Party	United Kingdom
Period covered in this report	1 Jan 2015 – 31 Dec 2017
Department or agency preparing this report	Department for Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA)
Contributing departments, agencies and organizations	Animal and Plant Health Agency (APHA) Royal Botanic Gardens – Kew (RBG Kew) Joint Nature Conservation Committee (JNCC) UK Border Force (UKBF) UK National Wildlife Crime Unit (NWCU)

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.

All Aichi Targets relevant to CITES, particularly Aichi Target 2, Target 6, Target 9, Target 12, Target 17 and Target 18.

Indicator 1.1.1: The number of Parties that are in category 1 under the national legislation project.

1.1.1a	Have any CITES relevant policies or legislation been developed during the period covered in this report? Yes ⊠ No □
	If 'Yes', have you shared information with the Secretariat? Yes ⊠ No ☐Not Applicable ☐
	The UK's Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies made good progress towards putting in place CITES legislation to bring them into Category one status. A comprehensive update was provided by email to the CITES Secretariat in September 2017.
1.1.1b	Does your legislation or legislative process allow easy amendment of your national law(s) to reflect changes in the CITES Appendices (e.g. to meet the 90 day implementation guidelines)? Yes No I If 'No', please provide details of the constraints faced: n/a

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

Aichi Target 3.

Indicator 1.2.1: The number of Parties that have adopted standard transparent procedures for the timely issuance of permits in accordance with Article VI of the Convention.

		Yes	No	No information
1.2.1a	Do you have standard operating procedures for application for and issuance of permits?	\boxtimes		
	Are the procedures publicly available?	\boxtimes		
1.2.1b	Do you have:			
	Electronic data management and a paper-based permit issuance system?	\boxtimes		
	Electronic permit information exchange between Management Authorities of some countries If 'Yes', please list countries		\boxtimes	

	Electronic permit information exchange to Management Authorities of all countries?		\boxtimes	
	Electronic permit data exchange between Management Authorities and customs?		\boxtimes	
	Electronic permit used to cross border with electronic validation by customs?		\boxtimes	
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please provide information on challenge	ges faced	or issues	overcome:
	If 'No', do you have any plans to move towards e-permitting ¹ ?	\boxtimes		
	The UK does have plans to move towards e-permitting but require development.	es approp	riate resou	urcing to fund
Indicator 1	1.2.2: The number of Parties making use of the simplified pro Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP16).	cedures p	provided fo	or in <u>Resolution</u>
1.2.2a	Has your country developed simplified procedures for any of the f	•	Fick all app	olicable
		Yes	No	No information
	Where biological samples of the type and size specified in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP16) are urgently required.			
	For the issuance of pre-Convention certificates or equivalent documents in accordance with <u>Article VII</u> , paragraph 2.	\boxtimes		
	For the issuance of certificates of captive breeding or artificial propagation in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 5.	\boxtimes		
	For the issuance of export permits or re-export certificates in accordance with Article IV for specimens referred to in Article VII, paragraph 4.	\boxtimes		
	Are there other cases judged by a Management Authority to merit the use of simplified procedures? If 'Yes', please provide details: n/a			\boxtimes
Objective	the Conference of the Parties. All Aichi targets relevant to CITES, particularly Target 9, Ta 1.3.1: The number of Parties that have implemented relevan Decisions of the Conference of the Parties and/or Standin	arget 14 a t reporting g Commit	nd Target g under F tee recom	18. Resolutions and mendations.
1.3.1a	Has your country responded to all relevant special reporting requirements. The period covered in this report, including those in the Resolution Conference of the Parties, Standing Committee recommendation the Secretariat? Responses provided to ALL responses provided to SOME of the responses provided to NONE of the responses provided to NONE of the response UK has responded to all regular reporting requirements. The UK has responded to all regular reporting requirements.	ns and Dens, and No relevant re- relevant re- relevant re- reporting re- reporting re- reporting re-	ecisions or otifications eporting re eporting re porting re quirements s also res	f the s issued by quirements quirements quirements applicable ponded to the
	majority of notifications resulting from the Resolutions and De Parties, and Standing Committee recommendations.	cisions of	the Conf	ference of the

e-permitting refers to the electronic (paperless) management of the permit business process, including permit application, Management Authority – Scientific Authority consultations, permit issuance, notification to customs and reporting.

	-UK Overseas Territories do not respond to reporting requirements directly. The UKMA commissions information from the relevant overseas territories and crown dependencies and submits information on their behalf as part of the UK response.					
1.3.1b	Were any difficulties encountered during the period covered in this report in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties? Yes ⊠ No □					
	If 'Yes', please provide details of which Resolution(s) or Decision(s), and, for each, what difficulties were / are being encountered?					
	Dalbergia spp listings – this led to many issues regarding identification, increased workload in terms of communication with range states, and led to lots of seizures. The listing also led to the following difficulties:					
	 The up-lisiting created a 27% increase in the volume of applications processed It created increased workload in terms of liaising with range states regarding the origin of timber 					
	 It led to the UK having to request significant scientific advice from Kew (questioning the source of the timber), 					
	 The UK had to engage with the EU to develop new guidance 					
	 The listing led to the seizure of containers arriving in UK without correct permits, in addition to a rise in retrospective applications 					

Objective 1.4 The Appendices correctly reflect the conservation needs of species. Aichi Target 1, Target 12, Target 14 and Target 19.

1.4.1: The number and proportion of species that have been found to meet the criteria contained in Resolution Conf. 9.24 or its successors. This includes both the periodic review and amendment proposals.

