

*Conservation
of
Sahelo-Saharan Antelope*

***Final report from:
A Meeting held at the Marwell Zoological Park
May 9-10, 2000***

***Funding generously provided by:
Marwell Zoological Park, UK
National Zoological Park, USA
The Living Desert, USA***

Sahelo-Saharan Antelope Meeting

Introduction

Aridlands antelope are considered keystone species, essential for the maintenance of biodiversity in the Sahelo-Saharan zone. Human activities have resulted in the decline or extinction of these antelope across their entire historic range. In contrast, captive populations of aridlands antelope are generally thriving as a result of cooperative efforts among North American and European zoos. The zoological community has developed a tremendous biological database on antelope across a broad array of disciplines including animal husbandry, management, nutrition, reproduction, genetics, behavior and animal health. As leaders in captive animal propagation, management, and conservation education, zoos now are seeking to form proactive, multidisciplinary partnerships with NGOs and range country governments to facilitate the development and implementation of effective *in situ* restoration and reintroduction programs for aridlands antelope.

In February 1998 official delegations from Sahelo-Saharan range states and antelope experts from around the world participated in a *Workshop on the Restoration and Conservation of Sahelo-Saharan Antelopes*, convened in Djerba Tunisia under the auspices of the United Nations Environmental Program's (UNEP) Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). Presentations on the historical status of antelopes, range state reports and case studies were presented, and working groups discussed 6 topics: 1) Desert Habitats; 2) Captive Breeding and Re-introduction; 3) Research and Monitoring; 4) Capacity Building and Training; 5) Sustainable Use and Economic Development; and 6) Development and Funding of National Projects. *Draft Status Reports* and a *Draft Action Plan* were presented discussed and revised; a final Action Plan document was completed and distributed in 1999. Since the Djerba meeting, significant progress has been made in supporting and/or initiating reintroduction projects in Morocco (Souss-Massa), Tunisia (Bou Hedma, Sidi Toui), and Senegal (Guembeul Nature Reserve).

Background Leading up to the Marwell Meeting

It is recognized that range country buy-in and participation is central to the success of any restoration or reintroduction program involving aridlands antelope. However, zoos and conservation organizations are well-positioned to provide technical and financial support, as well as animals, to range countries seeking to bolster aridlands antelope conservation efforts. *Thus, the Marwell meeting was intentionally narrow in scope and was designed to begin discussion about the specific roles that the world's zoos, along with partner organizations, can play in aridlands antelope conservation in the immediate, near and long-term.* The list of invitees was not comprehensive and it was anticipated that many other potential partners and/or interest groups were likely to be identified and invited to participate in future discussions.

A number of zoo and conservation professionals attended the 1998 Djerba meeting. Several of these individuals (John Newby, Frank Reitkerk, Mar Cano and Teresa Abaigar) were invited to attend the annual American Zoo and Aquarium Association's (AZA) Antelope Taxon Advisory Group (TAG) meeting held at Bamberger Ranch in Texas in the spring of 1998. Together with three North Americans (Alan Rost, Terrie Correll and Steve Monfort), these individuals provided the TAG membership with a review of the Djerba meeting and gauged the TAG's interest in becoming involved in

Sahelo-Saharan antelope conservation initiatives. There was tremendous enthusiasm from the TAG membership to become more closely linked with their European counterparts (EAZA; European Association of Zoos and Aquariums) and non-governmental organizations (i.e., WWF) in formulating conservation strategies for Sahelo-Saharan antelope. As an outcome of the 1998 Antelope TAG meeting, Terrie Correll (the Living Desert) and Steve Monfort (National Zoological Park) were tasked with pursuing opportunities for the TAG to become involved in long-term restoration and reintroduction projects for Sahelo-Saharan species.

