephant population: it is estimated there are about 2,000 wild elephants.

Captive elephant population: there are about 5,000 captive elephants of which over 3,000 are owned by the Government and over 2,000 are privately held. Out of these numbers a total of 4,382 are registered with the Forest Department.

Main elephant conservation issues:

Wild population

- Increasing poaching for skin, tusks, meat
- Human-elephant conflict
- Habitat protection and restoration

Captive elephants

- Management of the large captive elephant population
- Disease surveillance and screening
- High cost of supporting the elephants with limited staff
- Areas for pasture and movement of these elephants
- Illegal trade
- Lack of Government interest or Policy.

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Poaching for skin, tusks, meat and illegal trade
- Habitat loss and encroachment of elephant habitats
- Lack of a national plan for elephant conservation and protection with no planning for the habitats required for protecting the species
- Limited linkages between Government and NGOs
- Inadequate law enforcement leading to an increase in illegal killing and trade
- Lack of wildlife veterinarian protocols

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: A Myanmar Elephant Conservation Action Plan is nearing completion and will be finalized in early 2018.

Conservation initiatives:

- Eight units of Emergency Elephant Response Units formed and equipped
- Herding wild elephants away from human settlements/translocating wild elephants
- Vaccination and health care program for captive elephants
- Establishment of an elephant hospital
- Mahout training and education is ongoing

Sri Lanka

Wild elephant population: there are about 5,879 wild elephants (based on 2011 survey) and the number appears to be increasing. These elephants are mainly confined to dry zones. The next elephant survey is planned for later this year (2017).

The average mortality of elephants is 235 per year, mostly due to conflict with humans. There is no information available on the recruitment rate.

Captive elephant population: there are 230 captive elephants largely under private ownership; the numbers are in decline.

Main elephant conservation issues:

Wild population

- Habitat Loss and fragmentation
- Loss of migratory routes and shrinking home ranges

- Increased human-elephant conflict and accidents (train)

Captive elephants

- No breeding program
- Lack of proper care, and cruelty to elephants
- High cost of maintenance

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Gunshot injuries.
- Explosive devices called “Hakapatas”.
- Poisoning
- Road accidents (including railway accidents)
- Falling into wells
- Electrocution

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: The National Policy for Wild Elephant Conservation and Management provides guidance to:

1. Ensure the long-term survival of elephants in the wild in Sri Lanka
2. Mitigate human-elephant conflict
3. Derive socio-economic benefits from conserving elephants
4. Defray the costs imposed by human-elephant conflict on communities affected by it
5. Adopt regulatory mechanisms for the removal of elephants from the wild for management reasons
6. Promote scientific research as the basis for elephant conservation and management in the wild

Conservation initiatives:

- Trial of “Elephant Holding Ground” to overcome translocation problems
- Trial of Human-Elephant Coexistence programs
- Program to minimize wild elephant deaths due to railway accidents
- Revised Compensation Scheme (US\$ 3,290 per human death)
- Elephant Transit Home

Thailand

Wild elephant population: the wild elephant population is estimated at 3,100-3,600 individuals distributed in 69 Protected Areas.

Captive elephant population: there are 3,783 captive elephants with almost 95% of them privately owned.

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Political action
- Scientific research and monitoring
- Habitat protection
- Anti-poaching patrols
- Managing conflicts

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Increased HEC
- Poaching of wild elephants
- Illegal trade of ivory and live elephants

- Small populations and fragmented habitats

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: the National Master Plan for Elephant Conservation is being revised and updated to the National Master Plan for the Conservation of Elephants 2018-2037. The goal of the master plan is to ensure the conservation and sustainable management of elephants (both wild and captive) and their habitats. Thailand also has a specific “Elephant Action Plan” for some forest complexes (landscapes).

Conservation challenges:

- Reduce the illegal killing of elephants and illegal trade in elephant products
- Ensure connectivity between elephant populations
- Improve knowledge of elephant populations and their habitat
- Change the negative perceptions of elephant conservation by the wider public

Vietnam

Wild elephant population: in 2016 it was estimated that there were 104-132 wild elephants distributed in 8 provinces.

Captive elephant population: there are 88 captive elephants (24 males and 64 females).

Main elephant conservation issues:

- Trans-boundary cooperation in elephant conservation and law enforcement for illegal trade
- Mechanisms for exchange of captive elephants among countries/regions to enhance breeding

Main threats and elephant mortality causes:

- Habitat loss/disturbance due to economic development activities
- Climate change causing shortage of food and water for wild elephants
- Habitat isolation or illegal hunting increasing risks of elephant inbreeding
- Captive elephants are not managed well; there is no breeding and numbers are decreasing

Protocols, Guidelines, or Action Plan in place: an Elephant Conservation Action Plan was initiated in 2012.

Conservation challenges:

The wild elephant population decline is a major concern. There is also concern at the lack of captive elephant breeding programs.

Conservation Initiatives:

- Proposal of Elephant Conservation Plan 2013-2020 approved by the Prime Minister
- From 2015 to present the government has invested > US\$500,000 for elephant conservation
- An Elephant Conservation Center established in Dak Lak provides awareness activities and training in conflict prevention, elephant database, and monitoring activities. In Dak Lak there are 43 captive elephants and 5 wild elephant groups

Review of first Asian Elephant Range States Meeting held in Malaysia in 2006

Session facilitated by Mr. Ajay Desai, IUCN/SSC AsESG

As the majority of delegates attending the 2017 Asian Elephant Range States Meeting (Jakarta Meeting) had not attended the Asian Elephant Range States Meeting held in 2006 in Malaysia (2006 Meeting), information was sent to the delegates prior to the meeting in Jakarta to provide background and context for the Jakarta Meeting. Additionally, a short survey (*Annex 1*) was sent to each range State to identify a) the three main issues range States would like to see discussed, b) the main improvements to elephant conservation in their country since the 2006 Meeting, and c) the biggest challenges to elephant conservation in their country.

Mr. Ajay Desai was an IUCN/SSC AsESG facilitator during the 2006 Meeting. He provided a brief review of the issues and actions identified by range State delegates during the 2006 Meeting, and reported on responses to the Jakarta pre-meeting survey.

Issues identified by Range States for discussion (pre-meeting survey)

Mr. Desai noted that some of the issues identified in the 2006 Meeting are still relevant for discussion; these include habitat loss, illegal trade and poaching, HEC, and small populations.

New issues highlighted as a result of the Jakarta pre-meeting survey include: trans-boundary populations, growing elephant populations, captive breeding, legislation, small isolated populations, diseases, and calf mortality. For the Jakarta Meeting, respondents identified the following key issues as most important topics for discussion:

- Human elephant conflict (32% of respondents)
- Habitat (25%)
- Trans-boundary issue (17%)
- Protection (13%)
- Legislation (5%)
- Population (5%)
- Captive breeding (3%)

Actions proposed by Range States during the 2006 Meeting

A number of actions were proposed by the range State delegates during the 2006 Meeting. These actions included the following:

- Population:
 - Use standard methods to monitor distribution and status of elephants
 - Coordinate trans-boundary population monitoring
- Habitat:
 - Need to develop integrated land use planning and cross-sectoral linkages for securing habitat
 - Use behavioral ecology data for conservation planning
 - Use the Managed Elephant Range (MER) concept to secure adequate habitat for elephants
 - Increase conservation areas for elephants
- HEC:
 - Develop a holistic HEC mitigation policy

- Address the drivers of HEC using integrated land use planning
- Develop standardized HEC mitigation tools and test them
- Information sharing and awareness at all levels – local, national, and international
- Poaching:
 - Policy and legislation gaps to regulate domestic ivory registration and markets
 - Registration of captive elephants
 - Enhance law enforcement capacities
- Captive elephants:
 - Need to adapt a long term approach
 - Standardized registration of captive elephants
 - Policy and strategy to manage captive populations
 - Establish good management and husbandry practices
- Action Plan:
 - Peer review compilation of state-of-knowledge reports on species status and distribution
 - Threat/problem analysis and strategic plan development with broader representation of stakeholders and implementers
 - Development of action plans at relevant levels to ensure implementation
 - Increase funding for elephant conservation
 - Initiate research on ecology, behavior, population, carrying capacity, etc.

Actions taken by Range States since the 2006 Meeting (pre-meeting survey)

The pre-meeting surveys identified where range State governments have taken action since 2006:

- Action plan and legislation (21% of respondents)
- Habitat and conservation (21%)
- Human-elephant conflict (10%)
- Population survey (10%)
- Captive elephants (14%)
- Research (9%)
- Awareness (7%)
- Anti-poaching (5%)
- Funding (3%)

Key challenges identified by Range States for the Jakarta Meeting (pre-meeting survey)

To date, many of the 2006 challenges to elephant conservation in Asia remain. Respondents to the pre-meeting surveys indicated that in 2017 the main challenges are:

- Habitat (36% of respondents)
- Human-elephant conflict (27%)
- Poaching (18%)
- Funding and staff (9%)
- Captive breeding (2%)
- Mortality caused by collisions with trains (2%)
- Translocation (2%)
- Disease (2%)
- Unknown causes of deaths of young elephants (2%)

Meeting plan

Mr. Desai then explained that the goal of the Jakarta Meeting will be to encourage range State delegates to share and discuss their experiences and challenges for elephant conservation in Asia, and to find ways for collaborative processes to occur.

A short introduction to each technical session was given so that delegates had clarity on the topic. Information presented included: a) background information on the topic, b) threats or issues identified by range State delegates at the 2006 Meeting, c) the key issues identified for the Jakarta Meeting (in the pre-meeting survey).

The approach to each technical session included:

1. *Threat identification/conservation issues*
 - List past threats and issues identified
 - Review and add/delete new threats/issues
 - Prioritize
 - Discuss and agree on list and priorities
2. *Problem analysis/challenges to address threats/issues*
 - List challenges (for each threat/issue listed)
 - Prioritize challenges
 - Discuss and agree on list and priorities
3. *Solutions (possible)*
 - List possible solutions to each challenge
 - Discuss and identify solutions most likely to work or most suitable to a specific situation
 - Identify gaps, information needs and further work on identifying solutions if needed
4. *Propose next steps or concrete action on issues and solutions*
 - This can be in the global, regional, bilateral, or national context (or situation specific context)

The discussions were among range State delegates only. Technical support and inputs were provided by the IUCN/SSC AsESG and MoEF facilitators.

Documentation of the deliberations was done by two rapporteurs (Mr. Sandeep Kumar Tiwari and Mr. Gaius Wilson), and the day's notes were drafted into minutes of the meeting with help from a host nation representative and an IUCN/AsESG member. A sub-committee of delegates (one representative from South Asia, one from Southeast Asia, and one from the host nation) reviewed the minutes for the day and approved them on behalf of the range States. Delegates voted to have Mr. P.G.D.J. Pebotuwa from Sri Lanka, Mr. Salman Bin Sabaan from Malaysia (Peninsular), and Mr. Puja Utama from Indonesia to serve as the sub-committee representing all delegates in their review of each day's notes.

Final approved minutes were compiled into a report. A draft compilation was sent to all range States delegates for their comments and verification. Inputs from the delegates were incorporated and a final report of the 2017 Asian Elephant Range States Meeting was prepared.

INTERACTIVE SESSION I

Elephant Population Management: challenges of various landscapes and land use patterns - Session facilitated by Mr. Tonny Soehartono, MoEF

The delegates were asked by Mr. Tonny Soehartono to provide a quick overview of the type of elephant landscape present in their country, identify key potential and current threats as well as current efforts being taken to address these threats, and future challenges and management options available.

The exercise given to the delegates by Mr. Soehartono was to identify 2-3 keywords on:

- Key issues of elephant population/habitat
- Threats and challenges
- Current effort
- Management options

Bangladesh

- Elephants are found mainly in hilly areas.
- Need a better understanding of elephant home ranges.