1.4.1a	Have you undertaken any reviews of whether species would benefit from listing on the CITES Appendices? Yes ⊠ No □
	If 'Yes', please provide a summary here, or a link to the report of the work (or a copy of that report to the Secretariat if the work is not available online):
	JNCC (SA for Fauna):
	 JNCC contributes to reviews of whether species would benefit from listing in the wider context of their appraisal by the European Union (EU) through their Scientific review Group (SRG)
	Kew (SA for Flora):
	 Kew has reviewed potential listings data and proposals from the EU Scientific Review Group (SRG) and for COP17. Kew has also provided a comprehensive brief and analysis for the 13 flora proposals listed for COP17. During the reporting period Kew analysed 8 flora species that were selected for review at SRG 83 as a follow up from the UNEP-WCMC report SRG 81/9, to determine whether they met the criteria for listing in EU Annex B. The 8 species were: Arisaema sikokianum, Arnica montana, Arctostaphylos uva-ursi, Cetraria islandica, Gentiana lutea, Lycopodium clavatum, Menyanthes trifoliata, Selaginella lepidophylla. Kew also analysed and reviewed the Swedish SA commissioned 'Preliminary assessment of selected shrub and tree species for consideration as possible CoP18 proposals for amendment of CITES Appendices' presented at SRG 82. A further 8 species were reviewed.
	Montserrat (UKOT):
	Consideration was given to adding the Island's endemic species however no decision has been made yet.

Objective	Objective 1.5 Best available scientific information is the basis for non-detriment findings. Aichi Target 2, Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 9, Target 12 and Target 14.								
Indicator 1.	5.1:	The number of surveys, studies or other analyses the sources of information cited in Resolution Coa) the population status of Appendix-II species; b) the trends and impact of trade upon Append c) the status of and trend in naturally-occurring recovery plans.	nf. 16.7 on ; lix-II specie	Non-de	triment findings	s related to:			
1.5.1a		e any surveys, studies or other analyses been ertaken <u>in your country</u> in relation to:	Yes	No	Not Applicable	If Yes, How many?			
	- the	e population status of Appendix II species?	\boxtimes						
		e trends and impact of trade on Appendix II ecies?	\boxtimes						
		e status of and trend in naturally-occurring opendix I species?			\boxtimes				
		e impact of any recovery plans on Appendix I ecies?			\boxtimes				
	relev	e the surveys, studies or analyses integrated vant knowledge and expertise of local and genous communities?			\boxtimes				

	If there are such studies that you are willing to share, please provide:						
	A brief summary of the results of the survey, study or other analysis (e.g. population status, decline / stable / increase, off-take levels etc), or provide links to published reference material.						
	n/a	UK Biodiversity indicators: http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/page-18	3 <u>24</u>				
1.5.1b	How are the results of such surveys, studies findings (NDFs)? Please tick all that app		g non-detrir	ment			
	intensige (i.i.z. e).	Revised harve	st or export	guotas □			
			Banning				
		Stricter d	lomestic me	asures 🗌			
		Changed managen	nent of the s	species 🗌			
		Discussion with Mana	•				
		Discussion with o		_			
	The LUC deep met to be all a company of the late.	Other (please provide a sho					
	The UK does not typically export wild-take Appendix I and II species have been underta CITES non detriment finding.						
1.5.1c	Do you have specific conservation measure						
	plans for naturally occurring Appendix-I lister						
		Not Applicable		\boxtimes			
		No information					
	If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary, incl impact: n/a	uding, if possible, an evaluation o	of their				
1.5.1d	Have you published any non-detriment findir	ngs that can be shared? Yes 🗌 I	No 🖂				
	If 'Yes', please provide links or examples to n/a	the Secretariat within this report:					
1.5.1e	Which of the following (A to F of paragraph a do you use in making non-detriment findings		Yes	No			
	A. relevant scientific literature concerning sp distribution and population trends.	ecies biology, life history,	\boxtimes				
	B. details of any ecological risk assessments	s conducted.	\boxtimes				
	C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest lo from harvest and other impacts.	cations and at sites protected	\boxtimes				
	D. relevant knowledge and expertise of loca	I and indigenous communities.	\boxtimes				
	E. consultations with relevant local, regional	and international experts.	\boxtimes				
	F. national and international trade informatio the CITES trade database maintained by UN Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), publication trade and investigations of sales at marke example.	NEP World Conservation ons on trade, local knowledge					
	The UK does not export normally wild-taken listed fauna and so non detriment findings ar factors above are taken into account when for the import of CITES species into the UK Regulations.	e not required. However, all the making non detriment findings					

Indicator 1.5.2: The number of Parties that have adopted standard procedures for making non-detriment findings.

1.5.2a				No
		Yes	No	information
	Do you have standard procedures for making non-detriment findings in line with Resolution Conf. 16.7?	\boxtimes		
	If 'Yes', please briefly describe your procedures for making non-detrir or attach as an annex to this report, or provide a link to where the info on the internet:			found
	Kew: (the UK Scientific Authority for flora) The following link outlines the procedure used by Kew for making NDF https://www.bfn.de/en/activities/species-conservation/species-conservations/cites/perennial-plants.html		<u>islation</u>	-and-
	JNCC: (the UK Scientific Authority for fauna) JNCC uses all relevant guidance when making non-detriment findings Resolution 16.7 which, of course, focuses on wild-taken specimens. In consist mainly of captive bred specimens, such as falcons, where the an examination of the breeding operation against Conference Resoluti Article 54 of Regulation EC No 865/06).	relation NDF we	to faur underta	a, UK exports ake involves
1.5.2b	When establishing non-detriment findings, have any of the following			
	guidance been used?		ise tick	all that apply
	Virtual College		l	_
	IUCN Checklis		l	_
	Resolution Conf. 16.7	7		\boxtimes
	2008 NDF workshop)	[
	Species specific guidance	9	[
	Othe	r	[
	If 'Other' or 'Species specific guidance', please specify details: n/a			
1.5.2c	How often do you review and/or change your non- Case detriment findings? Annua	by case		
		two year	rs	
	Less f	requently	y	
	A mix	of the ab	ove	\boxtimes
	Please describe the circumstances under which non-detriment finding	gs would	be cha	anged:
	 When new information / data comes to light either from the with a country or information from another Member State v Scientific Review Group (SRG). The UK SAs would also review a NDF for a species-country company. 	ho shar	e infori	mation at the
	 an application recently, i.e over 3-5 years ago. We also review a species-country combination NDF if we k before was for a different area in that country and therefore v area in question. 	now the	inform	ation we had
	 Lastly, we scan through our NDFs and select species we research or where gaps existed in the NDF. Subject to car researching to see if any new information is available or if we who may be able to help. 	apacity v	we ded	icate time to

Indicator 1.5.3: The number and proportion of annual export quotas based on population surveys.