Little progress was achieved in the subsequent 12 months, in large part, because there was a reluctance to act until it was clear how CMS intended to implement their draft Action Plan (a final Action Plan was not distributed until 1999). At the 1999 AZA Antelope TAG meeting, members expressed concern that CMS had not solicited assistance from zoo and conservation professionals. Steve Monfort agreed to organize a meeting with international zoo and conservation NGOs to how joint progress could be made to implement Sahelo-Saharan reintroduction and restoration programs. Attempts to organize a meeting in 1999 were unsuccessful, but a meeting date was set for May 2000 with the venue being the Marwell Zoo. Invited participants (see list below) were chosen to represent the North American and European zoo communities as well as a select group of NGOs. All of the "Western" zoo and conservation professionals that attended the Djerba conference were invited to attend the Marwell meeting. Among the participants were representatives from the AZA, EAZA, WWF, IUCN Specialists Groups (Antelope Specialists Group, Reintroduction Specialists Group, Conservation Breeding Specialists Group) and the Convention on Migratory Species.

Purpose of the Marwell Meeting

Worldwide, zoos attract hundreds of millions of visitors each year and they are an ideal vehicle for stimulating public awareness about aridlands antelope conservation issues. The challenge is to develop new mechanisms for effectively linking *ex situ* and *in situ* conservation strategies being undertaken by diverse interest groups, including zoos, NGOs, international aid organizations and governments. To achieve greater success, zoo and conservation organizations must unite in a common effort to conserve and/or re-establish viable populations of aridlands antelope in nature. A consortium (or interest group) of zoos, non-governmental conservation organizations, and international aid organizations could work to implement and/or expand the efforts of the CMS in assisting range country governments with the implementation of aridlands antelope restoration and reintroduction programs. An aridlands antelope interest group could combine collective strengths to: 1) support ongoing aridlands antelope conservation programs; 2) examine the potential for new projects and initiatives; and 3) provide technical and financial support, as well as animals for existing and future re-introduction programs.

Thus, the purpose of the Marwell meeting was to determine how the participants and their constituents could move quickly to begin to implement effective *in situ* restoration and reintroduction programs for Sahelo-Saharan antelope. There was an *a priori* assumption that the represented parties possessed the "capacity" to solve existing conservation problems, and that further delays in implementing action steps were undesirable. A core question related to whether zoos, NGOs and international aid organizations could, in fact, be more effective by working collectively to conserve aridlands antelope, rather than as independent agents. And, if the answer was yes, what sorts of efforts were most likely to be most successful, and under what circumstances.

We also sought to determine whether this group should become formalized as an “interest group” specifically focused on Sahelo-Saharan antelope.

Before developing action steps the group was asked to use their collective knowledge about Sahelo-Saharan antelope to: 1) summarize the status of these species in the wild and in captivity; 2) discuss the Djerba Declaration and its implications for Sahelo-Saharan antelope conservation; 3) summarize the current status of ongoing *in situ* projects; 4) discuss lessons learned from ongoing projects; 5) discuss the major conservation problems facing these antelope; and to 6) develop a consensus vision. Following these important steps, participants suggested specific action steps that could realistically be implemented in the next year.

Special Thanks!

The meeting benefited from the outstanding facilitation skills provided by Mark Stanley Price. We are extremely grateful to our gracious host, John Knowles, Founder and Director of the Marwell Zoological Park. Special thanks also are due to Simon Wakefield and Renata Molcanova for organizing the meeting logistics, as well as many Marwell Zoo volunteers whom made the meeting both enjoyable and productive. Finally, many thanks to the National Zoological Park (USA) and the Living Desert (USA) for funding the costs related to meeting facilitation and production of this report.

Meeting Outputs

Part I: Status of Sahelo-Saharan species in the wild

Current status of Sahara-Sahelo Species

(listed in consensus rank order of conservation priority)

Note: Information was compiled based on the latest information and/or best judgement of expert participants.

