

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

---



Fifty-seventh meeting of the Standing Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 14-18 July 2008

CITES STRATEGIC VISION: 2008-2013, DEVELOPMENT OF INDICATORS

The attached document has been submitted by Mexico (in English only).

## **CITES STRATEGIC VISION: 2008-2013, DEVELOPMENT OF INDICATORS**

Mexico analyzed SC57 Doc. 9 (CITES Strategic Vision 2008-2013, Development of Indicators) and place forward, for consideration of the Strategic Vision Working Group of the Standing Committee, the following remarks (proposed additions underlined, proposed deletions strikethrough, Mexico's comments and suggestions under **MEXICO**).

### ***Recommendations over CITES Strategic Vision text (SC57 Doc. 9 Annex)***

#### Purpose

The ~~two~~ threefold purpose of the Strategic Vision is:

- to improve the working of the Convention, so that international trade in wild fauna and flora is conducted at sustainable levels;
- to promote cooperation amongst Estate Parties in order to improve their national capacities to implement the Convention.
- to ensure that CITES policy developments are mutually supportive of international environmental priorities and ~~take into account new~~ international initiatives, consistent with the terms of the Convention.

#### Structure

In order to achieve this purpose, three broad goals, of equal priority, have been identified as the key components of the Strategic Vision:

- Goal 1: Ensure compliance with and implementation and enforcement of the Convention.
- Goal 2: Secure the necessary financial resources and means for the operation and Implementation of the Convention.
- Goal 3: Contribute ~~to significantly reducing to reduce~~ the rate of biodiversity loss by ensuring that CITES and other multilateral instruments and processes are coherent and mutually supportive.

**MEXICO:** the language used in the paragraph is the same of the MDGs ("significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity"), while such language is appropriate for a political commitment, it is not necessary to use for a strategic scheme.

### ***Strategic Vision indicators proposed by Mexico***

Mexico believes an indicator should be useful to evaluate objectives fulfillment and to what extent. Following this approach, indicators have to be objectively verifiable and easily measurable, as well as independent, consistent and replicable.

## **GOAL 1 ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH AND IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONVENTION**

### ***Objective 1.1 Parties comply with their obligations under the Convention through appropriate policies, legislation and procedures.***

**MEXICO:** in order to achieve this objective, it will be necessary to develop particular indicators for policies, legislation and procedures.

## Indicators

### Legislation

~~—1.1.1 The number of Parties that have appropriate policies, legislation and procedures in place to implement the Convention. (WG, Canada, New Zealand)~~

**MEXICO:** the proposed indicator repeats the wording of the goal. The use of the word "appropriate" would seem to imply the need to develop a mechanism or criteria for determining when the measures taken at national level are "appropriate". It is suggested to eliminate such a word.

US, EC: The number of Parties that are in category 1 under the national legislation project.

**MEXICO:** supports US and EC proposal for this particular section of the objective.

~~—1.1.2 The number of Parties that have Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities that have the skills and resources necessary to undertake their Convention obligations. (WG)~~

**MEXICO:** it is not possible to measure the "necessary skills and resources".

~~Canada: The number of Parties that have designated Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities. (Canada recognizes that adequate resources are important, but believes these cannot be objectively measured as part of this indicator. New Zealand agrees that this version is probably the most measurable).~~

**MEXICO:** MA and SA are mandatory elements for the Parties to cover within the purposes of the Convention.

~~EC, Colombia: The number of Parties that have functioning Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities.~~

**MEXICO:** MA and SA are mandatory elements for the Parties to cover within the purposes of the Convention, moreover, it is not possible to measure "functioning".

### Policies

- 1.1.3 The number of Parties that have programmes for the conservation and sustainable management of CITES-listed species and the recovery of Appendix-I-listed species in the wild, with the aim that they no longer satisfy the biological criteria for inclusion in that Appendix. (WG, Australia, New Zealand, Colombia)

Canada: add: (that are not listed for look-alike reasons) after CITES-listed species.

EC: delete.

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording - "Proportion of Appendix I and Appendix II species with recovery or management programs in the wild."