1.5.3a	Do you set annual export quotas?	Yes No	
	If 'Yes', do you set quotas based on population survey, or by other means? Please specify, for each species, how quotas are set: Species Name (scientific) n/a	Population Survey?	Other, please specify n/a
	The UK does not normally export wild-taken specimens of its native fauna and so does not normally set export quotas. The UK has published, for a number of years now, a zero-export quota for trade in European eels (Anguilla anguilla) as part of wider EU measures to restrict imports and exports of this species into and from the Community.		
1.5.3b	Have annual export quotas been set at levels which will ensure sustainable production and consumption? The UK does not normally export wild-taken specimens of its native fauna and so does not normally set export quotas. The UK has published, for a number of years now, a zero-export quota for trade in European eels (Anguilla anguilla) as part of wider EU measures to restrict imports and exports of this species into and from the Community.	Yes No	
	If 'Yes', please describe how this fits into your non-detriment n/a	finding process:	

Objective 1.6 Parties cooperate in managing shared wildlife resources.

Aichi Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 10, Target 12 and Target 19.

Indicator 1.6.1: The number of bilateral and multilateral agreements that specifically provide for comanagement of shared CITES listed species by range States.

1.6.1a Is your country a signatory to any bilateral and/or multilateral agreements for co-management of shared species?

Yes ☑ No ☐

If 'Yes', please provide brief details, including the names of the agreements, and which other countries are involved:

The Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) (and relevant subsidiary agreements) - https://www.cms.int/

The Agreement on the Convention of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) – https://www.acap.aq/en

Indicator 1.6.2: The number of cooperative management plans, including recovery plans, in place for shared populations of CITES-listed species.

1.6.2a Do you have any cooperative management plans, including recovery plans, in place for shared populations of CITES-listed species? Yes ⊠ No □ If 'Yes', please list the species for which these plans are in place and provide a link or reference to a published plan for each species. -Through its membership of the EU, the UK has been involved in (since 1993) the development of Species Action Plans for around 50 bird species listed in Annex I of the Birds Directive, many of which are also CITES-listed. Developed by BirdLife International with the financial support of the European Commission, the plans provide information about the status, ecology, threats of each species and describe the key actions that are required to improve their conservation status in Europe. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/conservation/wildbirds/action plans/index en.htm -EU Eel Recovery Regulation 1100-2007 - COUNCIL REGULATION (EC) No 1100/2007 of 18 September 2007 establishing measures for the recovery of the stock of European eel (Anguilla anguilla) and under which we have a range of UK eel management plans. Species Name (scientific) Link or reference to a published plan See link above See link above

Indicator 1.6.3: The number of workshops and other capacity-building activities that bring range States together to address the conservation and management needs of shared, CITES listed, species.

1.6.3a Have the CITES authorities *received or benefited* from any of the following capacity-building activities provided by external sources?

Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity. Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	What were the external sources ¹ ?
Staff of Management Authority						n/a
Staff of Scientific Authority						n/a
Staff of enforcement authorities						n/a
Traders						n/a
NGOs						n/a
Public						n/a
Other (please specify): n/a						n/a

Please provide the names of Parties, and any non-Parties, involved.

1.6.3b	Have the CITES authorities been the <i>providers</i> of any of the following capacity-building activities to other range States?						
	Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity. Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	Details
	Staff of Management Authority						
	Staff of Scientific Authority						A representative from the UK's Scientific Authority (Fauna) in 2016 also participated as a lecturer in the MASTER'S DEGREE IN MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION OF SPECIES IN TRADE: THE INTERNATIONAL FRAMEWORK (12th edition) organised by the International University of Andalucia, Spain.
	Staff of enforcement authorities						During this reporting period BF delivered training to 90 enforcement officers at two events in Georgia (Tbilisi & Batumi). Training delivered on IWT focussing on the species located in the Caucuses.
	Traders						
	NGOs						
	Public						
	Other Parties/International meetings Other (please specify): Private sector businesses and leaders from the transport industry.						The UK hosted Transport Taskforce meeting in November 2017. More than 90 members now signed up to declaration.
1.6.3c	In what ways do you collaborate with	other C	ITES P	arties?	,		
		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	() () () () () () () () () ()	Further detail / examples
	Information exchange						Email correspondence with the MA and SA of other CITES parties on CITES issues.
	Monitoring / survey	\boxtimes					□ n/a

Habitat management	\square		☐ n/a
Species management			☐ n/a
Law enforcement			During the reporting period the British military provided antipoaching training for rangers in Gabon, home of Africa's largest population of forest elephants.
Capacity building			The UK collaborates with other CITES parties and helps build capacity through the IWT Challenge Fund Projects and the Darwin Initiative.
Other (please provide details): n/a			

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

Aichi Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 9, Target 10, Target 12 and Target 19.

Indicator 1.7.1: The number of Parties that have, are covered by, or engaged with:

- an international enforcement strategy and/or action plan;
- formal international cooperation, such as an international enforcement network;
- a national enforcement strategy and/or action plan; and
- formal national interagency cooperation, such as a national interagency enforcement committee.

1.7.1a	Do you have, are you engaged in, or covered by:	Yes	No	No Information
-	- an international enforcement strategy and/or action plan?	\boxtimes		
_	formal international cooperation, such as an international enforcement network?			\boxtimes
_	- a national enforcement strategy and/or action plan?	\boxtimes		
_	formal national interagency cooperation, such as a national interagency enforcement committee?	\boxtimes		
	 If 'Yes' to any of the above, please specify the level of engagement details: EU Action Plan on IWT & UK Wildlife priorities which inclu Enforcement working group – the UK is a member of the The task of the group is to monitor enforcement policy and pland make recommendations to improve the enforcement of catalyses the exchange of information, experience and expland to topics between the Member States (trends in illegal investigations), including sharing of intelligence information databases. International Consortium of Combating Wildlife Crime the UK announced an additional £13 million in funding (of tackle IWT through a variety of projects, including an up International Consortium of Combating Wildlife Crime (ICC) 	des CITE EU Enfor oractice in of wildlife expertise of al trade, s and estable (ICCW) doubling if to £4m of	cement W the EU M trade legi- on wildlife significant olishing ar C) – In No nvestmen	forking Group. lember States slation. It also trade control seizures and ad maintaining ovember 2016 at to £26m) to

Indicator 1.7.2: The number of Parties with a process or mechanism for reviewing their enforcement strategies, and the activities taken to implement their strategies.