- 1. Scimitar-horned oryx:** Recent reports of small numbers of animals in Niger and Chad.
- 2. Addax:** 30-50 animals remaining in Niger. Several dozen to 200 animals in Mali and Mauritania.
- 3. Dama gazelle:** Small numbers of animals in Mauritania, Senegal, Niger, and Southern Algeria. Can perhaps be best classified as having a wide range at very low densities.
- 4. Slender-horned gazelle:** Southern Tunisia and Algeria in the Great Erg. This is considered a very important population, but there is no information available.
- 5. Cuvier’s gazelle:** Viable populations in Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco; they also are considered “colonizers” and their status can be classified as improving.
- 6. Barbary sheep (Ammotragus):** Huge viable populations (thousands of animals) in Hoggar, Tassili, and into Libya. The species has a wide range and seems to thrive well in areas with abundant habitat; however, small populations may be declining. Overall, species is abundant but is probably “contracting” across its entire range.
- 7. Dorcas gazelle:** Some animals in Mauritania, but can probably be classified as having many viable populations in countries like Sudan, Chad and Niger. This species is considered a “colonizer” or “explorer” species that can be readily re-established.

Part II: Status of Sahelo-Saharan species in captivity

Captive population status

Important considerations:

- ◆ Taxonomy (subspecies issues)
- ◆ Disease considerations
- ◆ For some antelope, little is known about their basic biology and life history requirements; this can be seen as a problem and an opportunity for research
- ◆ Captive breeding has been low for some antelope because they are not considered charismatic. Paradoxically, there is an overabundance of some antelope (e.g., scimitar-horned oryx) in captivity
- ◆ The number of founders in captive populations is very low

1. Scimitar-horned oryx (30-40 founders worldwide)

North America-managed	250
Europe	300
Other worldwide-managed	300
Global-unmanaged	<u>2500</u>
Total	3350

2. Addax (13 founders worldwide)

North America-managed	250
Europe	300
Other worldwide-managed	300
Global-unmanaged	<u>2500</u>
Total	3350

3. Dama gazelle

Mhorr (12 founders)

North America-managed	100
Europe	160
Other-unmanaged in Texas	100's
South Africa	10
Middle East	<u>40</u>
Total	>>500

Ruficollis **Total** 25 from one site

4. Slender-horned gazelle (3 founders)

North America-managed	120
Europe	20
Other-unmanaged in Texas	100's
South Africa	10
Middle East	<u>40</u>
Total	>>300

6. Dorcas gazelle (*D. neglecta*, 20 founders from Western Sudan)

USA/Europe	170
Saudi Arabia	30
Tunisia	100
Morocco	<u>300</u>
Total	600

7. Cuvier's gazelle (4 founders)

North America-managed	100
Europe	70
Algeria	15 (wild-caught)
Other-unmanaged in Texas	<u>100's</u>
Total	>>500

8. Barbary sheep

A. sahariensis (2 founders)	140
Tunisia	9
Many other animals in zoos of unknown genetics	
Total	>>250

Part III: Review of Djerba Declaration

Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht: The finalized CMS Action Plan document was published in 1999 to serve as a document output from the Conference of the Parties of the Convention (in South Africa last October). A letter will be written to organizations (World Bank, UNEP etc.) to draw attention to work being conducted under the CMS Action Plan. This will be a call for an integrated approach for the recovery of species throughout their entire range. The letter needs also to be addressed to range country partners to keep them engaged, and to meet their commitments and responsibilities. The "Working Group" of the CMS has not been activated, but it is hoped that this meeting may be a catalyst for creating a functioning group. There has been no progress in the development of an agreement among the range states (this was stipulated as a follow-up priority action at the Djerba meeting), and it is unlikely that this will be resolved within the next 12 months. There is an effort being made to connect CMS antelope initiatives with overall biodiversity issues and GEF funding. There is a need to develop the capacity of expertise to develop such comprehensive proposals.

Rosaline B Beudels-Jamars: Mid-1998 attempts were made to seek GEF funding for projects in Tunisia from the French GEF (FFEM), and a project brief was submitted. The project reflects the action plan for Tunisia in a narrative format. Focus on the support of the 5 national parks in Tunisia with a budget of 1.8 million euros (this requires in-kind support from Tunisia). The second stage is for a French organization to become the lead organization; thus project submission was made under the CMS, and this was accepted. Tunisia is the focus of the project and would received approximately 50% of the budget; 5 other countries would benefit from the other half (Chad, Niger, Mali, Senegal, Mauritania).