### Procedures

~~—1.1.4 Legal acquisition findings are made on the basis of proper documentation and evidence. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** support intention, however, wording is not appropriate for an indicator and it will be advisable to propose to the WG to divide it on import and export procedures indicators.

- 1.1.5 Colombia: The number of Parties that have imposed sanctions for illegal trade, confiscated specimens or returned them to their country of origin.

**MEXICO:** this indicator should be located in the section on compliance.

**Objective 1.2 Parties have in place administrative procedures that are transparent, practical, coherent and user-friendly, and reduce unnecessary administrative burdens.**

**Indicators**

~~—1.2.1 The number of Parties that have adopted standard procedures for the timely issuance of permits in consultation with relevant stakeholders. (WG, Canada, US, New Zealand, Colombia).~~

EC: add: “publicly available” after have adopted.

EC, Australia: delete: “in consultation with relevant stakeholders”.

**MEXICO:** agree with EC and Australia proposal, but with a new wording - “Percentage of timely solved procedures in conformity with Article 6 and national legislation.”

~~—1.2.2 The number of Parties that have electronic systems for information management, permit issuance, marking of specimens and generating annual, biennial or other reports. (WG, Canada, New Zealand, Colombia)~~

EC, Australia: delete “information management”, “marking of specimens” and “or other” after biennial; add: exchange of data between competent authorities and/or the dissemination of information to stakeholders. (Australia expressed concern about the capacity of Parties to put in place electronic permitting systems).

~~US: The development of standards for good electronic systems for information management, permit issuance, marking of specimens and generating annual, biennial or other reports.~~

**MEXICO:** shares the concern of Australia about using this indicator, because not all countries have the capacity and the resources to implement an electronic information system. E-permits are not the only way to fulfill objective 1.2.

~~—1.2.3 Colombia: The number of Parties that have evaluated the quality of their procedures on the basis of the degree of user satisfaction.~~

**MEXICO:** it is not an indicator, is a mechanism for evaluating the effectiveness of the measures taken.

~~—1.2.4 Parties are to the fullest extent possible making use of the simplified procedures provided for in Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP13). (Pre-CoP WG, Australia)~~

New Zealand: delete.

**MEXICO:** supports New Zealand in eliminating this indicator, particularly for the use of terms “to the fullest extent possible”.

**Objective 1.3 Implementation of the Convention at the national level is consistent with decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties.**

**Indicators**

– 1.3.1 The number of Parties that have implemented relevant Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties. (WG, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, EC)

– 1.3.2 The number of Parties that have implemented relevant Decisions of the Conference of the Parties. (WG, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, EC)

**MEXICO:** agreed with both 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 indicators, only following the new wording - “Number of parties that have implemented applicable decisions and resolutions of the Conference of the Parties.”

– 1.3.3 Colombia: The percentage of Resolutions and Decisions that are being effectively implemented.

**MEXICO:** supports this indicator as amended.

~~—1.3.4 Multilateral CITES processes have been further developed that reduce the need by Parties for recourse to stricter domestic measures and reservations. (Pre-CoP WG, Australia)~~

~~—1.3.5 Parties have coherent positions on environment and wildlife trade in international fora. (Pre-CoP WG).~~

**MEXICO:** proposed indicators 1.3.4 and 1.3.5 do not correspond with the objective in verifying the consistency between national implementation of the Convention and Decisions by the Conference of the Parties. These indicators involves political positions that are not necessarily relevant to the implementation of CITES. Additionally, the question of consistency, for example in implementing conventions on biodiversity, is much broader than the implementation of Conference of the Parties Decisions.

#### ***Objective 1.4 The Appendices correctly reflect the conservation needs of species.***

##### **Indicators**

– 1.4.1 The number of species in the Appendices that are regularly reviewed by the Animals and Plants Committees, with support by the Parties and in accordance with any existing Resolutions and Decisions, to verify that they are appropriately listed on the basis of the agreed criteria, and for which amendment proposals may be prepared as appropriate. (WG, Canada, US, New Zealand, Colombia)

EC, Australia: The proportion of listed species identified for review by the Animals and Plant Committees that are actually reviewed to verify that they are appropriately listed on the basis of the agreed criteria.