1.7.2a	Do you have a process or mechanism for reviewing your enforcement strategy(ies) and the activities taken to implement your strategy(ies)?	Yes No, but review is under consideration No	
		No information	
	If 'Yes', what do you do?		
	The CITES priority delivery group oversees UK enforcement of UK CITES. This group reports twice a year to a strategic meeting chai		
	If 'Yes' or 'No, but review is under consideration', which tools do yo	ou find of value? n/a	
1.7.2b	Have you used the International Consortium on Combating	Yes	
	Wildlife Crime (ICCWC) Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit, or equivalent tools?	No, but toolkit use is unde consideration	er
		No 🖂	
		No information	
	If 'Yes', please provide feedback on the parts of the toolkit used an equivalent tools have been. Please specify improvements that coun/a		
	If 'No', please provide feedback on why not or what is needed to me tools useful to you:	nake the toolkit or equivalen	t
	The UK has not yet used the toolkit but will shortly be implementing London IWT Conference). The UK previously funded ICCWC for uprogramme, of which £1.6m has already been committed.		

Indicator 1.7.3: The number of Parties that have criminal (penal) law and procedures, capacity to use forensic technology, and capacity to use specialized investigation techniques, for investigating, prosecuting, and penalizing CITES offences..

1.7.3a	Do you have law and procedures in place for investigating, prosecuting, and penalizing CITES offences as a crime? If 'Yes', please provide the title of the legislation and a summary of the penalties available: -Title of legislation: The Control of Trade in Endangered Species Regulations 2018 (COTES) -Link to legislation: http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2018/703/contents/made -Summary of penalties: If offences are committed under COTES legislation, they are punishable by up to five years imprisonment.	Yes No No information	
1.7.3b	Are criminal offences such as poaching and wildlife trafficking recognized as serious crime ¹ in your country?	Yes No No information	
	If 'Yes', please explain what criteria must be met for poaching or w treated as serious crimes:	maine trainicking offerio	es to be

The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines serious crime as conduct constituting an offence punishable by imprisonment for at least four years or a more serious penalty.

	Wildlife crimes are recognised as serious in the UK. As such, if criminal offences are committed under COTES legislation, they are punishable by up to five years imprisonment. The Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA) also makes it an offence to intentionally kill, injure, take					
	from the wild, possess or have control of any species <a action="" airports="" already="" around="" at="" bf="" brand"="" by="" conducted="" coordinated="" href="http://www.legislation.gov.uk/title/wildlife%20and%</th><th>listed i</th><th>in sche</th><th>edule 5 to the a</th><th></th></tr><tr><th>1.7.3c</th><th>Do you have capacity to use forensic technology<sup>1</sup> to s investigation of CITES offences?</th><th>support</th><th>the</th><th>Yes
No
No information</th><th> </th></tr><tr><th></th><th>If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary of any sample collected and submitted to an appropriate forensic an another country) during the period covered in this repellease see appendix B & C.</th><th>alysis 1</th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr><tr><th></th><th>If 'Yes', and your country has an appropriate forensic please indicate which species it applies to:</th><th>analys</th><th>is facili</th><th>ty for CITES-lis</th><th>sted species,</th></tr><tr><th></th><th>Please see appendix B & C.</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr><tr><th>1.7.3d</th><th colspan=6>Did your authorities participate in or initiate any multi-disciplinary<sup>2</sup> Yes </th></tr><tr><th></th><th>If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary, including any other Parties: Where possible, a summary of relevant</th><th></th><th></th><th></th><th></th></tr><tr><th></th><th colspan=6> Operation COBRA 3 2015 – this was a global enforcement operation. Border Force (BF) conducted various risk testing operations at ports of import including Heathrow, Stansted, Royal Mail Langley and Coventry. Seizure results already published. BF invited UK police officers to work with Border Force officers at selected locations. Operation FROSTY 2017 - Operation conducted at Heathrow and Langley Royal Mail </th></tr><tr><th></th><th colspan=6> Operation Thunderbird 2017 - Global enforcement operation replacing the Cobra " interpol.="" li="" mainly="" published.="" results="" seizure="" the="" uk.<="" was=""> Operation LAKE – this is an ongoing operation coordinated by Europol focussing entirely on Anguilla anguilla (European Eel). BF & NWCU working in partnership on this. 					
1.7.3e	Do you have a standard operating procedure among relevant agencies for submitting information related to CITES offences to INTERPOL and/or the World Customs Organization? Yes No No information					
1.7.3f	Do you have legislative provisions for any of the following that can be applied to the investigation, prosecution and/or sentencing of CITES offences No period covered times was a functional times was a fun				If yes, how many times was this used during the period covered by this report?	
	General crime ³	\boxtimes			This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.	

Capacity to use forensic technology means the ability to collect, handle and submit samples from crime scenes involving CITES-listed species to an appropriate forensic analysis facility, located either in your country or in another country(ies).

A multi-disciplinary law enforcement operation is one that involves officers from all relevant enforcement disciplines as appropriate, for example officers from Police, Customs and the wildlife regulatory authority. It could be either sub-national, national or international in scope.

³ General crime laws relate to offences such as fraud, conspiracy, possession of weapons, and other matters as set out in the national criminal code.

Predicate offences ¹	\boxtimes		This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.
Asset forfeiture ²	\boxtimes		This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.
Corruption ³	\boxtimes		This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.
International cooperation in criminal matters ⁴	\boxtimes		This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.
Organized crime ⁵	\boxtimes		This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.
Specialized investigation techniques ⁶	\boxtimes		This info is not stored centrally so an accurate figure cannot be provided.
If 'Yes' to any of the above, please explain how each brief summary, including any lessons learned which n			
Asset Forfeiture Legislation: In the UK the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) provides During this reporting period the UK was able to use			

In the UK the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) provides for the confiscation of the proceeds from crime. During this reporting period the UK was able to use this legislative provision to convict a man who illegally sold imported primate body parts online. The body parts included four monkey heads and leopard skulls. The man also possessed images of bestiality. The gentleman was sentenced to 14 months imprisonment, suspended for two years and was ordered to pay a sum of £4,724.34. This case shows that strong controls are in place to protect endangered species and the police will take action against anyone found to be trading illegally.