John Newby: Stressed the importance of organizing and constituting the working group and defining its structure and function.

There was general discussion about how CMS priorities would be merged with the general needs articulated by the meeting participants.

Part IV: Current status of ongoing Sahelo-Saharan projects in situ

Summary of current range country efforts:

Country	Species	(Semi-free)-captive	Participants	Status	Constraints	Objectives
Tunisia	Scimitar-horned oryx	Sidi Toui (14)	CMS Flemish govt. Bratislava Marwell Zoo EEP	ongoing	lack of skills unclear endpoint	free-range genetic world herd in Tunisia
		Bou Hedma (100)	none	ongoing	lack of skills	reintroduction
	Addax	Bou Hedma (50)	none	ongoing	poor monitoring out-of-range poor management	animals for future translocation
	Dama	Bou Hedma (30)	CSIC	ongoing	poor monitoring out-of-range over-grazing	establish a captive population for research
	Cuvier's	Bou Kornine NP (17)	CSIC Spanish Govt.	ongoing	none	release into park for new population
	Dorcas	Dghoumes NP(#?)	none	ongoing	none	reintroduction
	Slender-Horned	Sidi Toui (3)	CMS Flemish govt. Bratislava Marwell Zoo EEP	ongoing	out-of-range unmanaged few founders	translocation for reintroduction confiscated animals for in situ support
	Barbary Sheep	Wild caught (5)	none	ongoing	few founders	release on site for reintroduction confiscated animals for in situ support

Summary of current range country efforts (continued):

Country	Species	(Semi-free)-captive	Participants	Status	Constraints	Objectives
Morocco						
	Addax	Souss Massa (150) 69 captive	GTZ Moroccan Govt. EEP	ongoing	out-of-range	translocation to Bas Draa
	Dama (mhorrr)	Souss Massa (20) 21 captive	GTZ Moroccan Govt . EEP	ongoing	out-of-range not managed	translocation to Bas Draa in situ breeding
		R'Mila (14) 21 captive	GTZ Moroccan Govt. CSIC CIC	ongoing	out-of-range not managed	translocation to Bas Draa in situ breeding
	Dorcas	Souss Massa (300) 152 captive	GTZ Moroccan Govt. EEP	ongoing	not sure	reintroduction in situ breeding
Senegal						
	Dama (mhorrr)	Geumbuel (32)	CSIC 29 captive	ongoing	inbreeding	release into Ferlo NP supplemental feeding high costs
	Scimitar-horned oryx	Geumbuel (0) 10 captive	Israel	ongoing	current conservation status of Ferlo NP	release into Ferlo NP
Niger						
	ongoing surveys all desert species	none	WWF ZSL	ongoing (planned)	lack of funds	assessment of wild status
Chad						
	ongoing surveys as above?	none	WWF ZSL	ongoing (planned)	lack of funds	assessment of wild status

all desert species

Summary of current range country efforts (continued):

Country	Species	(Semi-free)-captive	Participants	Status	Constraints	Objectives
Libya	Scimitar-horned oryx	20 captive from UAE Sheik	private	unknown	unknown	unknown
Egypt	Gazella sp.	Proposed captive Breeding Center	Italian Aid EEAA/IUCN	proposed	lack of definition	unresolved
	Scimitar-horned oryx	Proposed captive Breeding Center	Italian Aid EEAA/IUCN	proposed	habitat viability	reintroduction

Key:

CSIC: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Cientificas

CIC: Conseil International de la Chasse

FFEM/ONC: Fonds Francais Pour L'Environnement Mondial/Office National de la Chasse

GTZ: German Technical Institute

EEAA: Egyptian Environmental Aid Agency

ZSL: Zoological Society of London

CMS: Convention on Migratory Species

EEP: European Endangered Species Program

WWF: World Wildlife Fund

IUCN: International Union for the Conservation of Nature

UAE: United Arab Emirates

V: Lessons from ongoing projects

1. Country

- ◆ Good contacts required in-country to promote project
- ◆ Countries are not evenly distributed across Sahelo-Saharan range
- ◆ Projects “snowball” within countries
- ◆ Eco-tourism is a consideration for promoting projects
- ◆ Political stability has enhanced project success
- ◆ Potential economic benefits of projects has been an important factor for generating in-country support