– 1.4.2 US: The number of listed species that have been the subject of proposals considered by the Parties for removal from the Appendices or transfer from one Appendix to another outside the Periodic Review of the Appendices by the Animals and Plants Committees.

~~—1.4.3 The number of species that have not been reviewed. (WG) Canada, US, EC: this indicator is redundant in view of 1.4.1.~~

~~—1.4.4 The number of recommendations from the periodic review which have been acted upon. (WG, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, EC)~~

~~—1.4.5 The number of countries participating in the review of their indigenous species. (WG, Canada, New Zealand)~~

Colombia: replace “indigenous” by “native”.

EC: delete

~~—1.4.6 The number of cases where CITES regulation has had a positive impact on the status of species. (WG, Canada, New Zealand)~~

US: delete, as it would be difficult, complex, and require significant resources to assess, and is not directly relevant to this Objective.

~~—1.4.7 A resolution has been adopted specifying the procedure for the submission of amendment proposals regarding the species identified through this review. (Pre-CoP WG, Australia).~~

~~—1.4.8 A mechanism is in place for the regular evaluation of trade and biological information on unlisted species subject to significant levels of international trade to determine whether they would benefit from inclusion in the Appendices. (Pre-CoP WG, New Zealand, Australia)~~

EC: The number of unlisted species subject to significant levels of international trade, for which the trade and biological information is evaluated via a transparent mechanism available to the Animals and Plants Committees, to determine whether they would benefit from inclusion in the Appendices.

~~—1.4.9 Canada: The number of proposals for amendments to the Appendices which included prior consultation with the Animals or Plants Committee.~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new composed indicator that includes both indicators 1.4.1 and 1.4.2 intentions as follows – “Proportion of listed species, excluding those listed for look-alike reasons, evaluated through Periodic Review and placed accordingly within the Appendices or by Amendment Proposals in the last 10 years”.

Where:

$$X = [(A + B) - C] / D$$

X = proportion of listed species that correctly reflects the conservation needs.

A = number of listed species evaluated through Periodic Review and placed accordingly within the Appendices in the last ten years (indicator 1.4.1).

B = number of listed species by Amendment Proposals in the last ten years outside the Periodic Review (indicator 1.4.2).

C = number of look-alike listed species.

D = total number of listed species in the Appendices.

*Note: this indicator can be analyzed also by taxonomic group.*

### **Objective 1.5 Best available scientific information is the basis for non-detriment findings.**

#### **Indicators**

~~—1.5.1 The Conference of the Parties has adopted guidelines on the making of non-detriment findings, including guidance in relation to specific taxonomic groups. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

~~US: Guidance is provided to the Parties regarding methods for making non-detriment findings for various CITES-listed taxa.~~

**MEXICO:** it is not an indicator, but it can be considered as a mechanism to facilitate this objective fulfillment.

~~—1.5.2 US: Taxon-specific workshops are held for sharing information relevant to making non-detriment findings, with participation by range countries as well as recognized international experts.~~

**MEXICO:** it is not an indicator, although workshops can represent mechanisms to be considered by the GT to achieve the objective.

~~—1.5.3 EC: The number of Scientific Authorities that have access in their work environment to scientific expertise inter alia through the Internet.~~

**MEXICO:** using a tool like the Internet is a communication mean and can not be an indicator.

~~—1.5.4 The collection of information on species in trade, through field research and monitoring programmes, has been strengthened. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** it is more an objective like wording.

~~EC: The number of surveys undertaken by exporting countries of:~~

- ~~a) the population status as well as the trends and impact of trade upon Appendix II species; and~~
- ~~b) the status of and trend in Appendix I species and the impact of any recovery plans.~~

**MEXICO:** the way this indicator is written does not reflect the quality of information used to formulate NDF's.

~~—1.5.5 Non-detriment findings are made on the basis of sound and relevant scientific information and appropriate risk assessment. (Pre-CoP WG, Australia)~~

**MEXICO:** it is not an indicator, it resembles the objective.

~~—1.5.6 Canada, Australia, New Zealand: The number of Parties that have adopted standard procedures for making non-detriment findings.~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording – “Number of NDFs based on information obtained using scientifically sound methodologies or with the advice of qualified experts.”