Source: https://ww2.rspb.org.uk/Images/legal-eagle-79_tcm9-421996.pdf

Article 2, paragraph (h) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines a predicate offence is an offence whose proceeds may become the subject of any of the money-laundering offences established under the Convention.

Asset forfeiture is the seizure and confiscation of assets obtained from criminal activities to ensure that criminals do not benefit from the proceeds of their crimes.

Provisions against corruption include national laws to implement the United Nations Convention against Corruption covering offences such as bribery of officials, embezzlement or misappropriation of public funds, trading in influence and abuse of functions by public officials

International cooperation in criminal matters includes legislation through which a formal request for mutual legal assistance and/or extradition of a person for criminal prosecution can be forwarded to another country.

Article 2, paragraph (a) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines an organized criminal group as a structured group of three or more persons, existing for a period of time and acting in concert with the aim of committing one or more serious crimes or offences established in accordance with the Convention, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit.

Specialized investigation techniques are techniques that are deployed against serious and/or organized crime when conventional law enforcement techniques fail to adequately address the activities of crime groups. Examples include controlled deliveries and covert operations.

1.7.3g	Do you have institutional capacity to implement the legislative provisions listed in question 1.7.3f against CITES offences?	Yes No No information	
	If 'No', please provide a brief summary of your major capacity-build	ing needs: n/a	

Indicator 1.7.4: The number of Parties using risk assessment and intelligence to combat illegal trade in CITES-listed species.

1.7.4a	Do you use risk assessment to target CITES enforcement effort?	Always Very often Sometimes Rarely Never No information	
1.7.4b	Do you have capacity to analyse information gathered on illegal trade in CITES-listed species?	Yes No No information	
1.7.4c	Do you use criminal intelligence ¹ to inform investigations into illegal trade in CITES-listed species?	Always Very often Sometimes Rarely Never No information	
1.74d	Have you implemented any supply-side activities to address illegal trade in CITES-listed species during the period covered in this report?	Yes No, but activities are under development No No information	

¹ Criminal intelligence is information that is compiled, analyzed and disseminated in an effort to anticipate, prevent and/or monitor criminal activity. Examples include information on potential suspects held in a secure database and inferences about the methods, capabilities and intentions of specific criminal networks or individuals that are used to support effective law enforcement action.

1.7.4e	Have you implemented any demand-side activities to address illegal trade in CITES-listed species during the period covered in this report?	Yes No, but activities are under development	
		No	
	During the reporting period the UK has continued to fund projects through the Illegal Wildlife Trade (IWT) Fund. The fund has committed £13 million over 4 years (2014-2018) to support projects around the world tackling IWT in 3 main areas:		
	• developing sustainable livelihoods for communities affected by illegal wildlife trade		
	• strengthening law enforcement and the role of the criminal justice system		
	reducing demand for the products of the illegal wildlife trade		
	The UK also funded a demand reduction report during the reporting period. The study forms part of the UK government's commitment to "Eradicate the Market," made at the Hanoi Conference on Illegal		
	Wildlife Trade in November 2016.		
	(https://www.traffic.org/publications/reports/reducing-demand-for- illegal-wildlife-products/).		
	Further projects and activities funded by the UK to address demand reduction through the IWT Challenge Fund can be found in Appendix D .		

Indicator 1.7.5: The number of administrative measures, criminal prosecutions and other court actions for CITES-related offences.

During the	e period covered in this report:	Yes	No	No Information			
1.7.5a	Have any administrative measures (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related offences?	\boxtimes					
	If 'Yes', please indicate how many and for what types of offences. If available, please attach details: please see appendix B .						
	Enforcement activities in the Isle of Man (IOM) resulted in the following:						
	 Successful prosecution for the illegal importation of Har fines for illegal possession and a further £1000 for cruel case included £1000 in costs and a further £2000 comp (MSPCA) which provided housing. The perpetrator was for 10 years. The Hawks were later rehomed in the UK. Forfeiture of a Dendrobium orchid which was posted from The specimen was subsequently destroyed. Interception of an ivory statue in the UK in 2015. IOM Connectain aspects of the case but were not directly involved. In 2017 a 17ft Northern Rock Python skin from Nigeria will IOM Customs. The skin was subsequently held for educed. 	Ity to other bensation is also bann om Thailar sustoms acolived in the was volun	r pets. Othe for an anima ned from ke nd without a dvised UK E e seizure. tarily surren	r fines for this al charity eping animals ny permits.			
1.7.5b	Have there been any criminal prosecutions of CITES-related offences?						
	If 'Yes', how many and for what types of offences? If available, please see appendix B.	please at	tach details				
1.7.5c	Have there been any other court actions against CITES-related offences?	\boxtimes					
	If 'Yes', what were the offences involved and what were the result please see appendix B.	s? Please	attach detail	s:			
1.7.5d	How were any confiscated specimens disposed of?		Tick	all that apply			
	 Return to country of export 						
	Public zoos or botanical gardens			\boxtimes			
	Designated rescue centres						
	Approved private facilities						
	– Euthanasia						
	 Other (please specify): Confiscated specimens were used for law enforcement training to museums. 	g and also	donated				
	Have you encountered any challenges in disposing of confisca When there is a large number of specimens of the same speci	•	mens?				
	Do you have good practice that you would like to share with ot	her Partie	s? n/a				

Objective 1.8 Parties and the Secretariat have adequate capacity-building programmes in place. Aichi Target 1, Target 12 and Target 19.

Indicator 1.8.1: The number of Parties with national and regional training programmes and information resources in place to implement CITES including the making of non-detriment findings, issuance of permits and enforcement.

1.8.1a	Do you have information resources or training in place to support: Yes The making of non-detriment findings? Permit officers? Enforcement officers?	/ No	
1.8.1b	Is the CITES Virtual College used as part of your capacity building work? What improvements could be made in using the Virtual College for capacity building? No comments	Yes No No information	
1.8.1c	Is the ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Toolkit used in the development of capacity-building programmes, or does it form part of the curriculum of such programmes? What improvements could be made in using the ICCWC Toolkit for capacity building? N/A	Yes No No information	

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.