Bhutan

- Elephants mainly use lowland areas, all or most are in protected areas.
- Current efforts: using electric fencing, developing green infrastructure for elephant management. Biological corridor management plan includes developing wildlife Sanctuaries and National Parks, Strict Nature Reserve and Biological corridor where 51.44 % of the country has been declared under Protected Area networks. From the total PA network Bhutan has declared 8.61% of the country as biological corridors as a gift to the earth and people of Bhutan.

Cambodia

- There are 7 million ha of forest in Cambodia; elephants are mostly in lowland areas.
- Threats include forest conversion to agriculture.
- Efforts include developing better HEC compensation schemes.

China

- The elephant landscape in China is mainly lowland forest.
- Challenges are road and infrastructure development for human use.
- Efforts include maintaining protection of the habitat (forest). Currently a total of 400,000 ha is protected. It is important to maintain good habitat in the transboundary area between China and Myanmar.

India

- Although the main elephant populations are in the south and northeast of the country, elephants are increasingly found in east central landscapes which are dry land and have dense populations.
- Problems are landscapes fragmented by plantation, mining, national highways and railways.

- The trans-boundary migration of elephants is a regular occurrence between India and Bangladesh, Bhutan, and Nepal.
- Solutions include translocating elephants into new habitats with low population, and developing transboundary elephant management plans. A high level of protection is needed but elephants are often outside legally protected areas so corridors between these areas are needed.

Indonesia

- Elephants are found in lowland and highland areas of Sumatra and some in Kalimantan.
- Problems are mainly land conversion to plantations (rubber, oil palm, acacia), and development for human use.
- Solutions include an ongoing struggle to protect habitat. Habitat management plans need to be developed in a variety of landscapes including in concessions, and HEC mitigation tools need to be established.

Lao PDR

- Elephants are found in protected areas and production forest.
- Problem is fragmented habitat.
- Solutions need to consider more national protected areas and corridors.

Malaysia (Peninsular)

- Elephants are found in lowland and highland areas.
- Problem is mainly HEC due to people who do not have the resources for proper HEC mitigation tools and a lack tolerance to the existence of elephants in their area.
- Solutions include installing more electric fences, restoring corridors or connectivity of elephant habitat including across highways (green infrastructure). In the future a federal strategy seeks to enable population connectivity through the Managed Elephant Range (MER) concept, possibly develop elephant sanctuaries and relocate problematic elephants to more suitable habitat.

Malaysia (Sabah)

- Elephants are found in rain forest, lowland, and highland areas.
- Problems are habitat conversion in particular to oil palm plantations, increasing HEC, and poaching.
- Solutions should include human-elephant coexistence, and communication with the concession owners or small holders to reduce conflict with elephants.

Myanmar

- Problem is that poaching is increasing. Also the number of elephants in captivity is increasing.
- Solutions include habitat protection, and the government has a plan to develop an elephant release/reintroduction program.

Sri Lanka

- Elephants are found mainly in lowland dry areas.
- Problem for wild elephants is habitat conversion. Mortality is about 200 elephants/year mainly due to HEC.

- Solution is to develop more protected areas. Habitat enrichment is a challenge. Currently there are 25 National Parks and 16 Sanctuaries.

Vietnam

- Elephants are found in lowland and highland areas.
- Problems are that habitat is patchy due to human settlements as well as large scale agriculture (i.e. acacia plantations or concessions). Transboundary issues with neighboring countries.

Summary:

The key issues of elephant population management identified by the delegates during the exercise were the following (in order of priority):

- Habitat shrinkage and encroachment
- Fragmentation
- Human-elephant conflict
- Loss of corridors
- Lack of communications among stakeholders
- Increasing human population
- Poaching

Priority suggested by The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

Maintain large Asian Elephant conservation landscapes where no unregulated, economic or commercial infrastructure development or other adverse activities are permitted, and create connectivity between such landscapes where all permitted developmental activities are elephant- and biodiversity-appropriate.

INTERACTIVE SESSION II

Human-Elephant Conflict Management - Session facilitated by Mr. Ajay Desai, IUCN/SSC AsESG

Mr. Ajay Desai gave a brief presentation about HEC management outlining the main points:

- HEC is a major concern across all 13 Asian elephant range States;
- Why elephants raid crops;
- Factors that increase conflicts;
- Causes for lack of success in mitigating the problem; and
- Drivers of conflict, challenges, and possible solutions.

Main challenges

Range State delegates were then asked by Mr. Desai to identify the challenges in addressing HEC. The responses are summarized in the table below.

Major issues in HEC management	Specific challenges identified by Range States
Land use planning	Development is a higher priority than conservation
	Difficult to effect changes in land use policy
	Mainstreaming elephant conservation into cross-sectoral land use planning, while the desirable remains more of an aspiration than an actual goal
	Lack of systems to effect cross-sectoral linkages
	Lack of political will
	Insufficient funds
	Insufficient information/data
Law enforcement issues related to HEC	Unwillingness of law enforcement agencies to investigate deaths of elephants due to HEC
Habitat improvement to reduce HEC	Data on the need for habitat improvement is often lacking
	Implementation is typically difficult due to the scale required
	Inadequate staff resources to implement habitat management schemes
	Inconsistent policies
	Laws do not allow habitat improvement in PAs
	Insufficient funds
	Weak advocacy
Corridors to reduce HEC	Cross sectoral challenges
	Difficult to get Government support
	Illegal settlements in corridors
	Insufficient forest cover in corridor area
	Lack of awareness

	Lack of legislation
	Lack of political will
	Insufficient funds
	Poor development planning
	Lack of political will
Locally overabundant elephant populations	Testing feasibility of immuno-contraception
Guarding of crops	Lack of capacity and/or training
	Lack of appropriate tools
	Unwillingness of communities to guard crops
	Use of arms during guarding results in elephant injuries and deaths
Use of elephant deterrents	Often ineffective or only work under specific conditions
	Lack of capacity and training in the use of deterrents
	Unwillingness of communities to use deterrents
Barriers to keep elephants away from crops	Elephants learn to overcome barriers
	Scale issues: areas needing protection often too large
	Lack of community support
	Insufficient funds
	Poor maintenance
	Lack of clarity about who is responsible for maintenance
	Sustainability of barriers, aggravated by lack of community support and maintenance
Translocation of elephants	Assuring HEC problem is not simply translocated to another place
	Translocated elephants may have problems with elephants in the release areas
	Translocated elephants often return to their original home ranges
	Lack of funds
	Lack of capacity and other human resources
	Legislation may preclude use of translocation
	Risk of death or injury to elephants
	Shortage of good forest or other elephant habitat suitable for releasing the elephants
Planting of alternative crops (e.g. planting crops unpalatable to elephants)	Socio-cultural acceptability of alternative crops may be a problem
	Lack of capacity
	Insufficient funds
Resettlement of people out of HEC areas	Lack of political will
	Suitable alternative land may be unavailable

	No funds
	People not willing to move
	Population density of other place is also high
Compensation for crop damage	Lack of guidelines
	Lack of appropriate legislation
	Difficulty of obtaining reliable assessment of damage caused by elephants creates problems
	Administrative delays
	Illegal settlers not given compensation because doing so would encourage encroachment, but then the settlers are resentful
	Inadequate compensation relative to damage done
	Inadequate funds
Reducing elephant intrusions into human use areas	Encroachments complicate identification of human use areas
	Scattered houses and fields also complicate identification of human use areas
	Elephant habitat often too fragmented
	Too many elephants and/or human resources are not sufficient to prevent intrusion
	Lack of manpower
	No data on elephant movement patterns
	Insufficient funds
	Elephant areas may be poor habitat (lack of fodder and water) so elephants cannot be sustained in them
Reducing human intrusions into elephant habitat	Local politicians grant community rights in elephant habitat
	Politically encouraged encroachment
	Finding alternative livelihoods for local people who are excluded from elephant habitat
	Other livelihood issues including scarcity of land for human purposes
	Lack of legislation (clearer laws and decrees are needed)
Awareness building	Government agencies do not cooperate
	Lack of capacity
	Insufficient funds
Peoples' perceptions	People shouldn't have to compete for land with elephants
	Governments should take responsibility for HEC and not expect local communities to deal with it

Following the identification of the main issues facing the range State governments related to HEC, the delegates, led by Mr. Desai, discussed the issues in greater detail under the same headings as those in the table above.

Land-use planning

Mr. Desai discussed the fact that while all countries have laws that support elephant conservation there is a need to better integrate all sectors when planning land use. The range State delegates provided the following additional comments:

Bangladesh: has district level committees; special permission needs to be obtained to undertake developmental activities in forests.

Bhutan: already has strong forest conservation laws but there is still a need for better cross-sectoral linkages.

India: the National Steering Committee of Project Elephant takes up inter-sectoral issues with concerned Ministries/Departments. When addressing the development of infrastructure within forest areas/PAs (including elephant corridors), detailed impact assessment studies are carried out and a detailed report is put before the National Board of Wildlife and Forest Advisory Committee to minimize adverse ecological impacts.

Indonesia: has a coordination Ministry to help address multi-sectoral elephant conservation efforts and coordinate between government agencies.

Lao PDR: has a specific program to assess loss of habitat and poaching which begins with a review committee. The Forest Department can discuss the issues with the various agencies.

Myanmar: existing laws are not effective to minimize the impact of development.

Malaysia (Peninsular): the Department of Environment has a mechanism whereby developers should consult with relevant government agencies while undertaking development activities. There is an EIA process with dedicated management for wildlife rescue or conflict mitigation, including elephants.

Malaysia (Sabah): it has been proposed in the last National Elephant Action Plan (now in revision) to have a point person to coordinate with other agencies. Many projects were approved before 2000 but the Environmental Act law was implemented after 2000. Malaysia also has a Task Force at the district level to discuss how to minimize impact on elephant habitat and mitigate conflict while trying to save the elephants at the district level.

Sri Lanka: have district level committees that discuss actions between various agencies (wildlife, forest, electricity, etc.) on certain issues and meet monthly. There is a proposal to have a regional and national level committee involving various Ministries.

Thailand: has a National Committee on Asian Elephants but it has not been effective. There is also a National Master Plan for Elephant Conservation (2016-2036). The main problem is budget constraints (from the government).

Summary:

- **Using existing Action Plans can bring about synergy between various departments.**
- **Range States that have a National Elephant Action Plan could form a National Conservation Committee to coordinate with diverse stakeholders in their countries.**

Data needs and funding

Mr. Desai requested delegates to give input about whether they have specific data needs and if they are providing funds for elephant related research to help address HEC management.

Bangladesh: habitat related studies have been supported but the Forest Department has very few funds.

Bhutan: currently there are some studies on elephants' seasonal movements, but further studies are required.

Cambodia: would like to have research but needs funds and other resources.

India: has resumed collection of data under the CITES MIKE program since 2014. A collection of State-wide data regarding elephant population, human-elephant conflict, and other management needs is carried out regularly. The capacity for collection and compilation of data for elephant conservation needs to be strengthened.

Malaysia (Peninsular): has a collaborative research project with Nottingham University Malaysia Campus to put satellite collars on 50 elephants in order to understand elephant ecology, and identify corridors and areas used by elephants. This project is also used to evaluate the effectiveness of the elephant translocation program, and data from the collars functions as an early warning system in HEC areas.

Sri Lanka: has researchers working on elephant related topics such as habitat, migration, home ranges, etc.

Habitat improvement/Habitat management

Eight countries (**Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, and Sri Lanka**) are actively working on habitat management.

Cambodia: PAs have a zoning system; any habitat restoration and rehabilitation is done in the core zone.

India: Protected Areas and Elephant Reserves have 10 year Management Plans duly approved by the relevant Chief Wildlife Wardens. These Management Plans cover all aspects of elephant management in the Protected Area/Elephant Reserve, including habitat management/habitat improvement.

Barriers

Elephants often easily overcome barriers and more research needs to be done in order to design better barriers to prevent elephant movements into crop areas. Mr. Desai reminded the delegates that diverse skills are available in various groups (including the IUCN/SSC AsESG) and there is a need for range States to work collaboratively and share experiences and expertise.

India: elephant proof trenches (EPTs) and solar powered fences are used in various places to avoid human-elephant conflicts. However, these are not very effective, particularly if these extend over a long distance. The maintenance of barriers in remote areas is a major problem.