2. Species

- ◆ Projects have focused on species that already are thriving in captivity
- ◆ On-going projects focus on the rarest species

3. Projects

- ◆ Project success has relied upon a “champion”
- ◆ Opportunism has been very important
- ◆ Projects have been shaped by existing in-country infrastructure
- ◆ The issue of long-term project sustainability is a concern
- ◆ Some projects have lacked rigorous planning
- ◆ Scientific rigor (design, implementation and follow-through) has been lacking in most projects
- ◆ There has been a lack of financial support by conservation organizations (NGOs etc.)
- ◆ Performance measures have not been well-defined, and projects have not been rigorously evaluated

VI: Conservation problems facing Sahelo-Saharan antelope

1. Conservation issues have a low priority range countries

Decision-makers/politicians

- ◆ Lack of information about conservation issues
- ◆ Limited financial resources push conservation down priority list
- ◆ Lack of long-term vision regarding the importance of conservation of biodiversity
- ◆ Lack of clearly defined incentives (financial and otherwise) for conservation action

General Public

- ◆ Lack of awareness about the importance of conserving biodiversity
- ◆ Public has become disconnected from nature
- ◆ Conservation is considered less important than socioeconomic gain (i.e., poverty versus biodiversity)
- ◆ People versus wildlife conflicts often related to economics

Communication and coordination

- ◆ No centralized resource or organization for information
- ◆ No clear understanding of who the stakeholders are
- ◆ No coordination mechanism within range states
- ◆ No mechanism for disseminating information
- ◆ Language-communication problems among external partners and range states
- ◆ There is a lack of willingness to be “coordinated”, both by range state collaborators and external partners

2. Lack of Skills in Range Countries, including

- ◆ Animal management, husbandry, and animal health
- ◆ Wildlife and ecosystem management
- ◆ Communication and problem-solving skills
- ◆ Research and science capacity

3. Political Instability

- ◆ Lack of interest in living natural resources
 - Ø Leads to lack of commitment
 - Ø Creates resistance in the donor community to fund projects
- ◆ Creates unsafe working conditions in range countries
- ◆ Frequent turnover of relevant political authorities
 - Ø Disruption of project continuity and political support
 - Ø Lack of decision-making related to project
 - Ø Short-term involvement by government officials increases likelihood of corruption

4. Lack of Human Resources

- ◆ Personnel
 - Ø Expatriate acceptability can be a problem
 - Ø Patriates often lack technical and administrative skills
- ◆ Funds
 - Ø Poor availability due to low priority given to conservation
 - Ø Excessive administrative and accounting procedures
 - Ø Lack of confidence due to:
- ◆ Inadequate project design
- ◆ No track record of success/achievement
- ◆ Political instability
- ◆ Excessive project development requirements
 - Ø Funds often simply unavailable
- ◆ Infrastructure
 - Ø Project sites are remote
 - Ø Working conditions are often difficult
 - Ø Project expenses are high
- ◆ Animals
 - Ø Suitable animals for reintroduction often not available
 - Ø Logistics of animal transport can impose limitations on projects

5. Lack of Natural Resources:

- ◆ Sahel
 - Ø Increasing human populations
 - Ø Habitat degradation
- ◆ Mahgreb
 - Ø Socioeconomic future will dictate degree of habitat degradation
 - Ø Human population increase could increase degradation
 - Ø Increased urbanization may relieve pressure on habitat
- ◆ Unsustainable use of resources and lack of political will to solve problem
- ◆ Not enough demonstration zones (e.g., national parks)
- ◆ Poor development plans
- ◆ Changing land-use patterns
- ◆ “Short-vision” utilization of resources
- ◆ No political will for law enforcement
- ◆ Individual financial profit of wildlife and its habitat (e.g., land tenure organizations)
- ◆ Lack of information on species and their requirements
- ◆ Very low *in situ* populations and poor founder representation in captive populations