~~—1.5.7 EC, New Zealand: The number of annual export quotas based on population surveys.~~

~~—1.5.8 Australia, New Zealand: The number of reviews of significant trade where the Animals or Plants Committee recommends remedial action by range states.~~

~~—1.5.9 US: The proportion of Appendix II species subject to the Review of Significant Trade process that are found to require no action.~~

~~—1.5.10 US: The number of Appendix II species for which trade is determined to be nondetrimental to the survival of the species as a result of implementing recommendations from the Review of Significant Trade.~~

**MEXICO:** the four previous indicators did not seem to relate to the objective or provide partial elements to assess the objective, therefore should be deleted.

### ***Objective 1.6 Parties cooperate in managing shared wildlife resources.***

#### **Indicators**

~~—1.6.1 The number of shared recovery plans in place for shared populations of Appendix I species. (Pre-CoP WG, New Zealand, Australia, EC).~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording – “Number of coordinated recovery plans for shared species on Appendix I.”

~~US: The number of bilateral and multilateral cooperative agreements that specifically provide for co-management of shared species by range states.~~

**MEXICO:** have reservations about the use of terms “co-management of shared species”.

~~—1.6.2 The number of cooperative management plans in place for shared populations of Appendix II species. (Pre-CoP WG, Canada, New Zealand, Australia, EC)~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording – “Number of coordinated management plans in place for shared species on Appendix II.”

~~—1.6.3 EC: The number of agreements reached among Parties sharing wildlife resources.~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator intention is more specifically addressed in both new wording proposals within this objective.

~~— 1.6.4 US, Australia: The number of workshops and other capacity-building activities that bring range states together to address the conservation and management needs of shared species.~~

**MEXICO:** can support this indicator; however it can be incorporated in a separate section related to capacity building.

### ***Objective 1.7 Parties are enforcing the Convention to reduce illegal wildlife trade.***

#### **Indicators**

~~—1.7.1 The number of Parties with a national wildlife enforcement network incorporating representation of all relevant enforcement bodies. (Pre-Cop WG, New Zealand, Australia):~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording – “Proportion of Parties with an operational national CITES Law Enforcement Authority.”

~~—1.7.2 Mechanisms are developed to understand more precisely the scale of and trends in illegal trade in species in high demand and to assess the effectiveness of the corresponding enforcement measures. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording - “Proportion of Parties with mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of their enforcement measures.”

~~—1.7.3 Cooperation exists between national, regional and international law enforcement agencies and CITES authorities to effectively combat illegal trade in wild fauna and flora. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

~~EC, Australia, New Zealand: The number of Parties that have, or are covered by: regional enforcement action plans, regional enforcement networks, national enforcement action plans and national inter-agency enforcement coordination networks.~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording – “Number of Parties that have, or are members of regional enforcement networks.”

~~—1.7.4 Parties have strengthened their enforcement of the Convention to ensure that punitive action against offenders is commensurate with the seriousness of the offence. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

~~—1.7.5 EC: The number of Parties using both criminal and administrative law for penalizing CITES offences.~~

~~1.7.6 Canada: The number of Parties engaged in enforcement (e.g. inspections, investigations and prosecutions) against illegal trade.~~

~~US: The number of reported seizures, investigations, and prosecutions, and severity of fines collected and length of jail sentences served.~~

~~—1.7.7 New Zealand, Australia: The number of successful wildlife prosecutions for illegal trade in CITES species undertaken by each Party.~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording that includes the four previous indicators: “Number of Parties using both criminal and administrative law for penalizing CITES offences as a result of enforcement actions against illegal international trade, such as inspections, investigations and prosecutions.”