Information to be provided through records held by the Secretariat on financial management of the Convention.

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

Aichi Target 1, Target 2, Target 3, Target 12, Target 19 and Target 20.

Indicator 2.2.1: The number of Parties with dedicated staff and funding for Management Authorities, Scientific Authorities and wildlife trade enforcement agencies.

2.2.1a	Do you have an approved service standard(s)¹ for your	Yes	\boxtimes
	Management Authority(ies)?	No	
	If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d.		
	If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards?		
	Yes, APHA the UK management authority with the responsibility for processing cites applications and issuing permits has service standards for this function.		
	If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards ² ?	Yes	\boxtimes
	If 'Yes', what are your performance targets?	No	
	The UK CITES licensing team's (APHA) published target is to process 90% of complete applications for CITES permits within 15 days of receiving them.		
	Do you publish your performance against service standard targets?	Yes No	
	If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report:		
	APHA does not publish its exact performance against targets. However we can confirm that performance levels during the reporting period did fall slightly below the expectation due to a shortage in staff and the listing of certain species which caused a spike in work levels.		

For example, a time frame in which you are required to provide a response on a decision to issue or not issue a permit, certificate, or re-export certificate.

² For example, 85% of all decisions will take place within the service standard.

	If you did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall a result of:	Yes		No
	- availability of funding?			
	number of staff?			
	a shortage of skills?			\Box
	If 'Yes' to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of?			
	n/a			
2.2.1b	Do you have an approved service standard(s) ⁴⁷ for your Scientific Authority(ies)?		Yes No	
	If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d.			
	If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards?			
	JNCC, as UK Scientific Authority for fauna, is required to provide scientific advice on 90% of CITES licence applications within 5 working days and provide scientific advice on 90% of priority applications within 3 working days.			
	Kew (UK Scientific Authority for flora) have a Service Level Agreement with the MA (Animal and Plant Health) to fulfil our duty as a SA in terms of Services and Quality Assurance when providing advice on permits.			
	If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards ⁴⁸ ? If 'Yes', what are your performance targets?		Yes No	
	JNCC (the UK Scientific Authority for Fauna) is required to provide scientific advice on 90% of CITES licence applications within 5 working days (or within 3 for priority applications).			
	Kew (UK Scientific Authority for Flora) is required to advise on 97% of referrals/permits within 5 working days.			
	If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report:			
	UK records indicate that JNCC are meeting service standards despite an increase in the number of referrals to them (16,229 consultations between April- September 2017, compared to 11,969 consultation over the same period of the previous year). This increase is assumed to be the direct result of changes made to the CITES Appendices at CoP17 which saw the inclusion of <i>Psittacus erithacus</i> in App I and the consequent requirement for any commercial transactions within the UK/EU to be covered by an Article 10 certificate.			
	If you did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall a result of:	Yes		No
	availability of funding?			
	– number of staff?			
	– a shortage of skills?			
	If 'Yes' to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of? n/a			
2.2.1c	Do you have an approved service standard(s) ⁴⁷ for your		Yes	\boxtimes
	enforcement authority(ies)? If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d.		No	
	in 110, piedee go to edection 2.2. Id.			
-	•			

	If 'Yes', for which standards?	ch services are there star	ndards, and what are those			
	enforcement of	f CITES crimes) and doe	s not have any particular			
	If 'Yes', do you	have performance target	ts for these standards48?		Yes	
	If 'Yes', what a	re your performance targ	ets?		No	
				n/a		
		. , .	•	n/a		
	If you did not n a result of:	neet your performance ta	rgets then was this shortfall	Yes		No
	- availability	of funding?				
	- number of s	staff?				
	a shortage	of skills?				
	If 'Yes' to a sho	ortage of skills, which skill	ls do you need more of?			
2.2.1d						
	Do you have s	ufficient of the following for	or your authorities to functio	n effectively?		
	***************************************	Management Authority(ies)	Scientific Authority(ies)			
	Funding?	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes [] No 🗌	
	Staff?	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes [] No 🗌	
	Skills?	JK has UK-wide service standards for all policing (including cement of CITES crimes) and does not have any particular oved services standards for CITES offences alone. S', do you have performance targets for these standards ⁴⁸ ? S', what are your performance targets? In/a sible, please provide your performance against service ards during the period covered in this report: In/a did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall ult of: Yes railability of funding? Imber of staff? So to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of? The only complete this question if your answered 'No' to the first part of question 2 to a shortage of the existence of approved service standards for your author out have sufficient of the following for your authorities to function effectively? Management Authority(ies) Management Authority(ies) Yes No Yes Yes No Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes Y				

 changed the budget for activities;
 hired more staff. Indicator 2.2.2: The number of Parties that have undertaken one or more of the following activities:

- developed implementation tools;
- purchased technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement.

2.2.2a	Have any of the following activities been undertak covered in this report to enhance the effectiveness implementation at the national level?	Tick if applicable		
	Hiring of more staff			
	Development of implementation tools			
	Purchase of technical equipment for implementati	on, monitoring	g or enforcement	t 🗆
	Other (please specify):			
2.2.2b	During the period covered in this report, was the budget for your:	Increased	Stable	Decreased
	Management Authority(ies)			\boxtimes
	Scientific Authority(ies)		\boxtimes	
	Enforcement authorities		\boxtimes	
2.2.2c	Have you been able to use international development funding assistance to increase the level of implementation of your	Yes	No	Not applicable
	Management Authority(ies)?			\boxtimes
	Scientific Authority(ies)?		\boxtimes	

	Enforcement authorities?				\boxtimes			
2.2.2d	What is the respective level of priority for enhancing the effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level through the following activities?							
	Activity High Medium Low Not a P							
	Hiring of more staff	\boxtimes						
	Development of implementation tools	\boxtimes						
	Purchase of new technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement		\boxtimes					
	e-permitting	\boxtimes						
	Other (please specify): n/a							
2.2.2e	Do you have a operational system (e.g electronic database) for managing	J.	Yes	Under development	No			
	Species information		\boxtimes					
	Trade information		\boxtimes					
	Non-detriment findings	\boxtimes						

Indicator 2.2.3: The number of Parties raising funds for CITES implementation through user fees or other mechanisms.