VII: Development of a consensus vision statement

An Addax in every erg

A gazelle in every gulch

A bustard behind every bush

- ◆ That the Sahelo-Saharan antelope species exist in numbers that are self-supporting, and are spread between sites which are distributed across their former natural ranges, and which are connected and well-protected
- ◆ That the antelope species occupy areas of effectively conserved or restored habitats in which ecological processes function, and overall biodiversity status is improved
- ◆ That all sectors of society in the antelope range states support the conservation of their natural resource heritage because of the existence of adequate incentives and benefits, including from sustainable use.

VIII: Sahelo-Saharan Antelope Conservation Programs

Need to consider:

- ◆ Institutional preferences by country and by activity
- ◆ Priority needs by country
- ◆ Lessons learned and factors that lead to success
- ◆ Concept and project design
- ◆ Funding and expertise
- ◆ Coordination
- ◆ Bringing in new resources
- ◆ Needs assessments

- ◆ How project will promote aridlands conservation

Criteria for project selection:

- ◆ Reintroduction component
- ◆ High local demand and support
- ◆ High chance of success
- ◆ Sustainability
- ◆ Likelihood of obtaining funding
- ◆ Opportunity for replication—can project serve as a model
- ◆ Project would increase awareness about broader conservation issues
- ◆ Must focus on capacity building
- ◆ Project should demonstrate best practices

With respect to Sahelo-Saharan conservation efforts, there was consensus among Marwell participants regarding the following:

- ◆ The Djerba Action Plan was an effective first step critical for identifying general priorities that should be followed.
- ◆ The summary analysis provided by John Newby (see attached) provided useful supplemental information regarding the status and priority ranking for Sahelo-Saharan antelope, but that more information and consultation was needed before being finalized.
- ◆ The problems, relative rank rank-priority, and status of captive Sahelo-Saharan. It was generally agreed that these factors must be considered in any conservation proposal dealing with Sahelo-Saharan antelope conservation.

IX. Proposed projects, action steps & timelines

Project 1: Survey and feasibility study of Niger and Chad

Action 1: Translation of Niger proposal

Lead persons: John Newby, Alexandra Dixon, Roseline Beudels

Action Steps: Translation of Niger Document into English, revision of document, and dissemination to interest group members.

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: June 2000

Action 2: Circulate the Lamarck document detailing potential for survey work to be conducted in Chad

Lead persons: John Newby, Alexandra Dixon, Roseline Beudels

Action Steps: The Lamarck document will be converted into a formal proposal that will be used to facilitate dialogue with FFEM.

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: June 2000

Action 3: Submit proposal for funding to support survey work in Chad

Lead persons: John Newby, Alexandra Dixon, Roseline Buedels

Action Steps: Raise sufficient funds to support survey work in Chad.

Funds Needed: to be determined

Timeline: January 2001

Project 2: Innovation and origination of FFEM project proposals

Action 1: Seek approval from FFEM representatives for framework proposed at Marwell meeting

Lead persons: Roseline Buedels

Action Steps: Ensure approval for FFEM pre-proposal

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: end of May 2000

Action 2: Pre-proposal to define process whereby range states can submit national proposals for conservation projects within the overall GEF/FFEM proposal.

Lead persons: John Newby, Alexandra Dixon, Roseline Buedels

Action Steps: Develop a proposal to encourage submission of development and implementation of conservation projects in 5 Sahelo-Saharan states (Chad, Niger, Mali, Senegal, Mauritania). Distribute to relevant stakeholders for comments and input.

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: September 2000

Project 3: Project support for Tunisia projects

Action 1: Fencing and infrastructure for Jebil, Tunisia

Lead persons: Simon Wakefield, Koen de Smet, Renata Molcanova

Action Steps: Prepare materials lists and refine budget. A project proposal should include overall project description and primary objectives. Distribute document among relevant participants to solicit in-kind or direct support.