~~—1.7.8 New Zealand, Australia: The number of Parties with effective wildlife trade enforcement programmes.~~

**MEXICO:** it is difficult to measure “effective”.

~~– 1.7.9 EC: The number of Parties making use of risk assessment in order to better target their CITES enforcement effort.~~

**MEXICO:** supports this indicator.

## ***Objective 1.8 Parties and the Secretariat have adequate capacity-building programmes in place.***

### **Indicators**

~~—1.8.1 Capacity building programmes have been developed for training trainers. (Pre-CoP WG)  
EU: see under 1.8.3.~~

**MEXICO:** can not support this indicator, the wording is more an objective like.



~~—1.8.2 All Parties, in collaboration with the Secretariat where appropriate, provide their staff responsible for implementing CITES with access to adequate training and information resources. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** can not support this indicator, the wording is more a goal like, so it is proposed a new wording - “Number of Parties that provide (national or regional) training and information resources to their staff to implement CITES provisions.”

~~Canada: The number of training programmes developed in coordination with the Secretariat.~~

~~Australia, New Zealand: The number of Parties with national and regional training programmes and information resources in place to implement CITES.~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator intention is more specifically addressed in new wording proposal within this objective.

~~—1.8.3 National and regional training programmes are in place for all aspects of the implementation of CITES, including the making of non-detriment findings, issuance of permits and enforcement. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

~~EU: The number of capacity building initiatives covering the implementation of CITES, including the making of non-detriment findings, issuance of permits and enforcement, carried out annually by the CITES Secretariat, and individual Parties, either directly or through training for trainers programmes.~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator broadens the scope of previous indicator, for which a new wording proposal is already made.

~~—1.8.4 The Secretariat plays an active role in coordinating the production of identification materials to ensure consistency and prevent duplication of effort. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

~~—1.8.5 The number of training and capacity building programmes conducted by the Secretariat and reported by Parties in biennial reports.~~

~~—1.8.6 New Zealand, Australia: The number of training aids produced by the Secretariat to ensure consistency of implementation of the Convention and avoid the duplication of effort by Parties.~~

**MEXICO:** it is considered that the three previous indicators are not appropriate and it is proposed a new wording - “Number of Parties that request capacity building which received training support by the Secretariat.”

## **GOAL 2 SECURE THE NECESSARY FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND MEANS FOR THE OPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

### ***Objective 2.1 Financial resources are sufficient to ensure operation of the Convention.***

#### **Indicators**

~~—2.1.1 Appropriate measures are in effect in relation to Parties that have repeatedly failed to meet their obligations with regard to their assessed contributions to the Trust Fund. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** the wording is not that of an indicator.

New Zealand, Australia, Canada, EU: The number of Parties meeting their obligations with regard to their assessed contributions to the Trust Fund.

**MEXICO:** supports the indicator proposed by New Zealand.

~~—2.1.2 At the time of adoption of Resolutions and Decisions, the Conference of the Parties determines how their implementation will be funded. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** this is a condition not an indicator.

~~New Zealand, Australia: The number of projects in Decisions and Resolutions that are adequately funded through the method and source indicated in the Resolution or Decision.~~

~~EC: The percentage of the work programme agreed by the Conference of the Parties that is funded through the Trust Fund.~~

US: The number of activities mandated in Decisions and Resolutions that are not completed due to insufficient funds or the inability to obtain external funding.

**MEXICO:** the consideration of the budgetary implications of CoP Decisions has proved to be an appropriate approach to rationalize the use of budgetary resources in other multilateral environmental conventions.

~~2.1.3 EC: The amount of voluntary contributions provided by Parties and organizations.~~

~~2.1.4 The examination of sources of additional funding for implementation of CITES at national and international levels includes non-traditional sources. (Pre-CoP WG, Australia).~~

**MEXICO:** consideration of alternative funding sources is a process, not an indicator.

~~2.1.5 US, Australia: The number of activities identified as core functions of the Secretariat are suspended or incomplete as a result of a shortfall in the Trust Fund.~~

**MEXICO:** this is a hypothesis, is not an indicator.

## ***Objective 2.2 Sufficient resources are secured at the national/international levels to ensure compliance with and implementation and enforcement of the Convention.***

### **Indicators**

~~2.2.1 New Zealand, Australia: The number of Parties with adequately funded Management Authorities, Scientific Authorities and wildlife trade enforcement agencies enabling them to implement and enforce the Convention.~~

~~EC: The number of full-time staff working in Management and Scientific Authorities and in enforcement agencies.~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator intention is more specifically addressed on indicator 2.2.3.