Sri Lanka: the country has almost 4000 km of electric fences. These are broken daily by elephants using trees and branches, elephants trampling the wires, and elephants learning to tolerate shocks. In the past, various pest management strategies have been tried and no single method was sufficient. There is a need for integrated management; in addition to electric fences there should be the use of living fences, sensors, alarms, lights, etc. These methods should not be used along the whole lengths of existing fences but should be focused in critical areas.

Alternative crops

Regarding alternative crops, the socio-cultural acceptability of cultivating alternative crops is a major challenge.

Bangladesh: has tried okra and chili plants as alternative crops.

Sri Lanka: has tried unpalatable crops. Farmers grow sesame and aubergine/eggplant; these are not eaten by elephants.

Translocation of elephants

There will likely be more translocation of elephants in the future as moving elephants, especially small pocketed herds, will become a necessity. There may be an increasing need to move elephants as part of meta-population management programs and such translocations will need to be monitored systematically.

Relocation of people

India: has done a lot of resettlement of people in connection with tiger conservation and reducing human–tiger conflict, but relatively few resettlements because of elephants, except in corridors. No other country has done resettlements in a significant way.

Sri Lanka: relocation has been attempted in two corridor areas. One location was successful, but in the other area only 62 or 63 out of 82 families were relocated as some local people had political backing and did not want to move. Because not all families were relocated, the entire corridor plan failed.

Reducing elephant intrusions into human use areas

India: the creation of forest-like areas/small plantations on forest fringes facilitates elephants taking refuge in the day and raiding crops in the night and should be avoided where possible.

Sri Lanka: Sri Lanka does not encourage forest clearance but it happens in areas that are human dominated. A problem is the clearing of small patches of forests which act as a refuge for elephants in human use areas.

Summary:

- **Most range State governments support some elephant related research to address HEC management.**
- **Barriers to prevent HEC are a challenge. There is a need for integrated management when developing barriers to mitigate HEC.**
- **Some range State governments have translocated elephants and/or relocated people with varying success.**

Priority agreed to by Range States in The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

Minimize the negative impacts of humans on Asian Elephants and their habitats, address the root causes of human-elephant conflict and develop long term solutions to minimize such conflict; engage with local communities to gain their participation in biodiversity conservation and land-use planning; and provide sustainable and alternative livelihoods through financial support, technical guidance, and other measures.

Initiative for an Asian Elephant Action Plan - Session facilitated by Mr. Vivek Menon, IUCN/SSC AsESG, and Mr. Tonny Soehartono, MoEF

The aim of this session was to discuss the development of a Range-wide Asian Elephant Action Plan and to assess whether the range State delegates felt there is a need for such a document. Mr. Vivek Menon gave a brief presentation about Action Plans. In 1990 an Asian Elephant Action Plan was prepared by Santiapillai and Jackson on behalf of IUCN but no further updates have been published.

Mr. Menon described the guiding principle of Action Plans which are documents outlining distribution, abundance, threats, and management measures for a particular species. An Action Plan also presents a framework of guidelines that defines what needs to be done, when, where, and the cost. An Action Plan provides a vision, goals, objectives, as well as strategies and targeted actions to achieve the objectives, along with a set of priorities.

Mr. Menon acknowledged that some range States have already developed their own National Elephant Action Plans and proposed that there could be different ways to decide on an over-arching Range-wide Asian Elephant Action Plan:

1. This document could be a compilation of National Elephant Action Plans
2. This document could propose a general Range-wide Asian Elephant Action Plan

It might also be possible to combine both options for two separate documents.

Mr. Simon Hedges, IUCN/SSC AsESG, added some information about the existing African Elephant Action Plan (AEAP). The AEAP document was developed by the African elephant range States and facilitated by IUCN in 2010; it addresses elephant conservation issues in all 37 African elephant range States. The AEAP took two years to complete. This Plan allows for the fact that there are divergent views on some issues within the African elephant range States. For example some range States want to sell legally collected ivory and some don't.

Mr. Menon asked the Range States about National Elephant Action Plans. While all range States agreed about the need for National Elephant Action Plans, not all countries have such plans.

Range States with a valid National Elephant Action Plan:

- (5) **Sri Lanka, Malaysia (Peninsular), Indonesia, Nepal, Vietnam**

Range States with an expired National Elephant Action Plan:

- (1) **Malaysia (Sabah)**

Range States with a draft National Elephant Action Plan:

- (6) **Thailand, China, Cambodia, Bangladesh, Myanmar, Malaysia (Sabah)**

Range States with no National Elephant Action Plan:

- (3) **India** (only Elephant Reserve Management Plan), **Lao PDR, Bhutan**

Mr. Menon then asked the delegates about their views on developing a National Elephant Action Plan versus a Range-wide Action Plan. He also requested input on compiling strategies, information, and

actions from existing National Elephant Action Plans and using that as a basis for developing a Range-wide Action Plan.

Bangladesh: supports both National and Range-wide Elephant Action Plans.

Bhutan: prefers to see a Range-wide Action Plan developed first, then a National Elephant Action Plan.

China: needs guidance and help from range State and IUCN/SSC AsESG experts to develop a holistic National Elephant Action Plan and to provide financial support.

India: feels that a National level plan is required first as laws vary among countries. Action Plans should include issues relating to trans-boundary migration of elephants between range countries. India is in the process of signing an agreement with Bangladesh for trans-boundary conservation of elephants. India intends to take up similar agreements with Nepal, Bhutan, and Myanmar.

Indonesia: noted that there are some problems with transboundary issues and those should be included in a Range-wide Action Plan.

Malaysia (Peninsular): supports the proposal on a general Range-wide Asian Elephant Action Plan, but feels that National Elephant Action Plans should also be developed.

Malaysia (Sabah): suggests that a Range-wide plan should offer strategy, guidance, and policy for the range State governments.

Myanmar: supports both type of Plans but feels that first the range States should develop National Elephant Action Plans before developing a Range-wide Plan. National Elephant Action Plans are usually focused on wild elephants, but in some countries there is a need to focus on captive elephants as well; e.g. in Myanmar. This should be considered when developing a Range-wide Action Plan.

Sri Lanka: supports a Range-wide Plan in the broad sense but also National Elephant Action Plans, and notes that Protected Areas also require management plans. Sri Lanka's National Elephant Action Plan mainly focuses on HEC mitigation so some topics such as captive elephant management are not adequately covered.

Thailand: stated that the National Master Plan for Elephant Conservation (2016-2036) is being revised to include fresh strategies and actions based on available resources. However Thailand feels both National Elephant Action Plans and a Range-wide Action Plan are necessary

Vietnam: believes that National Elephant Action Plans should be developed first. A Range-wide Action Plan should include transboundary issues and technical issues that are difficult to address in National Elephant Action Plans. However those could be incorporated into activities for National Elephant Action Plans.

Summary:

- **All range States present agreed that National Elephant Action Plans should be developed for each country.**

- **Most range States prefer to develop National Elephant Action Plans before developing a Range-wide Action Plan.**
- **Most range States support the concept of a Range-wide Action Plan as a common vision, strategy, and policy document.**

Mr. Menon then asked the delegates if they thought it would be useful to develop an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund similar to the African Elephant Fund adopted in 2010 following a CITES resolution. He encouraged delegates to share their views on this issue and suggested that the AsESG could form a small Working Group to facilitate the process if such a fund would be useful. Mr. Menon also reminded delegates of the proposed Giants Summit meeting planned by Sri Lanka in 2018, where the launch of an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund may be appropriate.

Discussion ensued; most delegates felt that such a fund would be useful but that it would need to be carefully developed and monitored with guidelines and protocols in place. Furthermore delegates felt that all range State governments should approve the Fund.

Summary:

- **All 12 range States present agreed that an additional funding mechanism for Asian elephant conservation would be useful.**
- **Delegates agreed that the concept of an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund could be initiated at the proposed Sri Lanka Giants Summit in 2018 to attract donors.**
- **Guidelines and protocols should be developed for an Asian Elephant Conservation Fund and should be approved by all range State governments.**

Priority suggested by The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

Develop where necessary National Asian Elephant Action Plans and a Range-wide Asian Elephant Conservation Plan and ensure their timely implementation.

Poaching and Illegal Trade of Elephant Ivory and Parts - Session facilitated by Mr. Widodo Ramono, MoEF, and Mr. Simon Hedges, IUCN/SSC AsESG

Mr. Widodo Ramono, MoEF, and Mr. Simon Hedges, IUCN/SSC AsESG, provided some background information about the topic of elephant poaching and illegal trade. Asia remains a major market for legal and illegal trade in live elephants, as well as elephant ivory and other elephant products (skin, meat, and other body parts). While the international ivory trade continues to dominate international attention and resources, the local demand (nationally) and regional demand (within Asia) for Asian (as well as African) elephant ivory and live elephants is sufficient to adversely affect many populations, due to the low numbers of elephants where poaching and illegal trade in live elephants takes place.

Some of the important questions to answer in order to understand the consequences of poaching and illegal trade on the viability of Asian elephant populations include:

- How big is the effect of the illegal trade in ivory on the viability of wild Asian elephant populations?
- What are the challenges and what are the difficulties in getting data on elephant poaching in Asia to meet international requirements including that of the CITES Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE) programme?

It was agreed that there is a need for better information on the scale and drivers of elephant poaching in Asia. Delegate responses to some key questions about poaching are summarized in the table below:

Country	How much poaching is going on?	How much poaching is driven by the illegal ivory trade?	How much is driven by the demand for other elephant parts, e.g. skin and meat?	How much is driven by other causes, e.g. retaliation for HEC?	Other notes
Bangladesh	Domestic trade in limited numbers. In 2016, poaching mostly driven by HEC (1 male; 3 females); skin, ivory not main drivers.	Low	None	2016 – 4 cases	
Bhutan	No record of poaching (zero poaching concept rolled out nationally) so far but seizures of ivory	None	None	None	Assistance from international expertise requested
Cambodia	6 elephants (4 lost ivory). Last year 1 elephant was caught by snare. Total = 7. No poisoning.	4 cases reported			Have law enforcement teams working with communities to prevent poaching and remove snares

China	Very few	Low	None	Data Not available	
India	Ivory poaching and smuggling drastically reduced.	400 kg ivory seized in 2016. Case under prosecution in court (Kerala).	None	30-40 elephants annually	The Wildlife Crime Control Bureau is assisting State Forest Departments in cases of crimes relating to elephants.
Indonesia	Combination poaching and killing. Poisoning is a big problem.	Low	None	Elephants killed in retaliation for HEC and other reasons: 2012 (28) 2013 (33) 2014 (46) 2015 (40)	Detection depends on the patrol efforts. In 2013-2014, many males killed mainly by people closely associated with elephants and most in oil palm plantations (Riau, Aceh).
Lao PDR		Yes		Southern and northern part: 10 elephants killed (2008-2009) by poachers in retaliation for HEC	Deaths mostly by poaching, one by accident. ASEAN Wildlife Protection Network coordinates with police and customs to address the issue
Malaysia (Peninsular)	From 1974 to 2016 - 19 poaching cases plus 15 cases of elephant deaths due to traumatic injury (mostly by wire snare) were reported. No domestic ivory market.	Low	None	In same period, 51 cases of retaliatory killing reported, of which 45% of them were poisonings.	National Ivory Action Plan (NIAP) in place. Operation with Interpol and Wildlife Justice Commission (WJC). Several cases of apprehended criminals.
Malaysia (Sabah)	Cases of shooting and poisoning	No cases reported		50 cases reported in last 25 years; largely retaliatory killing for HEC	Deployed a Park District Enforcement team; a joint task force developed with Indonesia and Sabah customs or boundary officers to share information.
Myanmar	From 2010-2016 - 133 cases were reported. It is increasing every year.	Earlier poaching was only for ivory	Since 2010 increased poaching for skin, meat, and other organs	Very low or none. No poisonings reported.	Have 8 patrol units with wildlife protection police.