Funds Needed: cost of fencing be determined

Timeline: July 2000

Action 2: Comprehensive project planning for Jebil, Tunisia

Lead persons: Simon Wakefield, Koen de Smet, Renata Molcanova

Action Steps: Develop comprehensive project proposal and consult with North American and European zoo counterparts (EEP, TAGs etc.) to seek input, in-kind and direct support.

Funds Needed: to be determined

Timeline: December 2000

Action 3: Sidi Toui (Tunisia) proposal for training and infrastructure

Lead persons: Simon Wakefield, Koen de Smet, Renata Molcanova

Action Steps: Develop project proposal for training, animals and infrastructure for gazelle work. Distribute among

Funds Needed: to be determined

Timeline: July 2000

Project 4: Morocco Bas Draa: fencing, translocation, and monitoring costs

Action 1: Fencing and infrastructure for Bas Draa National Park in Morocco

Lead persons: Heiner Engel, Mar Cano, Terrie Correll

Action Steps: Prepare materials lists and refine budget. A project proposal should include overall project description (details pertaining to infrastructure, capture, transport, training, monitoring etc.) and primary objectives. Distribute document among relevant participants to solicit in-kind or direct support.

Funds Needed: cost of fencing be determined

Timeline: July 2000

Project 5: Coordination of Hoggar (Algeria) situation report

Lead persons: Koen de Smet

Action Steps: Assess feasibility of Hoggar component

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: December 2000

Project 6: Gazelle-breeding Center in Egypt

Lead persons: Tim Wachter, Mark Stanley Price

Action Steps: Conduct site visit to Egypt to learn about project, evaluate project, identify players, inform the Sahelo-Saharan interest group, and potentially influence direction of program

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: July 2000

Project 7: Develop terms of reference for the Djerba Working Group, and its relationship to the Sahelo-Saharan Interest Group (S-SIG)

Lead persons: Koen de Smet

Action Steps: Develop terms of reference and objectives for the Djerba Working Group (at the request of the Executive Secretary, UNEP/CMS) and determine how the S-SIG relates to the Djerba Working Group. This document should be circulated for comment among the S-SIG before the April 2001 follow-up meeting

Funds Needed: none

Timeline: December 2000

X. Structure of Sahelo-Saharan Antelope Interest Group

- ◆ There was consensus that an *informal Sahelo-Saharan interest group (S-SIG)* would be formed consisting of those present at the Marwell meeting. While additional interest group participants may be identified, no active effort will be made to expand and/or formalize the group beyond its present composition (see list below).
- ◆ The goal of the S-SIG will be to implement effective *in situ* conservation action in Sahelo-Saharan range states.
- ◆ The interest group will work informally and collaboratively to accomplish the priority projects listed in Section VIII of this document.
- ◆ It was also recognized that some of the participants represented much broader constituencies than their home organizations (i.e., AZA, EAZA, IUCN, UNEP, WWF etc.). The S-SIG will reconvene in April 2001 to evaluate progress made in achieving the stated objectives (section VIII, above), and to determine whether or not, and under what umbrella (i.e., IUCN, UNEP) the group will seek to formalize its structure.
- ◆ For the next year, Steve Monfort will act as the conduit for disseminating information among group members. Anyone with information relevant to the S-SIG should channel information to him, and he will maintain a hard-copy file, and disseminate information among the S-SIG via electronic or regular mail, as appropriate. Monfort will also be responsible for tracking progress related to proposed action steps, and this will include sending reminders and seeking updates from “lead” persons listed under each proposed project.

XI. Meeting Participants

Teresa Abaigar

Estacion Experimental de Zonas Aridas
C.S.I.C.

General Segura 1
04001 – Almeria SPAIN
Tel. 34-950 281045
Fax. 34-950 277100
abaigar@eeza.csic.es

R.C. Beudels-Jamars de Bolsee

Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de
Belpipue
29 rue Vautier
1000 BRUXELLES
Tel. 32 (0)2 6274354
Fax. 32 (0)2 6494825
roseline.beudels@kbinirsnb.be

Mar Cano

Estacion Experimental de Zonas Aridas
Parque de Rescate de Fauna Sahariana
C.S.I.C.