2.2.3a	Does the Management Authority charge fees for:	Tick all that are appl	icable
	 Administrative procedures 		\boxtimes
	 Issuance of CITES documents (e.g. for import, exports, re-export, o the sea) 	r introduction from	\boxtimes
	 Shipment clearance (e.g. for the import, export, re-export, or introdu of CITES-listed species) 	ction from the sea	
	 Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species 		\boxtimes
	 Harvesting of CITES-listed species 		
	 Use of CITES-listed species 		
	 Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species 		
	Other (please specify): n/a		
2.2.3b	Is a fee schedule publicly available?	Yes 🛛 N	lo 🗌
	If 'Yes', please provide an internet link, or a copy of the schedule to the https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/syste		ta/file/
2.2.3c	Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or	r wildlife conservation	1?
	·	Entirely	
		Partly	
		Not at all	
		Not relevant	\boxtimes
2.2.3d		Yes	No
	Do you raise funds for CITES management through charging user fees	?	
	Do your fees recover the full economic cost of issuing permits?		\boxtimes
	Do you have case studies on charging or using fees?		
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please provide brief details: APHA charges an application fee for processing all CITES applications by the applicant before their application can be processed or invoiced a customers. The current charges were introduced in July 2013. approximately 50% of the cost of the service through these charges (£7)	fter for BACS We recover	

charges were developed on the basis of the time taken to process different types of applications. These were then averaged out for the different types of applications (for example import permit, export permit, re-export permit, A10 certificate).	
Do you use innovative financial mechanisms to raise funds for CITES implementation? If 'Yes', please provide brief details: n/a	\boxtimes

Indicator 2.2.4: The number of Parties using incentive measures as part of their implementation of the Convention.

2.2.4a	Do you use incentive measures¹ such as those described in CoP14 Doc 14.32 to implement the Convention?	
	Due diligence □ ⊠	
	Compensatory mechanisms $\ \square \ oxtimes$	
	Certification \square	ļ
	Communal property rights	ļ
	Auctioning of quotas	
	Cost recovery or environmental charges ☐ ☐	ļ
	Enforcement incentives	
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, or if you use other measures, please provide a summary or link to further information: n/a	
2.2.4b	Have incentives harmful to biodiversity been eliminated?	
	Not at all ☐	
	Very little⊡	
	Somewhat □	ŀ
	Completely⊠	

Defined as 'Social and economic incentives that promote and regulate sustainable management of and responsible trade in, wild flora and flora and promote effective enforcement of the Convention'. The intent of such measures is not to promote wildlife trade as such, but rather to ensure that any wildlife trade undertaken is conducted in a sustainable manner.

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

Aichi Target 12, Target 19 and Target 20.

Indicator 2.3.1: The number of capacity building activities mandated by Resolutions and Decisions that are fully funded.

2.3.1a	you run during the period covered in this report?			Withou from th Secreta		nce Conducted or assisted by the Secretariat	
			N	lone			
				1			
				2-5		\boxtimes	
				6-10			
		N	ı More tha	1-20 an 20			
	Please list the Resolutions or Decisions			all 20		Ш	
	The activities below relate to (but are no		-	solutio	n Conf.	11.3 (Re	ev. CoP17).
2.3.1b	What sorts of capacity building activities	have ta	aken pla	ice?			·
	 -2 Police Wildlife Crime Officers (PWCC understand the A10s CITES requirement -The UK has also conducted a Wildlife I CITES requirements. 	nts and I	now to e	enforce	e them.	·	
2.3.1c	What capacity building needs do you ha	ave?					
	Please tick all boxes which apply to indicate which target group and which activity.	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial	Training	Other (specify)	Dotoilo
	Target group		:	т «			Details
	Staff of Management Authority						
	Staff of Scientific Authority						
	Staff of enforcement authorities						
	Traders / other user groups						
	NGOs						
	Public						
	Other (please specify)						

An activity might be a single day training e.g. for a group of staff from the Management Authority, or a longer course / project undertaken by an individual.

GOAL 3 CONTRIBUTE TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING THE RATE OF BIODIVERSITY LOSS AND TO ACHIEVING RELEVANT GLOBALLY-AGREED GOALS AND TARGETS BY ENSURING THAT CITES AND OTHER MULTILATERAL INSTRUMENTS AND PROCESSES ARE COHERENT AND MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE

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.

Aichi Target 2 and Target 20.

Indicator 3.1.1: The number of Parties funded by international financial mechanisms and other related institutions to develop activities that include CITES-related conservation and sustainable development elements.

3.1.1a	Has funding from international financial mechanisms and other related institutions been used to develop activities that include CITES-related conservation and sustainable development elements?	Yes No Not applicable No information	
	If 'Yes', please provide brief details: n/a		
3.1.1b	During the period covered in this report, has funding for your country from international funding mechanisms and other related institutions:	Increased Remained stable Decreased	

Indicator 3.1.2: The number of countries and institutions that have provided additional funding from CITES Authorities to another country or activity for conservation and sustainable development projects in order to further the objectives of the Convention.

3.1.2a	Have you provided technical or financial assistance to another country or countries in relation to CITES?							information
	If 'Yes', please tick boxes to indicate type of assistance provided Country(ies)	Species Management¹	Habitat Management²	Sustainable use	Law Enforcement	Livelihoods	Other (specify)	Details (provide more information in an Appendix if necessary)
	Malawi							Further details of assistance can be provided on request.
	Georgia							Further details of assistance can be provided on request.

Use species conservation column for work directly related to species – e.g. population surveys, education programmes, conflict resolution, etc.

Use habitat conservation column for work that will indirectly support species conservation – e.g. habitat management, development of policy frameworks for how land is managed, etc.

Objective 3.2 Awareness of the role and purpose of CITES is increased globally. Aichi Target 1, Target 4, Target 12 and Target 18.

Indicator 3.2.1: The number of Parties that have been involved in CITES awareness raising activities to bring about better awareness by the wider public and relevant user groups of the Convention requirements.