Sri Lanka	Zero poaching for ivory reported.	None	None	The 7 year data set shows 41.9% of elephants killed due to HEC. In 2016, 126 out of 274 elephants killed were due to HEC.	In some cases carcasses are decayed so cause of death is unknown. 42 patrol units (6 people/unit for 10 days) are proposed. Patrol reports are sent to the Cabinet.
Thailand	Problem of baby elephant captures by snares. More than 60 elephants were confiscated in past 10 years	Between 2016-2017 – 3 cases reported	Rarely reported	9 cases due to HEC	Problem area is the border of Thailand and Myanmar.
Vietnam	2009 - 14 cases of poisoning, mostly captive elephants. 2011- 2 cases. 2015 - 1 male killed by snare.	None	None	2011 - 2 cases of shooting (not for ivory).	

Mr. Hedges discussed the need for a better understanding of ivory trade flows in Asia. This could be accomplished via improved reporting of seizures to CITES' Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS). All outstanding ETIS data needs to be reported to CITES/ETIS by 31 May 2017 (per CITES Notification of 23 March 2017). Even if there are no seizures this needs to be reported to CITES.

The ETIS Director had requested that Mr. Hedges ask the range States present at the Jakarta Meeting about the status of their country reports to ETIS, and to remind governments to send any outstanding reports by the deadline of 31st May 2017. The ETIS programme comments and requests to the range State governments were as follows:

- **Bangladesh** – Since 1989, ETIS has not received a single record of an ivory seizure case from Bangladesh. It is one of two Asian Elephant Range States that has never reported a single ivory seizure case. Five seizures have been reported by other countries with Bangladesh implicated as part of the trade chain. If there are any records of law enforcement actions that have led to an ivory seizure case, Bangladesh is requested to send the data to ETIS.
- **Bhutan** - Bhutan has never reported any ivory seizures cases to ETIS, whilst it has been implicated as part of the trade chain in two seizure cases made elsewhere since 1991. Unlike most other countries, Bhutan has written ETIS to report no ivory seizures cases in various years and this correspondence is greatly appreciated; accordingly, it is not on the list of countries that have never reported to ETIS.
- **Cambodia** – Cambodia has made and reported 13 seizure cases to ETIS since 1995 and another 39 seizures have occurred elsewhere with Cambodia identified as part of the trade chain. ETIS is concerned that Cambodia has become a transit country for illegal ivory trade into Vietnam. Any recent cases need to be reported. Cambodia was a country of 'secondary concern' in the ETIS analysis to CITES CoP17 and is part of the National Ivory Action Plan process under CITES.

- **China** – Represents ETIS’s largest data set. China has made and reported 4,117 ivory seizure cases to ETIS since 1989. This is highly commendable and greatly appreciated. Another 516 cases involving China in the trade chain have been made by other countries, mostly in Africa. Even though it is an exceptionally impressive record, it appears that additional seizures made by provincial authorities of the State Forestry Administration are not being reported to ETIS. China was a country of 'primary concern' in the ETIS analysis to CITES CoP17 because of its role as an end-use market and is part of the National Ivory Action Plan process under CITES.
- **India** – Since 1989, ETIS has 281 ivory seizure records for India, whilst another 133 ivory seizures have been made in other parts of the world implicating India in the trade chain. Whilst this is an impressive record, it is of concern that the Indian government itself has not reported a single seizure to ETIS in over eight years although the media and NGOs have drawn attention to at least 60 ivory seizures in this same time period. As the largest Asian elephant range State, it is important for the Indian government to meet its responsibilities to report ivory seizures to ETIS as mandated by CITES.
- **Indonesia** - Since 1989, Indonesia has made and reported 21 ivory seizures to ETIS, and has been implicated in the trade chains of 61 other ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. ETIS would benefit from – and requests – regular reporting from Indonesia as mandated by CITES.
- **Lao PDR** - Since 1989, ETIS has not received a single report of an ivory seizure case from the Lao PDR. It is one of only two Asian elephant range States that has never reported a single ivory seizure case. Twenty seizures have been reported by other countries with Lao implicated as part of the trade chain. Lao was identified in the ETIS analysis to CITES CoP17 as a country of 'important to watch' given that domestic trade in ivory seems to be increasing and the country represents a cross-border trade market for Chinese buyers. The Lao PDR is part of the National Ivory Action Plan process under CITES.
- **Malaysia** – Since 1989, Malaysia has made and reported 37 ivory seizures to ETIS, and has been implicated in the trade chains of 52 ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. Malaysia was a country of 'primary concern' in the ETIS analysis to CITES CoP17 because of its role as a transit country and is part of the National Ivory Action Plan process under CITES.
- **Myanmar** – Since 1989, Myanmar has made and report 15 ivory seizures to ETIS, and has been implicated in the trade chains of 9 ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. ETIS would benefit from regular reporting from Myanmar. The domestic ivory market in Myanmar seems to be growing and border towns with China, such as Mong La, are playing an increasing role in illegal cross-border wildlife trade.
- **Nepal** – Since 1989, Nepal has made and reported 10 ivory seizure cases to ETIS, and has been implicated in the trade chains of 6 ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. ETIS would benefit from regular reporting from Nepal.
- **Sri Lanka** - Since 1989, Sri Lanka has made and reported 8 ivory seizures to ETIS, and had been implicated in the trade chains of 10 ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. ETIS would benefit from regular reporting from Sri Lanka.
- **Thailand** – Since 1989, Thailand has made and reported 111 ivory seizures to ETIS, and had been implicated in the trade chains of 431 ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. Thailand was a country of 'secondary concern' in the ETIS analysis to CITES

CoP17 and is part of the National Ivory Action Plan process under CITES. Thailand has changed its legislation to outlaw African elephant ivory trade and recent market surveys have shown that ivory trade has been reduced to negligible levels in Bangkok. The progress in Thailand is highly commendable.

- **Vietnam** - Since 1989, Vietnam has made and reported 74 ivory seizures to ETIS, and had been implicated in the trade chains of 117 ivory seizures made elsewhere in the world during the same period. Vietnam remains a country of 'primary concern' in the ETIS analysis to CITES CoP17 and is part of the National Ivory Action Plan process under CITES. Recent investigations by the Wildlife Justice Commission have documented widespread illegal ivory trade in Vietnam, including processing and cross-border trading with China.

A discussion ensued about the need for better enforcement to combat illegal trade. This should include improved inter-agency and inter-regional collaborations. Mr. Hedges noted that MIKE has a new funding grant from the European Union and will be setting up an office in Asia. There will be increased support for the range State governments when the MIKE Asia office is open.

There is also a need to collaboratively develop techniques and a mechanism to allow more effective law enforcement. In Indonesia, the Eijkman Laboratory has a facility and database related to DNA identification of elephant and other wildlife including tiger and rhinos. The lab has been recognized by the ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) as a facility able to identify specimens and support efforts to combat the illegal trade. There are challenges to identify DNA from ivory as opposed to DNA from skin and blood.

The discussion among delegates brought up the challenges of managing ivory stockpiles; delegates requested more support from CITES to allow easier and cheaper means to identify ivory. Another request from the delegates was for more data analysis as not all countries have provided data to ETIS so the analysis is not as useful for conservation as it could be.

Mr. Hedges then discussed the issue of illegal trade in live elephants. It is important for range States to develop strategies to implement and monitor the registration of captive elephants in their countries as a way to help reduce the illegal trade in wild elephants. There are NGOs who are able to provide funding support to help develop effective registration programs for captive elephants.

A delegate asked if elephants can be traded or not between CITES parties. Mr. Hedges noted that wild caught elephants and first generation captive elephants cannot be traded for commercial purposes because Asian elephants are listed on CITE Appendix I. Asian elephants born in captivity can be traded with various restrictions. The main concern is first generation individuals being traded illegally as a result of illegal captures from the wild. However the trade of 2nd generation elephants born in captivity is allowed with proper CITES permits.

Summary:

- **There is a need for more information on the scale and drivers of elephant poaching in Asia.**
- **All seizures of ivory need to be reported to CITES' ETIS programme by May 31, 2017. Not all range State governments have provided reports in a timely manner.**
- **Law enforcement to combat illegal trade needs better inter-agency and inter-regional collaborations.**

- Range State governments should request support from CITES and other agencies as well as NGOs on how to manage ivory stockpiles securely.
- It is important for range State governments to develop strategies to implement and monitor the registration of captive elephants in order to help reduce the illegal trade in live wild elephants.

Priority suggested by The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

Ensure effective enforcement of existing national laws and regulations across the species' range to prevent illegal killing of Asian Elephants and the illegal trade in live Asian Elephants, ivory, and other elephant body parts.

Strengthen international collaboration, coordination, and communication where relevant, involving specialized expertise from international organizations, including but not limited to, CITES, INTERPOL, and UNODC.

**Habitat Conservation - Session facilitated by Mr. Simon Hedges, IUCN/SSC
AsESG**

Mr. Simon Hedges provided a brief introduction about the various threats to elephant habitat in Asia including loss and fragmentation. He also commented that there is a need for better information on the scale and pattern of elephant habitat loss and fragmentation across Asian elephant range countries.

Mr. Hedges gave as an example what has occurred in Africa with the “Great Elephant Census” (GEC). Under the GEC, aerial surveys were conducted to assess numbers of savannah elephants (and numbers of elephant carcasses), and dung surveys are now being done to assess the numbers of forest elephants in Central Africa. While the primary donor to the GEC is not interested in an Asian elephant census there is a need for a similar endeavor in Asia. Any such endeavor should also identify likely viable habitat blocks, threats to those blocks, and key connectivity corridors between blocks of elephant habitat to help maintain or re-establish connectivity before it is too late.

Some questions were put forth to the delegates.

Do range State governments think linking efforts to assess elephant numbers to efforts to assess habitat blocks in need of protection is useful?

India: it is useful to have good estimates of elephant numbers. State-wide elephant population data has been compiled since 1993. A well planned and coordinated exercise “All India Synchronized Elephant Population Estimation, will be carried out across the country this year (2017). Both direct and indirect methods were used simultaneously for estimation of elephant numbers.

Indonesia: more and more elephants are living outside forest areas in plantation areas. Understanding elephant habitat requirements and trying to provide information necessary for land managers is urgently needed. An assessment could help plan management strategies for these areas.

Malaysia (Sabah): good work is being done in Sabah by collaring and tracking various species, i.e. elephants, wild boar, etc., to generate movement information on a large array of animals.

Vietnam: there is a low number of elephants in country and population assessment, movement, corridors, focus on three main elephant populations.

Action proposed: IUCN/SSC could develop a concept for a combined Asian Elephant Census or support any such initiatives coming from the wider conservation community or the range States.

How best should elephant habitat be conserved – what is working and what is not working?

As an example, Mr. Hedges mentioned that Indonesia has a number of areas conserved as National Parks; unfortunately not all are able to accommodate elephants as some are not suitable due to terrain (i.e. steep slopes). In the last 2-3 years, Indonesia has developed a new law that allows private sector entities to manage logged areas and restore wildlife habitat. Some areas with elephants are in the process of restoration.

Three years ago the concept of Essential Ecosystem Areas was developed in Indonesia; these are areas that are outside of conservation areas and may be under the control of the local government. The concept is how to collaboratively manage the area, not by planting crops but allowing elephants to use the area. Indonesia also has regulations that local governments should collaborate with NGOs or private companies.

India: while the government has set aside elephant conservation areas and is trying to secure elephant corridors, the local community can play a role in protecting an area, e.g. in Garo Hills, Meghalaya, the community has set aside about 2,200 ha for protection of elephant and gibbon habitat and corridors. The conservation benefit can be shared with communities contributing to habitat protection. Recently a MoU with Mahanadi Coalfields Limited Mines was developed to provide 400 million INR for elephant conservation in the State of Odisha. Mining corporations can be asked to help in planning or managing habitat protection strategies. Indian companies, as part of their corporate social responsibility programs, are also contributing towards conservation including habitat protection for elephants. In agricultural areas where elephants pass through, for example tea gardens, there is a need to work with the local communities and tea garden management so that there is minimal human-elephant conflict. Expansion of elephant habitat can also facilitate elephant movement through large scale agriculture.