General Segura 1
04001 – Almeria SPAIN
Tel. 34-950 281045
Fax. 34-950 277100
mar@eeza.csic.es

Terrie Correll

The Living Desert
47-900 Portola Ave.
Palm Desert, CA 92260 USA
addax@mindspring.com

Koenraad De Smet

Afdeling Natuur
Albert II laan 20, bus 8
B1000 Brussel BELGIUM
Tel. 32 2 553 7684 32 3 440 8848
Fax. 32 2 5537685
koen.desmet@lin.vlaanderen.be

Alexandra Dixon

2 Clifton Gardens
London W9 1DT UNITED KINGDOM
Tel./Fax. 44 0207 266 3736
106231.2322@compuserve.com

Heiner Engel (Private)

Bunteweg 17
31515 Wunstorf GERMANY
Tel. 49(0) 5031-76097
Vier-engel-luthe@t-online.de

Heiner Engel (Office)

Zoo Hannover gmbh
Adenauerallee3
30175 Hannover GERMANY
Tel. 49(0) 511-28074150
engel@zoo-hannover.de

Dr. Edmund Flach

Whipsnade Wild Animal Park
Dunstable
Bedfordshire LU6 2LF UNITED
KINGDOM
Tel. 0044 1582 872171
Fax. 0044 1582 872649
edmund.flach@ioz.ac.uk

Renata Molcanova

Zoological Garden Bratislava
Meynska' dolira 1
842 27 Bratislava SLOVOKIA
Tel. 421 7 65424034
Fax.421765421868
Zoo@zoobratislava.sk

Marwell Zoological Park
Colden Common
Nr. Winchester
HANTS S021 1JH UNITED KINGDOM
Tel. 0044 (0)1962 777 407 ext.234
Fax. 0044 (0)1962 777 511
RenataW566@aol.com

Steven Monfort

Conservation & Research Center
Smithsonian Institution
1500 Remount Road
Front Royal, VA 22630 USA
Tel. 540 635-6589
Fax. 540 635-6506
smonfort@crc.si.edu

Arnulf Müller-Helmbrecht

UNEP/CMS Secretariat
Martin Luther King Str. 8
D- 53175 Bonn GERMANY
Tel. 49 228 815 24-02/-10
Fax. 49228 815 24-49
Ulfm-h@unep.de (personal)
Cms@unep.de (secretariat)

John Newby

WWF-International
CH-1196 Gland SWITZERLAND
Tel. 41 (022) 3649543
Fax.41 (022) 3645829
jnewby@wwfint.org

Claude Renvoise

Museum National d'Historie Naturelle de
Paris
Parc Zoologique de Paris
53 av Saint Maurice 75012 Paris
FRANCE
Tel. 33 1 44752022
Fax. 33 1 43435473
renvoise@cimrs1.mnhn.fr

Frank Rietkerk (Private)

Eekderstraat 2
1171 JD Badhoevedorp
NETHERLANDS
Tel. 31 20 6599938 (private) 31 55
3575740 (office)
f.rietkerk@worldonline.nl

Mark Stanley Price

P.O. Box 24803
Nairobi KENYA
Tel. 254-2-883697
Fax. 254-2-890413
markstanleyprice@e-conserve.org

Peter Stevens

Executive Director, Paignton Zoo
Totnes Road
Paignton Devon TQ4 7EU UNITED
KINGDOM
Tel. 44 01803 697500
Fax. 44 01803 523457
director@paigntonzoo.org.uk

Tim Wachter

C/O FCC, Zoological Society of London
Regent's Park
London NW1 4RY UNITED KINGDOM
Tel. 44 027 449 6204
Tim.wachter@hotmail.com

Simon Wakefield

Marwell Zoological Park
Colden Common
Nr. Winchester
HANTS S021 1JH UNITED KINGDOM
Tel. 0044 (0)1962 777407 ext.234
Fax. 0044 (0)1962 777511
simonw@marwell.org.uk