– 2.2.2 EC, Australia: The number of Parties having national budgets for the implementation and enforcement of the Convention.

**MEXICO:** supports this indicator.

– 2.2.3 EC, New Zealand: The number of Parties that have undertaken one or more of the following activities in the past two years:

- increased the budget for activities
- hiring more staff
- development of implementation tools
- improvement of national networks
- purchase of technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement
- computerization.

**MEXICO:** supports this indicator.

~~2.2.4 As far as possible, Parties are recovering the costs of implementing the Convention. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

~~New Zealand, Australia: The number of Parties recovering the costs of implementing the Convention in their territory, where the Party deems it appropriate for their circumstances.~~

***Objective 2.3 Sufficient resources are secured at the national/international levels to implement capacity-building programmes.***

**Indicators**

~~—2.3.1 Canada, Australia, New Zealand: The number of capacity-building programmes funded by (inter)national financial mechanisms and other related institutions.~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator intention is more specifically addressed in the new wording proposal for indicator 2.3.5.

~~—2.3.2 EC, New Zealand: The amount of funding provided by the private sector and NGO's for CITES projects.~~

~~—2.3.3 US: The Trust Fund provides funding for the secretariat to perform its capacity-building functions at or above the level in previous years.~~

~~—2.3.4 New Zealand, Australia: The secretariat is adequately funded to provide capacity building materials and programmes to enable Parties to comply with the terms of the Convention.~~

~~—2.3.5 US: Capacity building activities mandated by Decisions and Resolutions are completed.~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording - "Number of capacity-building activities mandated by decisions and resolutions completed."

~~—2.3.6 US, Australia: The number of requests from Parties to the Secretariat for training and capacity-building assistance that remain unfulfilled.~~

**MEXICO:** the number of applications reflects no concrete progress regarding the implementation of the target, for example, if no application were served, no progress can be achieved.

~~— 2.3.7 US: The number of instances of capacity-building assistance provided by Parties to one another or by inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations.~~

**MEXICO:** the language of this indicator is not clear; however Mexico supports the general intent of this proposal.

~~EU: The number of Parties having provided financial or technical assistance to another country.~~

**MEXICO:** intention is covered by indicator 2.3.7.

**GOAL 3 CONTRIBUTE TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING THE RATE OF BIODIVERSITY LOSS BY ENSURING THAT CITES AND OTHER MULTILATERAL INSTRUMENTS AND PROCESSES ARE COHERENT AND MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE**

**MEXICO:** the language used in the paragraph is the same of the MDGs ("significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity"), while such language is appropriate for a political commitment, it is not necessary to use for a strategic scheme.

***Objective 3.1 Cooperation between CITES and international financial mechanisms and other related institutions is enhanced in order to support CITES-related conservation and sustainable development projects, without diminishing funding for currently prioritized activities.***

**MEXICO:** it is suggested alternative wording as follows – “Enhance the cooperation between CITES and international financial mechanisms and other related institutions in order to support CITES-related conservation and sustainable development projects.”

## Indicators

– 3.1.1 The number and size of CITES-related conservation and sustainable development projects, funded by international financial mechanisms and other related institutions, have increased without diminishing funding for currently prioritized areas. (Pre-CoP WG).

Australia, New Zealand: delete: “and sustainable development”

Canada, New Zealand: delete “without diminishing etc”) (Canada recognizes the importance of not diminishing funding for priority areas, but believes this concept cannot be measured objectively)

**MEXICO:** supports both proposals.

~~EC: The number of projects funded by international financial mechanisms and other related institutions that include CITES-related conservation and sustainable development elements.~~

**MEXICO:** propose a new wording – “Number of Parties funded by international financial mechanisms and other related institutions to develop activities that include CITES-related conservation and sustainable development elements.”