Indonesia: elephant habitat is being lost to concessions and plantations; human encroachment undermines habitat protection and restoration efforts.

Malaysia (Peninsular): a hydro-electric power project converted over 6,000 ha for its dam. The responsibility was shared by the company to rehabilitate the habitat, and they provided 5 satellite collars to study elephant movement and allocated support for monitoring and enforcement activities. The private sector also has a responsibility to conserve elephants and these sorts of cooperative efforts can be used as a model for the private sector.

Sri Lanka: cattle are a large problem in several National Parks, as the Forest Department is managing the resources, not just for wildlife but also cattle. Research shows that elephants like to live in shifting cultivation areas, especially after harvesting. If those areas can be connected for elephants, then fodder problems could be addressed. In some cases invasive weeds are also a problem, so weed removal is an important aspect of habitat management.

Vietnam: a lot of land is held by the private sector. Where corridor management is required, there needs to be cooperation with the local communities. Current laws make it difficult to incorporate elephant conservation in land management.

Range States were asked where do Managed Elephant Ranges (MER) work and where do they not?

Bangladesh: there are unplanned developmental programs which have been executed and implemented in elephant home range areas, e.g., a 200 km railway line that passes through elephant home ranges and corridors.

Bhutan: elephants in Bhutan are under the management of a National Elephant Plan. In the southern part of the country elephants move outside of Bhutan. In some areas water holes have been created, natural salt licks enriched and artificial salt licks created, habitat restoration (such as grassland management), and green infrastructure promoted in the places frequently used by elephants. In some

cases bridges are being used by elephants. While there is habitat protection activity on the ground there is no written document saying that elephants are using MERs.

Cambodia: the eastern landscape forest covers 800,000 ha but when compared to the population of elephants it is not large enough. On the Cambodia-Vietnam border there is a need for more surveys on elephant movement and for better management plans to control movement. Now law enforcement is being strengthened by an increased number of rangers in the area.

China: recently a draft elephant and habitat management plan was developed but it needs to be assessed further. There is a need to study elephant movement, plan for corridors, including transboundary conservation areas, and improve habitat management.

India: there are 29 Elephant Reserves in the country covering 65,000 km². Most reserves have a scientific management plan addressing two main issues: elephant dispersal due to population increase and degradation of habitat. Most elephant areas have rich reserves for mining. If the area becomes an Elephant Reserve, then mining in that area is regulated. The concern is how to manage elephant populations in areas that are rich in mineral reserves and how to demarcate areas as Elephant Reserves.

Indonesia: the concept of MER has been implemented but a bit differently from the actual concept of IUCN. For example, outside of strict conservation areas, there are areas under restoration rather than conservation. Other areas that are trying to use the MER concept are in northern Aceh as elephant habitat extends across several land-use areas.

Lao PDR: wild elephants move in forests in National Protected Areas, but these areas have no management plan and at the same time lack staff. Earlier there were some transboundary connection problems but now there is better movement between neighboring countries.

Malaysia (Peninsular): There are 3 forest complexes where habitat has been improved after logging and connected through linkages via viaducts. However, the implementation is sometimes a challenge as there are different land ownerships and it involves many stakeholders at the federal and state levels.

Malaysia (Sabah): in Sabah there are 4 MERs; all are separated from each other but there is a possibility to connect two of them and there is an attempt to connect one to the Indonesian side. In early 2000, there were only 8,000 ha of PA, but that area has now increased.

Myanmar: there are 40 Protected Areas of which 7 have elephant populations. Currently there is a National Habitat Restoration Plan (2018-2027).

Sri Lanka: there is a National Policy for wild elephant conservation approved by the Cabinet, which includes a policy to establish MERs. But Sri Lanka is still trying to establish its first MER. In 2009, the MER concept was included in the Fauna and Flora Protection policy and it was stated that land ownership will not be changed; the only use will be for elephants. The fact that the ownership of land in a MER will not change is a challenge for management. All forest areas in the country are managed by the Wildlife Department and Forest Department; and there is currently no area for MER.

Thailand: there are 17 forest complexes of which 7-8 are connected and are large enough to support elephants. In regards to isolated populations, the government does not have the funds to move these isolated elephants. Right now there is one forest corridor to ensure genetic spread. In regards to MERs,

the concept is difficult because much of the land around protected areas is private land and it cannot be purchased due to lack of financial support.

Vietnam: between Vietnam and Cambodia there are two MERs. There is a big elephant population in one area, and the other elephant population has a very small number. In 2015, the two countries signed a MoU to conserve wildlife, in particular tigers and elephants. The MERs are managed by multiple agencies, the Forest Department, military, and other organizations. A challenge is tracking elephant movement from PAs to other areas. Monitoring work is required to track movements and assess the need for corridor areas.

A discussion ensued on habitat degradation and the drivers of fragmentation. Indonesia's recent experience with habitat loss due to conversion of forest to plantation showed that after some time elephants started eating the Acacia in plantations. There was a switch in some areas to Eucalyptus, but this type of plantation suppresses ground vegetation.

Range States agreed that the biggest challenge is how to reconcile the need for elephant conservation with the rights of private land owners and issues of human–elephant conflict. There is also the need to study how to value the role of elephants on private lands, as well as the general economic value of elephants. Mr. Hedges pointed out that in Africa there is a lot of attention on the value of iconic species, such as elephants, on private lands for tourism and this can add economic value for conservation.

Summary:

- **Range States felt there is a need to census elephant numbers and assess areas of suitable habitat, as many elephants are found outside PAs.**
- **There is a need to manage elephant habitat via multiple stakeholders, i.e. local governments and private sector (mining companies, plantation owners, etc.).**
- **The concept of Managed Elephant Ranges is used in several range States but experiences with the concept differ due to the various management and land ownership policies in each country.**
- **There is a need to understand the economic value of elephants, in particular of those on privately owned lands, in order to better preserve elephants and their habitat outside of protected areas.**

Priorities suggested by The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

Maintain large Asian Elephant conservation landscapes where no unregulated, economic or commercial infrastructure development or other adverse activities are permitted, and create connectivity between such landscapes where all permitted developmental activities are elephant- and biodiversity-appropriate;

Work collaboratively on transboundary issues to allow uninhibited movement of wild Asian Elephants in and between Range States through appropriate corridors and transboundary protected areas.

**Captive Elephant Management - Session facilitated by Ms. Heidi Riddle,
IUCN/SSC AsESG**

Ms. Heidi Riddle introduced the session by providing some background information on captive elephants in Asia. According to government provided data, currently the number of captive elephants in Asia is approximately 15,000. The largest populations are in Myanmar (5,000+), India (3,600+), and Thailand (3,400+). Almost half of the range States have captive elephant populations with numbers of individuals approximately equal to or higher than the numbers of wild elephants in country.

During the 2006 Meeting, delegates identified the following captive elephant actions:

- Need to adapt a long term approach to captive elephant management;
- Standardized (and expedited) registration of captive elephants;
- Policy and strategy to manage captive populations;
- Establish good management and husbandry practices; and
- Consider future needs for captive elephants and whether breeding strategies are needed.

According to the pre-meeting survey for the Jakarta Meeting, the following captive elephant issues were identified by respondents as important to discuss:

- Exchange programs to facilitate breeding;
- Regulating captive breeding;
- Captive elephants do not breed well;
- Captive elephants not managed well;
- Disease management (EEHV) and zoonotic diseases; and
- Domestic and international trade in live elephants.

Challenges for registration of captive elephants

Registration of the captive elephant population is a challenge for most range State governments. Ms. Riddle asked the delegates about their national registration schemes, and whether there is a need for improvement. She mentioned that currently a method of DNA sampling is being developed to better identify and monitor captive elephants in Asia. While earlier it had been suggested that microchips could help positively identify individuals, it is now becoming more apparent that microchips are not tamper proof, so the use of DNA for identification is likely a better option.

The delegates were asked if they would be interested in DNA registration; one of the possibilities offered is a portable genotype machine that is being funded by the U.K. Government. Delegates were also queried whether they would need any assistance to develop a DNA-based registration system as some NGOs have offered to support a workshop to assist with DNA techniques and help develop that capacity. DNA allows easier tracking of the origin of elephants within their range. Interested countries were encouraged to take advantage of the offer.

Bhutan: there are only 9 captive elephants in country, so it is not difficult to maintain a record. For DNA techniques it would be a challenge as there is no laboratory available in country.

Bangladesh: requested that an invitation to a DNA registration workshop be sent to the head of the Bangladesh Forest Department as there would be interest in learning more about this method.

Cambodia: would prefer to use DNA testing as it will be easier to check if individual elephants are of wild origin or already captive.

India: uses microchips, however there are still problems as many privately owned elephants do not have documentation as per the law. There had been a deadline to declare and register captive elephants, but that has already expired.

Indonesia: noted that a problem that was talked about the previous day was the unavailability of laboratory facilities for DNA analysis in range countries. Indonesia now has support from a donor to register captive elephants with microchips and also has funds for a clinic. Indonesia is interested in participating in DNA forensic testing; currently it is used only for wild animals in country.

Lao PDR: uses microchips. Earlier the captive elephant registration was done through the Department of Livestock.

Malaysia (Peninsular): uses microchips and has a forensic laboratory.

Malaysia (Sabah): feels that maintaining a studbook of the captive elephant population is important.

Myanmar: registration is very difficult in the country. All captive elephants need to be registered through a government agency, the Forest Department. According to data there are over 5,000 captive elephants in Myanmar, but approximately 4,000 are actually registered. So an awareness program needs to be conducted so that private owners register their elephants.

Thailand: wants to upgrade the system of registering captive elephants. Captive and wild elephants fall under different government administration systems. Captive elephants are registered under a local Registration Department. Currently the number of registered elephants is 3,783. It is believed that there are other un-registered elephants that travel across the borders with Cambodia and Vietnam. All captive elephants need to be registered to have an accurate count.

Summary:

- **Almost all range States agreed that their current captive elephant registration strategy has problems in the implementation.**
- **Many range State governments currently use microchips as part of registration, but all range States present would be interested in a DNA-based registration.**

Policy and strategy to manage captive elephant populations; do range State governments have guidelines for the management and use of captive elephants?

All 13 Asian elephant range States have captive elephant populations. Delegates were asked about their short- and long-term plans for managing their captive elephant populations, as well as any management guidelines in country.

Bangladesh: is trying to develop elephant management guidelines, but they will likely be general in nature.

China: has no specific guidelines for elephants. There is no real need for captive elephant guidelines as there are very few in country, most are in zoos, and there are already zoo guidelines for all captive wildlife.

Cambodia, Lao PDR, Malaysia (Sabah): do not have specific guidelines for captive elephant management.

India: the Government of India issued detailed guidelines for the management of captive elephants on 8th January, 2008. The states of Tamil Nadu and Kerala have notified rules for the management of captive elephants. Complaints are received from time to time regarding implementation of these guidelines/rules. India has also developed many elephant rescue and rehabilitation centers for injured/abandoned elephants. The Central Zoo Authority of India accords recognition to elephant rescue and rehabilitation centers.

Malaysia (Peninsular): there are only guidelines for elephants in zoos.

Malaysia (Sabah): does not have a history of elephant domestication, however in recent years there have been instances of abandoned calves as well as sick or injured elephants that have been brought into captivity. All are managed by the Sabah Wildlife Department. The main challenge is a lack of fodder for these elephants. The government would like to release them back into the wild and requested input to rehabilitate young elephants.

Myanmar: the Myanma Timber Enterprise (MTE) has specific elephant management guidelines (incl. Manual, Standing Order for Staff, Departmental Instruction) for the use and management of MTE elephants.

Sri Lanka: has prepared guidelines on captive elephant welfare to address all aspects of captive elephants. These guidelines are now pending approval from the Supreme Court.

Thailand: elephant management guidelines are being prepared; currently existing animal welfare laws are used for protection. Thailand is also working to solve the problem of unemployed elephants and how to utilize them in tourism. Separate guidelines for the use of elephants in tourism have been requested.

