
Those countries with no sites listed did not have members from their countries present at the meeting, and members present did not feel comfortable prioritising sites for them. Hence, there is no information for those countries. However, those countries with

members have been sent the same form which was filled out at the meeting and they have been asked to carry out the same exercise which was done at the meeting. These sites will be added as responses are received.

SESSION TITLE: HUMAN-ELEPHANT CONFLICT TASK FORCE (HETF)

Chair: K Okoumassou

Rapporteurs: J Ononanga, E Bossou

PRESENTATION: HUMAN - ELEPHANT CONFLICT BIBLIOGRAPHY

The HETF has put together a bibliography of material on all aspects of human-elephant conflict. This

bibliography is available from the AfESG Secretariat on demand.

DISCUSSION OF HETF TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Human-Elephant Conflict Task Force (HETF) is concerned with all issues surrounding the collection and analyses of data, and research related to human-elephant conflict carried out by the African Elephant Specialist Group (AfESG).

As agreed to by the Group, the HETF members are suggested by the AfESG Chair and presented to the members of the Specialist Group for approval each triennium or meeting. If the need arises, the Chair can appoint an acting HETF member until the time arises when the acting member's services are no longer required. The Chair of the Task Force is appointed from within.

All members of the HETF must be actively involved in human-elephant conflict work.

The members of the Task Force are as follows:

Richard Hoare, Chair
Sam Kasiki
Sally Lahm
Moses Kofi Sam
Martin Tchamba
Greg Overton, Secretary

SESSION TITLE: CAPTIVE BREEDING OF ELEPHANTS

Chair: J Waithaka

Rapporteurs: L Osborne, L Saiwana

With increasing frequency, zoos/captive breeding facilities are arguing that their maintenance of African elephants is primarily for elephant conservation reasons

and not primarily to generate viewing revenues. Therefore the AfESG is being asked more and more to make technical statements/judgements as to their worth. A

number of members expressed discomfort with this. Therefore we solicited American Zoos Association for their view. A paper from Michael Hutchins was written for the Group on the subject which was discussed at the meeting.

The AfESG membership debated the role played by captive facilities in the conservation of the African elephant. The Group agreed on the following points which it asked the Chair to present formally to the American Zoos Association:

- AfESG recognises there is some role for captive facilities in the conservation of African elephants, through the fields of public education, scientific research, development of technologies, professional training and direct support to the conservation of the species in the field.
- AfESG also recognises the role that zoos and zoological societies play in mobilising public support for funding of these activities.

- However, the AfESG is concerned by the poor breeding success and low life expectancy of captive African elephants and does not see any contribution to the effective conservation of the species through captive breeding per se.
- Where African elephants are held in captivity, the AfESG believes that special care should be accorded to their physical and psychological well being.
- AfESG encourages captive facilities to maintain and expand field programmes directed to African elephant populations in African Range States, but wishes to point out that the holding of African elephants by a captive facility is not a necessary precursor for involvement in *in situ* African elephant conservation.

SESSION TITLE: A REVISIT TO THE IUCN RED LISTING OF THE AFRICAN ELEPHANT

Chair: N Leader-Williams

Rapporteurs: S Mainka, M K Sam

The Group agreed in 1996 that the African elephant should be listed as Endangered under the new IUCN Red Listing criteria. This listing was subsequently published by IUCN in Baillie and Groombridge (1996). However, a petition was received from Jon Hutton of the Africa Resources Trust that this listing was not appropriate, particularly for southern Africa, where many elephant populations were increasing and/or were strictly managed. Under procedures currently being developed by IUCN for appealing against listings, the first step in the process is for the listing authority, in this case the Group, to consider the merits of the petitioner's case, and determine if the listing should be revised.

Through debate, the only realistic alternative listing for the African elephant was in the category of Data Deficient. This was discussed at great length because, in the case of the African elephant, the current Red List criteria require that the population trend should be examined over 60 years, whereas the first continental estimate dates back only to 1979. Discussions centred on whether the moving window approach was valid for looking at these data.

Further discussions examined whether the taxonomy of the African elephant might be revised into two species, and therefore in future be listed separately. This was dismissed as a current consideration, as review of the data regarding genetic differences between the forest and savanna elephant is still ongoing.

After considerable debate, the Group decided by simple majority that the African elephant should remain listed as Endangered. This decision was reached for the following reasons:

- the new criteria for listing all species are currently under a process of further review by IUCN;
- under these criteria, most difficulty has been encountered in listing long-lived or widely distributed, but differentially impacted species, for which there is no clear evidence of declines over three generation lengths;
- the present criteria do not allow for national and regional listing; and,
- the various continental elephant estimates from 1979