~~–3.1.2 Social and economic instruments are in place to provide benefits to local communities and conservation from wildlife trade, to an extent commensurate with the value of the specimens traded. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** can support intention of this proposal, however, the language should be changed to fit an indicator.

~~–3.1.3 EC: The number of CITES-related projects that contribute to poverty alleviation and livelihoods of local communities.~~

**MEXICO:** considers that new proposal on 3.1.1. includes this element.

~~–3.1.4 Colombia: The number of countries and institutions that have proposed alternative funding for conservation and sustainable development projects which further the priority objectives of the Convention.~~

**MEXICO:** supports this proposal, with minor adjustments – “Number of countries and institutions that have provided additional funding for conservation and sustainable development projects which further the priority objectives of the Convention”.

~~–3.1.5 Colombia: The number of alternative funding proposals.~~

**MEXICO:** it does not address the objective.

~~–3.1.6 New Zealand, Australia: A reducing number of cases of non-documented trade in CITES-listed species.~~

**MEXICO:** it is not clear the intention of this proposal and seems not related to the objective.

## **Objective 3.2 Awareness of the role and purpose of CITES is increased globally.**

### Indicators

~~–3.2.1 A communication strategy is developed, where appropriate with other MEAs, for conveying concise, accurate and objective information about the Convention and its achievements. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** supports this proposal intention with a small amendment to fit an indicator wording – “Number of communication strategies *implemented*, where appropriate with other MEAs, for conveying concise, accurate and objective information about the Convention and its achievements.”

~~– 3.2.2 A list has been developed of CITES accomplishments and lessons learned. (Pre-CoP WG, Australia and New Zealand would support a more measurable version).~~

**MEXICO:** suggests deletion of this indicator, as its intention is covered in 3.2.1.

– 3.2.3 EC, Australia: The number of Parties having established communication and awareness raising campaigns or programmes, for instance CEPA (Communication, Education and Public Awareness) programmes.

**MEXICO:** supports this proposal

– 3.2.4 EC: Market surveys indicate an increase in understanding of the role and purpose of CITES.

**MEXICO:** this can be an important input for the communication strategy, but is not an indicator, needs further elaboration.

~~– 3.2.5 CITES permits are considered as a certification of sustainable trade. (Pre-CoP WG).~~

**MEXICO:** this is not an indicator and generate confusion regarding the responsibilities of national authorities.

– 3.2.6 Canada: The number of visits on the Secretariat’s website.

– 3.2.7 Canada: The number of organizations involved in CITES outreach.

– 3.2.8 Canada: The number of outreach programmes.

– 3.2.9 US, Australia, New Zealand: The number of outreach and other activities involving stakeholders that are reported by the Parties in biennial reports.

**MEXICO:** can support the US, Australia and New Zealand suggestion with a proposal that encompasses some of the Canadian’s - “Increase of the number of outreach and other activities involving stakeholders that are reported by the Parties in biennial reports.”

***Objective 3.3 Cooperation with relevant international environmental, trade and development organizations is enhanced.***

**Indicators**

~~– 3.3.1 Common biodiversity conservation goals, objectives and principles are integrated with those of relevant multilateral environmental agreements and related conventions, agreements and associations. (Pre-CoP WG, Australia)~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator does not reflect the intention of moving towards a goal, so that basically suggests integrating common elements among several instruments. Mexico does not understand what is meant by associations. Therefore, the following alternative language is proposed - “Number of common biodiversity conservation goals, objectives and principles of CITES and those of relevant multilateral environmental, trade and development agreements, and conventions that are identified and implemented in an integrated manner”

~~EC, New Zealand: The number of biodiversity conservation goals, objectives and principles agreed between CITES and relevant international environmental, trade and development organizations.~~

– 3.3.2 Scientific and technical programmes of the Convention are coordinated with those of relevant technical partners and other competent organizations and agencies, particularly the multilateral environmental agreements. (Pre-CoP WG)

**MEXICO:** supports the intention of this proposal. However, the wording is an objective like, needs further refinement.