Vietnam: there are no detailed guidelines for captive elephants, but there are general guidelines for wildlife management.

Do range State governments have training programs for captive elephant management staff?

Bangladesh: has no existing program but is interested in training mahouts.

China: in 2016, a new wildlife conservation law was introduced to conserve multiple species (e.g. tiger, panda, and elephant) regulated by the central government. There will be special criteria developed for captive management of these animals including staff training.

Cambodia: currently there is no staff training program. However in the last 6 months, 2 mahouts were killed by captive elephants, so there is a plan to develop a mahout training program.

India: has training programs for mahouts and veterinarians in the states of Assam and Kerala.

Indonesia: has a forum for mahouts, as well as collaborations with universities that have a faculty of veterinary science.

Lao PDR: captive elephants in-country are owned by villagers; there are no government owned elephants and no staff training mechanism.

Malaysia (Peninsular): has training for elephant management staff on topics such as husbandry management, biosafety/health management, and has mahout training.

Malaysia (Sabah): there are not enough mahouts, but the Wildlife Department has 6 trained veterinarians.

Myanmar: MTE has a training school for mahouts and a training program every year, including for higher-level administration. MTE has also started an annual workshop for mahouts. Different areas of the country have different systems so mahouts from all areas are brought together to share experiences.

Thailand: has two elephant training schools for training elephants and mahouts.

Sri Lanka: there is staff training at Pinnawala which was previously under the Zoological Department and is now under the Department of Wildlife Conservation.

Vietnam: there is no training program for mahouts.

Summary:

- **Most range State governments already have or are developing captive elephant management guidelines.**
- **About half of the range State governments do not have training programs for captive elephant management staff.**

Do range State governments have plans to increase or decrease captive elephant numbers in-country and what are the challenges?

While all range States have a captive elephant population, there are differing views within the region about the need to maintain the numbers of elephants in the captive populations. Captive elephant breeding programs are an issue that was brought up for discussion. During the discussion Mr. Simon Hedges, IUCN/SSC AsESG, clarified one point about the need to exchange captive elephants. The exchange of elephants for cultural or diplomatic gifts has to be dealt with differently than the exchange of elephants for breeding.

Cambodia: most of the captive elephants in country are over breeding age. Therefore the concern is that there will be increasing wild captures if there are no more captive elephants. There is a need for financial and technical support to address this issue.

China: has built an elephant breeding center on a small scale (30-50 individuals). The goal is to support wild population conservation by sending captive elephants back to the wild and not maintain them in captivity.

India: the management and use of temple elephants, and how their management can be improved, needs to be assessed.

Indonesia: there is now a government program to increase the population of 25 protected species including elephants. There are also programs for the use of captive elephants in tourism, conflict resolution, forest protection, and for breeding.

Lao PDR: wants to continue to maintain captive elephants and needs to set up a breeding center. There is currently no captive breeding in Lao PDR. One of the challenges is the absence of breeding management guidelines.

Malaysia (Peninsular): there is no plan to increase captive elephant numbers but sometimes it cannot be avoided due to circumstances such as elephant rescue activities, demand from zoos for new bloodlines, and to overcome HEC in particular areas.

Malaysia (Sabah): there is a need to come up with specific guidelines for the use and limitation of elephants in tourism. The need for future release programs should also be considered. There is also a need for disease control management guidelines for captive elephants.

Myanmar: will consider loaning captive elephants, for example to Cambodia for breeding or tourism, but will not sell them due to CITES regulations.

Sri Lanka: would like to consider a future exchange program where captive elephants can be exchanged between range countries.

Thailand: there is a need for long-term support for private owners. Good healthcare services are required. There are rules about elephant welfare; if owners mistreat elephants they will be fined.

Vietnam: is interested in maintaining a captive elephant population in the long-term and would like an exchange program with neighboring countries that have good captive elephant populations, such as Thailand. A law was enacted requiring certain criteria to be fulfilled so that a captive elephant could be registered. However, more than 50% of private owners could not register their elephants because they cannot meet the criteria.

Summary:

- Overall range State governments plan to maintain populations of captive elephants but challenges vary.
- There is a high level of interest among range State governments to develop captive elephant breeding programs so that wild populations are not affected.
- Several range State governments would be interested in elephant exchanges between countries, primarily to help develop captive elephant breeding programs.

Priorities suggested by The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

***Cooperatively develop captive Asian Elephant registration programs, including where appropriate microchipping and/or DNA-based systems, and ensure cross-border movements of captive Asian Elephants are in compliance with all national and international laws and regulations;
Ensure the welfare of captive elephants is maintained at all times.***

Elephant Population Management - Session facilitated by Mr. Simon Hedges, IUCN/SSC AsESG, and Mr. Ajay Desai, IUCN/SSC AsESG

Mr. Simon Hedges provided some background information. Initially only guess estimates of elephant numbers were available for most of Asia, so only a rough estimate of the total abundance of elephants in Asia was possible. Now that well-developed methods are available to estimate elephant numbers and the capacity of the Asian elephant range States' staff is (in many cases) higher, there is both the possibility of and the need for robust estimates of elephant population size and distribution. Thus rigorous methods (i.e. dung density based estimates that use reliable information on elephant defecation rates, and dung decay rates or dung DNA-based capture–recapture based methods) should be used when monitoring populations. However, it should be noted that dung decay and defecation rates vary from region to region, and unless both these figures are established for each survey population, the size cannot be clearly estimated. For robust estimation, DNA sampling could be used whenever possible.

Mr. Hedges stated that when population data was reviewed by the IUCN/SSC AsESG at its 2016 meeting it was noted that only 6% of Asian elephant population estimates used methods considered reliable. Thus range State governments and the global conservation community still have a poor understanding of actual elephant numbers across most of Asia. Mr. Hedges also noted that there have been advances in DNA-based survey methods including the necessary laboratory protocols, so there may be a need for (re)training survey staff to use the improved population estimate methods. Due to the need for a better understanding of the situation with regard to elephant population sizes and trends across Asia, the delegates were asked about methods used for population estimation in their countries.

What methods are the range State governments using for elephant population estimation?

Bangladesh: dung count based method.

Bhutan: transect, dung survey, and camera traps. There has been difficulty in identifying individuals, but now they are looking at the size of herds from camera traps.

Cambodia: DNA-based surveys mainly but prior to 2015 these had only been done in a few areas; camera traps have also been used. In 2015, there was a program of dung DNA sampling which covered 37% of elephant habitat. The samples were sent to the U.K. as there is no suitable lab in Cambodia.

China: previously multiple methods, including camera traps, were used. Now a project is starting using DNA sampling for individual identification that will facilitate capture–recapture based estimates.

India: since 1993 there has been an All India Synchronized Elephant Census every 5 years with training given to every state in the 4 regions. For estimation the following criteria are used: a) elephant occupancy at beat level, b) block count, c) line transects, d) water hole/salt lick counts. Dung decay rate methods are being used from this year (2017).

Indonesia: direct counts or concentration counts, dung count, occupancy, and DNA-based capture–recapture methods have been used. A dung decay rate assessment was done in Way Kambas National

Park. Occupancy surveys have been done in collaboration with other species, i.e. tiger and rhino. In some areas there is good success from DNA sampling, but not in other areas.

Lao PDR: camera traps have been used as have dung DNA-based capture–recapture methods in at least 3 areas. Lao would like to do more DNA-based surveys.

Malaysia (Peninsular): direct counts and indirect counts using footprints have been used. Dung density based methods have also been used with WCS’s assistance in Taman Negara National Park and Endau Rompin Landscape, and DNA-based capture–recapture surveys are on-going.

Malaysia (Sabah): a variety of methods has been used including dung density based methods and dung DNA-based methods; the government is confident that their population estimate is fairly accurate.

Myanmar: dung count density-based methods have been used by the government and NGOs; direct counting by field staff is done during capture operations.

Sri Lanka: a waterhole count was used in 2011 to carry out an island-wide survey. The first survey was done in 1993 but at that time the North and East of the country could not be surveyed. In 2004 and 2008, regional surveys were done. In 2011 for the first time all regions were done. Sri Lanka would like to know the population structure but cannot get that via the dung count method. Another survey will be conducted again this year (2017).

Thailand: techniques depend on the size of the area; direct count is used for small areas and indirect count is used in large areas. Dung DNA-based capture–recapture methods have also been used.

Vietnam: local authorities interview foresters then go to the field to measure foot prints and take photos or video. Dung collection for DNA analysis is also used. For small populations there is no need to use sophisticated methods.

Mr. Hedges suggested that if range State governments require technical assistance in obtaining population estimates from the international community, the IUCN/SSC AsESG could facilitate workshops on this topic. Additionally a Working Group of the IUCN/SSC AsESG could be formed to develop broad guidelines for population estimation methods suitable for use across Asia, followed by workshops to conduct training in how to implement those methods.

Discussions continued about how to manage small populations to address isolation issues (genetic and demographic). Mr. Hedges noted that there is a need to assess genetic diversity and whether it is necessary to move elephants to recreate gene flow and reduce the negative effects of population isolation. Sometimes genetic flow can be addressed by corridors; in the future moving elephants could be one of the few options available as Asia’s elephant ranges become more isolated. However moving elephants from one place to another is risky if not done properly.

Mr. Ajay Desai stated that India has a lot of experience in the translocation of elephants, and both India and Sri Lanka have expertise in moving sedated elephants over long distances, so he suggested that their assistance should be requested. Mr. Desai also advocated using a boma or other such enclosure so the elephants could be kept in controlled conditions for some time before release, and not to release the elephants immediately after translocation.

Is there a need to consider moving elephants to mitigate the effects of genetic and demographic isolation in small populations?

Bangladesh: does not think so; the elephant population in country is not so high.

Bhutan: 21% of the country is already protected; HEC mainly occurs in non-protected areas so there is no need to translocate elephants.

Cambodia: has a concern about isolated elephants; corridor land often belongs to the private sector, so yes there is a need for translocation.

India: the translocation of elephants has been carried out in past per decisions of Courts. The Government of West Bengal has created Mayurjharna Elephant Reserve in southwest Bengal, mainly to accommodate migrant elephants from other States in the East-Central elephant landscape.

Indonesia: has many small populations, some are in danger of isolation. There is a need for interventions to move elephants however these require scientific backing. The government needs to decide on actions as moving elephants can be a problem. There is disagreement with other government organizations so it is important to have guidance including criteria to define when a small population is so isolated it needs to be moved.

Lao PDR: no, but the issue needs further discussion.

Malaysia (Peninsular): there is a need to know how to deal with small pocketed herds of elephants.

Malaysia (Sabah): there are a number of issues with elephants and there is no need to move elephants until the situation is really problematic.

Myanmar: there is no need to move elephants; captive elephants can go into the forest and breed with the wild elephants.

Sri Lanka: there are small isolated populations in the central highlands (223 km²) that had about 20 elephants in the 1980s but now have only 2 male elephants and HEC is high. A decade back, the plan to relocate these elephants was resisted by villagers. If other elephants are brought to the area to avoid inbreeding there will be a problem with HEC and this will affect the long term survival of these elephants. By solving the inbreeding problem HEC will increase, so this needs to be properly planned.

Thailand: to move elephants there is a need to coordinate and manage stakeholders; it is not a priority for Thailand.

Vietnam: is in favor of translocation as there may be a necessity to move the 2-3 small isolated populations to reduce HEC and help the elephant population as there are no males. However any translocation would be over a long distance (1,600 km).

How should isolated herds or individuals be managed?

The question put to the delegates was if there is a need for formal guidelines or criteria for the range States to determine whether there are certain isolated, possibly doomed, populations and what should be done with them (e.g. translocation).

Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, and Vietnam felt that there should be guidelines to define and identify isolated elephant populations and how to manage these populations.

Action proposed: the IUCN/SSC AsESG should form a Working Group to develop guidelines to define, identify, and manage isolated elephant populations, as well as guidelines for translocation. The IUCN/SSC AsESG could also constitute a panel of experts who would assist the range State governments with these issues.

Summary:

- There is a need for better information on elephant population sizes and trends across Asia, so that proper population management strategies can be implemented, and the success of those strategies assessed.
- Most range State governments use direct counts and dung counts to estimate population numbers.
- There is a need for more rigorous methods to estimate population numbers and for support to train range State staff in best practices (e.g. dung DNA-based capture–recapture methods).
- Most range State governments do not feel the need to move small populations of elephants.
- Several range State governments feel that guidelines and criteria should be developed to define and identify isolated (doomed) elephant populations and how to best manage them.

Another aspect of population management is the reintroduction of captive elephants to wild conditions. This would help augment the gene pool. Several countries are thinking about this, in particular Myanmar as it has a large captive elephant population and a declining wild population. Thailand has reintroduced captive elephants to the wild in the past.

Mr. Vivek Menon, IUCN/SSC AsESG, raised the point that there is a need to differentiate between releasing wild orphan calves that are not trained or human imprinted versus captive, trained elephants. Thailand has reintroduced fully trained captive elephants, and while originally there were problems now the situation is better with no HEC issues. In North East India, orphaned elephants brought into captivity temporarily have been reintroduced to the wild in Manas National Park; the same has occurred in Sri Lanka with orphan calves in Uda Walawe National Park.

Is there a need to reintroduce captive elephants to the wild?

Bangladesh: there is no need at present, but it may be required in the future.

Bhutan: only has a small number of captive elephants, so there is no need.

Cambodia: no need.

China: not at the moment or in the near future as the government wants to protect wild elephants first.

India: there is already an increase in the size of the wild elephant population in country. Additionally, the Forest Department needs elephants and since it is not legally possible to capture them from the wild it is preferable to keep the captive elephants.

Indonesia: the National Elephant Action Plan has a provision to develop a semi-wild open enclosure (temporary managed habitat), but this has not been done yet and needs to be addressed in the update of the National Elephant Action Plan.

Lao PDR: no need.

Malaysia (Peninsular): already has experience releasing captive elephants to the wild. However these elephants go to villages as they are familiar with humans so this poses a danger. There is a need to develop techniques to reintroduce captive elephants to the wild.

Malaysia (Sabah): most captive elephants in this area are from the wild. There is always the intention to release some back to the wild, and they could be released anytime, but this will be a problem as elephants will be less afraid of people and HEC may increase.

Myanmar: manages a large number of captive elephants, but cannot release all these elephants. Some elephants are very reliant on people and will not be able to adapt to the forest. MTE will release/reintroduce some of their captive elephants if approval and funding is available from the government.

Sri Lanka: does not release captive elephants to the wild. But wild orphan calves are released into the wild after spending about 4 years in a “transit home”.

Thailand: has a reintroduction program that started in 1997. Thailand cautions that for any planned reintroduction the HEC issue needs to be carefully considered.

Vietnam: yes there is a need. The biological aspect is a concern (very few males in wild populations). as is the willingness of private owners to release their elephants.

How to deal with locally overabundant elephant populations?

Mr. Hedges stated that this may not be a priority for the majority of the range State governments. However, he noted that the IUCN/SSC AsESG could set up a Working Group to review and modify guidelines, possibly using the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group’s guidelines for the management of locally overabundant elephant population guidelines as a starting point.

India: in North and South Bengal, the number of human deaths by elephants is a major concern and the Chief Wildlife Warden has asked to capture elephants over a 3 year period to control HEC. The thought is that if the dominant elephants are captured, there will be an atmosphere of fear amongst other herd members. But these are controversial issues and need to be dealt with utmost caution in the planning and implementation stages.

Sri Lanka: large areas of land are being cleared both legally and illegally reducing forest cover and leading to increased conflict. The government is working on human-elephant co-existence models

allowing the elephants to use crop land after harvest. During the crop season the agricultural land is fenced off but after harvest the fence is removed to facilitate elephant use and movement.

Thailand: there are 4 forest complexes with high HEC (Eastern forest complex, Dong Prayayen Khao Yai forest complex, Phu-Kheio-Nam Nao forest complex, and Kheang Kra Chan forest complex). There are still large areas but the quality of the habitat is very poor, so elephant habitat improvement programs are being implemented. Habitat is being improved by adding and maintaining grasslands close to permanent water sources. HEC strategies use deterrent methods such as electric fence, trench, guarding, alarm system, beehive fence, etc. However, there is not much information on potential areas that can support elephant populations.

Summary:

- **Most range States felt there was currently no need to reintroduce captive elephants into the wild.**
- **Several range States have or are developing such programs but acknowledge proper planning is essential so that reintroduced elephants do not increase HEC.**
- **Most range States do not have the issue of locally overabundant populations.**

Other issues related to population management:

Malaysia enquired why births of calves in a population are not a good indicator of population growth. Mr. Desai responded that there are several points that need to be understood about why the birth of calves in a population is not a good indicator. First, the inter-calving interval is about 5 years and not all females in a herd have calves in the same year. In some years many of the females may have a calf but in other years very few females may calve. Due to the disparity in body size, calves are less tolerant of stress in the environment so at times calf mortality rates can be high. This mortality rate drops as the calf grows older. After 10 years of age there is less chance of mortality and better survival chances. Hence, one cannot judge a population just in the number of calves noted at any given time.

Malaysia (Sabah) noted that in their region sometimes herds abandon their calves; the question is whether there is any possibility that this is an indication of overpopulation. Mr. Desai replied that calf abandonment happens in high degradation and disturbance situations and is generally not seen in good habitats. If an elephant calf is alone it will follow anything, i.e. humans, a buffalo herd etc., but in cases where there is high density, the abandoned calf will possibly try and follow another elephant herd although it is usually not accepted.

Mr. Hedges observed that in SE Asia the most common situation is when villagers chase elephants from villages and the calves can get separated from their herds. Conflict situations thus lead to abandonment, with calves caught in mud wallows or similar obstacles. In low density populations, when elephant mothers in small groups are killed by poachers the calf is left alone. The reason why mothers abandon a calf in non-conflict scenarios is not clear. At times, it could be the poor health of the calf. More studies would be needed on this issue.

Other population management problems:

A few other problems relating to population management were discussed by the delegates.

India: elephant mortality because of collisions with trains is a major problem since the 1980s with over 260 elephants killed by trains. India is now creating a high speed train corridor and this is a big

challenge. The major reasons for train-related elephant deaths have been identified and the government is working with NGOs and the railways to address them. Mitigation measures include night patrolling of critical stretches, leveling of embankments, clearing of bushes, and developing sensor based animal detection systems. A few of these methods have already been field tested. Signage has also been fixed and the speed of trains reduced in high accident prone areas. Recently issued Guidelines for HEC include various aspects relating to elephant death/injury due to collisions with trains.

Sri Lanka: has a similar problem and is working on sensors to detect animals so they can be driven away from tracks. Sri Lanka is also working on various other initiatives to prevent collisions, i.e. a trial with infra-red cameras, placing stones up to the level of the sleepers to stop elephants going over the tracks, widening curves, and use of modern technology to inform the engine drivers of elephant presence.

Another problem experienced by Sri Lanka is elephants raiding garbage disposal sites. Earlier projects started recycling garbage, but now it is not done as much and even garbage from hospitals, including surgical blades, is eaten by elephants.

Summary:

- **The number of calves in a population is not necessarily a good indicator of population health and growth.**
- **Calf abandonment is not an indicator of over-population.**
- **Elephant mortality rates caused by collisions with trains are high in India and Sri Lanka; various initiatives are being tested to prevent such collisions.**

Priority suggested by The Jakarta Declaration for Asian Elephant Conservation:

Work collaboratively on transboundary issues to allow uninhibited movement of wild Asian Elephants in and between Range States through appropriate corridors and transboundary protected areas.

Funding Schemes for Asian Elephant Conservation - Presented by Dr. Meenakshi Nagendran, USFWS

Funds for conservation work are always needed. As a donor to conservation work and a supporter of the Asian Elephant Range States Meeting, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)'s representative, Dr. Meenakshi Nagendran, offered some insight into funding schemes for Asian elephant conservation.

The USFWS Asian Elephant Conservation Fund supports Asian elephant programs in all 13 range countries. The Act authorizing this Fund was passed by the U.S. Congress in 1997 and signed into law by then President Clinton. The Fund provides support in the form of grants to programs that conserve wild elephants in their range countries. Range country governments and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can receive grants. All projects must be supported by the respective governments, and therefore all grant proposals must be accompanied by a letter of support from the relevant government authority.

In response to Thailand's query whether the funds are only given to NGOs, Dr. Nagendran noted that the funds are also available for government partners. In the past, situations have happened where funds were made available to a range State government agency, but the agency was unable to spend the funds and returned the money. USFWS has a lot of NGO partners; therefore Dr. Nagendran suggested that if a range State government agency wants to accomplish work in a Protected Area, an NGO partner can submit a proposal on behalf of the government agency. Multiple proposals can be submitted. For example USFWS received multiple proposals for MIST (a ranger management program similar to SMART) and all were awarded. If a government agency cannot accept the funds directly (due to law or bureaucracy), they can engage local NGOs to partner with government and undertake the proposed work. However no grants are awarded if a project is not supported by the government.

USFWS receives a lot more proposals than can be approved. On an average, about 50-60 proposals are received each funding cycle. These proposals are critically reviewed by a USFWS committee and, based on reviews, grants are awarded. The grant is typically for a one year performance period, but can be extended to a bit more than one year if required. The number of grants funded depends on funding availability. Typical USFWS grants are about \$50,000-\$60,000 per grant.

Annex 1 – Pre-Meeting Survey Questions



Pre-Meeting Survey Questions 2nd Asian Elephant Range States Meeting Jakarta, Indonesia – April 18 to 20, 2017

Which Asian Elephant Range State do you represent?

Please list the top 3 elephant issues your country would like to discuss during the Asian Elephant Range States Meeting in Jakarta:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Please list the main improvements to elephant conservation in your country since the 2006 meeting:

What are the biggest challenges to elephant conservation in your country?

Please email the completed form to regainfoundation@yahoo.com before April 7, 2017

Annex 2 - Agenda

Agenda Asian Elephant Range States Meeting Jakarta 18-20 April 2017

Time	Activity	Remarks
Day I		
Tuesday, 18 April 2017		
8.00	Registration	
8.30 – 10.00	Opening ceremony 1. General introduction by AsERSM Organizing Committee 2. Keynote Speech Chairman of IUCN-SSC Asian Elephant Specialist Group 3. Welcoming remarks by Ministry 4. Photo session 5. Coffee/Tea Break	Official opening by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry
10.15 – 12.15	Session I: Asian Elephant Conservation Status – Brief Country Reports	Facilitator IUCN-SSC Mr. Vivek Menon
12.15-13.00	Lunch	
13.00-15.00	Session II: Review of 2006 Meeting, discussion points for 2017 Meeting	Facilitator Mr. Ajay Desai
15.00 – 15.15	Coffee/Tea Break	
15.15-17.00	Session III Discussion: Elephant population management; challenges of various landscapes and land use patterns	Facilitator Mr. Tonny Soehartono
Day II		
Wednesday 19 April 2017		
8.30 – 9.30	Session IV Discussion: Human-Elephant Conflict Management Continuation	Facilitator Mr. Ajay Desai
9.30 – 10.30	Session V Discussion: Captive elephant conservation management	Facilitator Ms. Heidi Riddle
10.30 – 10.45	Coffee/Tea Break	