~~Australia, New Zealand, EC: The number of additional biodiversity conservation, trade and development goals, scientific and technical programmes that integrate CITES requirements agreed between environmental and trade conventions and international financial mechanisms.~~

**MEXICO:** this indicator intention is more specifically addressed in the new wording proposal.

~~– 3.3.3 The number of MoU's signed between the CITES Secretariat and relevant international environmental, trade and development organizations~~

**MEXICO:** this is a tool not a meaningful indicator.

~~– 3.3.4 CITES has observer status in the formal trade negotiating forum of the World Trade Organization and a Memorandum of Understanding on cooperation has been concluded between the two bodies. (Pre-CoP WG)~~

**MEXICO:** this is not an indicator is a task to be fulfilled.

~~– 3.3.5 US, Australia: The number of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations participating as observers in CITES meetings (CoPs and committee meetings), participating in and/or funding CITES workshops and other training and capacity-building activities, and communicating with the Secretariat and committee Chairs on CITES issues.~~

**MEXICO:** it has no relation to the objective.

***Objective 3.4 The contribution of CITES to the relevant Millennium Development Goals and sustainable development goals set at WSSD is strengthened by ensuring that international trade in wild fauna and flora is conducted at sustainable levels.***

#### **Indicators**

~~– 3.4.1 New Zealand, Australia: All international trade in endangered wild fauna and flora is conducted on a sustainable basis.~~

**MEXICO:** the language of this proposal can better fit as a general objective.

– 3.4.2 EC, Australia, New Zealand: The number of cases where CITES Regulation has had a positive impact on the conservation status of species.

**MEXICO:** supports the general intention of this proposal, however it is difficult to determine the “positive impact”.

– 3.4.3 EC, New Zealand: The number of cases where the livelihoods of local communities have benefitted from sustainable trade in species in accordance with CITES.

**MEXICO:** supports the idea behind this proposal, but it is not directly related to the achievement of the multilateral agreed goals. It will be advisable to ask for input from the WG on Livelihoods for developing appropriate indicators.

~~– 3.4.4 EC: The number of not listed commercially exploited species, subject to significant levels of unsustainable trade for which research has been carried out by Parties to assess whether they would benefit from inclusion in the Appendices; the number of subsequent amendment proposals put forward~~

~~for consideration by the Conference of the Parties and the number of these amendment proposals adopted by the Conference of the Parties.~~

**MEXICO:** it is not related to objective 3.4.

– 3.4.5 US, Australia, New Zealand: The number of recommendations for trade suspensions that are issued or rescinded.

**MEXICO:** this indicator is most appropriate for the purpose of improving the enforcement of the Convention.

***Objective 3.5 Parties and the Secretariat cooperate with other relevant international organizations and agreements dealing with natural resources, as appropriate, in order to achieve a coherent and collaborative approach to species which can be endangered by unsustainable trade, including those which are commercially exploited.***

**MEXICO:** had reservations about the use of the term "unsustainable trade." Additionally, it is not considered appropriate that the Secretariat is involved in the achievement of a specific goal of this strategic vision. The role of the Secretariat is primarily to support the efforts of States Parties. Furthermore the scope of this proposed objective should be restraint to issues related to the regulated species. A definition on unsustainable trade accepted by all CITES parties is required. Mexico favors deletion of this Section 3.5 or it can be placed, once it is redrafted, in Section 3.3.

### **Indicators**

- 3.5.1 New Zealand, Australia: The number of common actions taken to prevent species becoming endangered by unsustainable trade, including those species which are commonly exploited.

**MEXICO:** this indicator is most appropriate for the purpose of improving the enforcement of the Convention.

– 3.5.2 US, Australia, New Zealand: The number of formal agreements established between the CITES Secretariat and other bodies for information and technical exchanges.

**MEXICO:** agreements between CITES and other instruments are tools, they can not be regarded as indicators.