10.45 – 12.15	Session VI Discussion: Initiative for the Asian Elephant Action Plan	Co-Facilitator Mr. Vivek Menon Mr. Tonny Soehartono
12.15 - 13.00	Lunch	
13.00 – 15.00	Session VII Discussion: Poaching and Illegal Trade	Facilitator Mr. Widodo Ramono
15.00 -15.15	Coffee/Tea Break	
15.15 – 17.00	Session VIII Discussion: Habitat conservation	Facilitator Mr. Simon Hedges
Day III		
Thursday 20 April 2017		
8.30 – 10.30	Session IX Discussion: Population management	Co-Facilitator Mr. Ajay Desai Mr. Widodo Ramono
10.30 -10.45	Coffee/Tea Break	
10.45 – 12.30	Session X Discussion: Finalize “The Jakarta Declaration of Asian Elephant Conservation”	Co-Facilitator Mr. Simon Hedges Mr. Tonny Soehartono
12.30 – 13.30	Lunch	
13.30 – 15.00	Session XI Discussion: Funding schemes for Asian elephant conservation	USFWS
15.00 – 15.15	Coffee/Tea Break	
19.00 - finish	Signing Ceremony Agenda for Signing Ceremony • Cultural performance • Remarks and Meeting Recommendation by IUCN – SSC • Presentation and video by EU • Cultural performance • Reading and Signing of “The Jakarta Declaration of Asian Elephant Conservation” by delegates, witnessed by the Minister of Environment and Forestry and invited officials including donors • Remarks by the Minister of Environment and Forestry	Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Annex 3 – AsERSM Participant List

Bangladesh

Mr. Md. Ali Kabir, Divisional Forest Officer Cox's Bazar, Bangladesh Forest Department
Mr. A. N. M. Abdul Wadud, Divisional Forest Officer Chittagong, Bangladesh Forest Department

Bhutan

Mr. Dorji Rabten, Park Manager, Phibsoo Wildlife Sanctuary, Department of Forests and Park Services
Mr. Phub Dhendup, Divisional Forest Officer, Department of Forests and Park Services

Cambodia

Mr. Meas Sophal, Deputy Director General, Directorate of Department of Administration for Nature Conservation and Protection
Mr. Prum Sovanna, Staff, Environmental Department Mondulkiri Province

China

Dr. Jin Kun, Director General, Office of Wildlife Conservation, Ministry of State Forestry Administration
Dr. Chen Difei, Senior Officer, Department of Wildlife Conservation, Ministry of State Forestry Administration
Dr. Shi Kun, Professor, Beijing Forestry University
Mr. Zhang Shanning, Division Director, CITES China

India

Mr. R.K. Srivastava, Inspector General of Forests (Project Elephant), Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change

Lao PDR

Mr. Sangvane Bouavong, Director, Wildlife and Aquatic Management Division, Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Mr. Phayvieng Vongkhamheng, Technical Staff, Sustainable Forest and Land Management, Ministry of Environment and Forestry

Malaysia (Peninsular)

Mr. Abdul Kadir bin Abu Hashim, Director General, Department of Wildlife and National Parks
Mr. Salman bin Saaban, Director of Enforcement Division, Department of Wildlife and National Parks

Malaysia (Sabah)

Mr. Augustine Tuuga, Director General, Sabah Wildlife Department
Mr. Hussein Muin, Wildlife Officer, Sabah Wildlife Department

Myanmar

Mr. Maung Maung Naing, Assistant Director, Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation
Mr. Pyae Phyo Swe, Director's Office, Nature and Wildlife Conservation Division, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environmental Conservation
Mr. Aye Cho Taung, Managing Director, Myanmar Timber Enterprise
Dr. Zaw Min Oo, Veterinary Manager, Myanmar Timber Enterprise

Sri Lanka

Mr. W.S.K. Pathirathne, Director General, Department of Wildlife Conservation
Mr. P.G.D.J. Pebotuwa, Assistant Director (Elephant Conservation), Department of Wildlife Conservation

Thailand

Mr. Supagit Vinitpornawan, Forestry Technical Officer, Wildlife Conservation Office
Ms. Daraporn Chairat, Forestry Technical Officer, Division of Wild Fauna and Flora Protection

Vietnam

Mr. Nguyen Vu Linh, Deputy Director, Department of Nature Conservation
Mr. Nguyen Van Doan, Vietnam CITES Office

Indonesia

Mr. Bambang Dahono Aji, Direktur KKH
Mr. Puja Utama, Kasubdit Pengawetan Jenis, Direktorat KKH
Kepala Balai Besar KSDA Riau
Kepala Balai Besar TN Gunung Leuser
Kepala Balai Besar TN Kerinci Seblat (Kepala Balai Besar)
Kepala Balai Besar TN Kerinci Seblat (Staff)
Kepala Balai Besar TN Bukit Barisan Selatan
Kepala Balai KSDA Aceh
Kepala Balai KSDA Sumatera Utara
Kepala Balai KSDA Jambi
Kepala Balai KSDA Bengkulu
Kepala Balai KSDA Sumatera Selatan
Kepala Balai KSDA Kalimantan Timur
Kepala Balai TN Tesso Nilo
Kepala Balai TN Way Kambas (Kepala Balai)
Kepala Balai TN Way Kambas (Staff)
Direktorat Penerapan Konvensi Internasional, Direktorat KKH (Ka.Sub Dit)
Direktorat Penerapan Konvensi Internasional, Direktorat KKH (Staff)
Protokoler KEMLU
Protokoler KEMLU
Direktorat Hukum dan Perjanjian Ekonomi
Direktorat Asia Timur dan Pasifik (Staff)
Direktorat Asia Timur dan Pasifik (Kasubdit)
Prof. Dr. Sarwono Kusuma Atmaja
Dr. Efransyah
Dr. Wahjudi Wardoyo
Ms. Hanni Adiaty
Mr. Nuril Hakim Yohansyah
Mr. Nova Harifan
Mr. Hariadi Himawan
Mr. Pramu Risanto

Mr. Kelik Wirawan
Mr. Sonny Partono
Direktur Bina Pengelolaan Ekosistem Esensial, Ditjen KSDAE
Direktur Pemolaan dan Informasi Konservasi Alam, Ditjen KSDAE
Direktur Pemanfaatan Jasa Lingkungan Hutan Konservasi, Ditjen KSDAE
Direktur Kawasan Konservasi, Ditjen KSDAE
Direktur Konservasi Keanekaragaman Hayati, Ditjen KSDAE
Direktur Perjanjian Internasional Sosial Budaya, Kementerian Luar Negeri
Direktur Pembangunan Ekonomi dan Lingkungan Hidup, Kementerian Luar Negeri
Direktur Kerjasama Intrakawasan dan Antarkawasan Asia Pasifik dan Afrika, Kementerian Luar Negeri
Direktur Pencegahan dan Penanganan Hutan
Kepala Biro Hubungan Masyarakat, Kementerian LHK
Kepala Biro Kerjasama Luar Negeri, Kementerian LHK
Kepala Pusat Penelitian Biologi LIPI

IUCN-SSC AsESG

Mr. Vivek Menon, Chair, AsESG
Mr. Ajay Desai, past Co-Chair, AsESG
Mr. Simon Hedges, past Co-Chair, AsESG
Mr. Sandeep Kumar Tiwari, Programme Manager, AsESG

Organizing Committee AsERSM

Mr. Bambang Dahono Aji, Direktur KKH
Mr. Puja Utama, Kasubdit Pengawetan Jenis, Direktorat KKH
Ms. Desy Satya C., Kasie Pengawetan Insitu
Mr. Drajat Dwihartono, KKH
Ms. Firda Maftukha H, KKH
Ms. Fitty Machmudah, KKH
Mr. Widodo S. Ramono, KKH
Mr. Tonny Soehartono, KKH
Mr. Wahdi Azmi, Regain Foundation
Ms. Fithria Edhi, Regain Foundation
Ms. Diah Lestari, Regain Foundation
Mr. Gaius Wilson, Regain Foundation
Ms. Deborah Olson, International Elephant Foundation
Ms. Heidi Riddle, International Elephant Foundation
Mr. Donny Gunaryadi, FKGI
Mr. Wishnu Sukmantoro, FKGI
Mr. Sunarto, FKGI
Ms. Nurzhafarina Othman, Volunteer



THE JAKARTA DECLARATION FOR ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION

WE, THE REPRESENTATIVES OF THE RELEVANT AGENCIES FROM ASIAN ELEPHANT RANGE STATES INCLUDING THE KINGDOM OF BHUTAN, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH, KINGDOM OF CAMBODIA, PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA, REPUBLIC OF INDIA, REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA, LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC, FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF NEPAL, DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF SRI LANKA, REPUBLIC OF THE UNION OF MYANMAR, MALAYSIA, KINGDOM OF THAILAND, AND THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM, DECLARE OUR COMMON GOAL TO CONSERVE THE ASIAN ELEPHANT IN ALL ASIAN ELEPHANT RANGE STATES, AND:

RECOGNIZE THAT THE ASIAN ELEPHANT, A SERIOUSLY ENDANGERED SPECIES AND ONE OF ASIA'S MOST CHARISMATIC ANIMALS, FACES A CHALLENGING FUTURE WITH THE LOSS OF ITS HABITAT, FRAGMENTED POPULATIONS, HIGH LEVELS OF HUMAN-ELEPHANT CONFLICT, POACHING, AS WELL AS OTHER FACTORS THAT HAVE RESULTED IN SERIOUS POPULATION DECLINES IN MOST OF THE RANGE STATES;

NOTE THAT COMPARED TO THE MORE FREQUENTLY PUBLICIZED AFRICAN ELEPHANT THERE ARE TEN TIMES FEWER ASIAN ELEPHANTS, AND LIKE THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT, SOME ASIAN ELEPHANT RANGE STATES FACE THE LOSS OF THEIR ELEPHANT POPULATIONS;

ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THE ASIAN ELEPHANT IS A KEYSTONE SPECIES AND AN UMBRELLA SPECIES WHOSE CONSERVATION HELPS ENSURE THE CONSERVATION OF MYRIADS OF OTHER SPECIES. ASIAN ELEPHANTS ARE ALSO CULTURALLY SIGNIFICANT ACROSS ASIA. A FAILURE TO PROTECT ASIAN ELEPHANTS AND THEIR HABITAT WILL THEREFORE NOT ONLY RESULT IN THE LOSS OF ELEPHANTS BUT ALSO THE LOSS OF BIOLOGICAL AND CULTURAL DIVERSITY AND THE TANGIBLE AND INTANGIBLE BENEFITS PROVIDED BY ELEPHANTS AND THE ECOSYSTEMS THEY INHABIT;

NOTE THAT WHILE ELEPHANT CONSERVATION IS PRIMARILY A NATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, THERE IS AN URGENT NEED TO SYNERGIZE NATIONAL ACTIONS WITH INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION AMONGST THE RANGE STATES FOR THE LONG-TERM CONSERVATION OF ASIAN ELEPHANTS. THE REVERSAL OF THE CRISIS FACING ASIAN ELEPHANTS IS ADDITIONALLY DEPENDENT UPON POLITICAL, FINANCIAL, AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT FROM THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY;

UNDERSTAND THE ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS ON THE CONSERVATION OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND PROTECTION OF RARE AND ENDANGERED SPECIES, INCLUDING THE ASIAN ELEPHANT, SUCH AS THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA (CITES), THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY (CBD), AND THE CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF MIGRATORY SPECIES OF WILD ANIMALS (CMS);

ACKNOWLEDGE THE PRESENCE AND SUPPORT OF OTHER GOVERNMENTS, INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS, NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS, AND OTHER SUPPORTERS OF ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION.

THUS WE DECLARE:

- **WE HAVE A COMMON VISION TO PROMOTE ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION;**
- **AFFIRM OUR INTENTION TO COOPERATE BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND THROUGH RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT, EDUCATION AND TRAINING, FUND-RAISING, AS WELL AS OTHER ACTIVITIES THAT ARE RELEVANT TO ASIAN ELEPHANT CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT WITHIN THE RANGE STATES;**
- **COMMIT TO DEVELOP WHERE NECESSARY, AND IMPLEMENT OUR NATIONAL ASIAN ELEPHANT ACTION PLANS THAT INCLUDE, BUT ARE NOT LIMITED TO, THE PRIORITIES LISTED IN THE ANNEX TO THIS DECLARATION.**

AND CALL UPON THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY TO JOIN US IN REVERSING THE DECLINE IN ASIAN ELEPHANT NUMBERS AND POSITIONING THE ASIAN ELEPHANT SECURELY ON THE ROAD TO RECOVERY.