3.2.1a	Have CITES authorities been involved in any of the following activities to bring about better awareness of the Convention's requirements by the wider public and relevant user groups? Press conferences Press releases Newspaper articles, brochures, leaflets Television appearances Radio appearances Presentations Public consultations / meetings Market surveys Displays Information at border crossing points	Wider public	Relevant User Groups
	Telephone hotlineWebsite(s) – if so please provide link(s):		
	www.nwcu.police.uk		
	https://www.gov.uk/guidance/cites-imports-and-exports www.gov.gg/article/152126/Endangered-species		
	 Other (specify): The UK holds regular meetings with traders of CITES-listed specimens which contributes to bringing about better awareness of the convention's requirements as well as improved compliance. These meetings with selected traders are known as the CITES Sustainable Users Group (CSUG). 		
	Please attach copies of any items or describe examples: Please see appendix A.		

Indicator 3.2.2: The number of visits to the CITES website.

3.2.2a	How regularly do your Authorities consult the CITES website?						
	Please tick boxes to indicate the most frequent usage (decide on an average amongst staff if necessary). Target group	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less frequently	Not known	
	Staff of Management Authority	\boxtimes					
	Staff of Scientific Authority	\boxtimes					
	Staff of enforcement authorities		\boxtimes				
3.2.2b	What has been your experience with using the CITES website? Excellent						
				Goo	d	\boxtimes	
				Ave	rage		

IMPLEMENTATION REPORT – UK SUBMISSION

Poor		
Very P	oor \square]
No info	ormation 🔲]
Any further comments on the CITES Website? (e.g. useful aspects, any difficult which authorities find which functions/tools most useful, what is missing, etc): no		

Indicator 3.2.3: The number of Parties with web pages on CITES and its requirements.

A question relating to this indicator is within question 3.2.1a.

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

Indicator 3.3.1 The number of Parties which report that they have achieved synergies in their implementation of CITES, other biodiversity-related conventions and other relevant multilateral environmental, trade and development agreements.

3.3.1a	Have measures been taken to achieve coordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national CITES authorities and national focal points for other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the other biodiversity-related conventions: CBD, CMS, ITPGR, Ramsar, WHC) ¹ to which your country is party?	Yes No No information	
	If 'Yes', please give a brief description: The major multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) are dealt with	th hy the same 'Inter	rnational
	Biodiversity' team within Defra. This allows for coordination amongst the line the UK.		

Indicator 3.3.2: The number of biodiversity conservation or sustainable use projects, trade and development goals, or scientific and technical programmes that integrate CITES requirements.

	How many international projects which integrate CITES issues has your country contributed towards?				
3.3.2a	The UK contributes to and funds many international projects which integrate CITES issues. Examples of such projects can be found in Appendix D or at the following link which provides details of IWT Challenge Fund projects: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/746965/iwt-challenge-fund-list-2018.pdf				
3.3.2b	In addition to 3.2.2a, how many national level projects has your count integrate CITES issues? A series of IWT Conference which were initiated in 2014.	ry implemented	d which		
3.3.2c	Have there been any efforts at a national scale for your CITES Management or Scientific Authorities to collaborate with:	Yes	No		
	Agencies for development?				
	Agencies for trade?	\boxtimes			
	Provincial, state or territorial authorities?	\boxtimes			
	Local authorities or communities?		\boxtimes		
	Indigenous or local peoples?		\boxtimes		
	Trade or other private sector associations?	\boxtimes			
	NGOs?				
	Other (please specify)				
3.3.2d	Are CITES requirements integrated into?	Yes	No		
	National and local development strategies?				
	National and local poverty reduction strategies?				

CBD = Convention on Biological Diversity; CMS = Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, ITPGR = International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Ramsar = The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, WHC = World Heritage Convention.

IMPLEMENTATION REPORT – UK SUBMISSION

Planning processes?	\boxtimes
National accounting?	\boxtimes

Indicator 3.3.3: The number of Parties cooperating / collaborating with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to participate in and/or fund CITES workshops and other training and capacity-building activities.

3.3.3a	Has funding been provided or received to facilitate CITES workshops, training or other capacity building activities		Which
	to / from:	Tick if applicable	organizations?
	Inter-governmental organizations?		No info
	Non-governmental organizations?		No info

Objective 3.4

The contribution of CITES to the relevant Millennium Development Goals, the sustainable development goals set at WSSD, the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* and the relevant *Aichi Biodiversity Targets*, and the relevant outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development is strengthened by ensuring that international trade in wild fauna and flora is conducted at sustainable levels.

This objective may also be assessed by a variety of means beyond the reporting format, including action taken to implement many of the CITES resolutions and decisions.

Aichi Target 1, Target 2, Target 3, Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 12, Target 14, Target 17, Target 18 and Target 19.

Indicator 3.4.1: The conservation status of species listed on the CITES Appendices has stabilized or improved.

3.4.1a	Do you have data which shows that the conservation status of naturally occurring species in your country listed on the CITES Appendices has stabilized or improved?	Yes	No	Not Applicable
	Appendix I	\boxtimes		
	Appendix II	\boxtimes		
	Appendix III	\boxtimes		
	If there are such studies that you are willing to share, please pro	vide:		
	Although a number of status surveys have been undertaken, an Appendix I and Appendix II species (such as peregrine falcon) to export wild-taken specimens of native fauna the details of these this report. Full details can be provided upon request.	ecause	the UK d	loes not normally
	The status of Scottish Wild Cat (<i>Felis silvestris</i>) is constantly mor UK native birds of prey (<i>F.peregrinus</i> (App I) and UK native b monitored through a number of partnership schemes including annual reporting, where relevant, by the Rare Birds Breeding Part the Breeding Bird Survey (https://www.bto.org/volunteer-surveys/b (e.g. see https://www.scottishraptoring.org/ and http://www.scottishraptoring.org/ and https://www.scottishraptoring.org/ and http://www.scottishraptoring.org/	irds of periodi iel (<u>http:</u> obs), and	prey and c national displayed by other displayed by	owls are regularly targeted surveys p.org.uk/), through volunteer schemes
	With regards to CITES listed Cetacea, here is an obligation under to undertake surveillance on the conservation status of all cetace and report on this every six years. Monitoring is undert (http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/pdf/Report481 web.pdf).	an spe	cies occur	ring in UK waters
3.4.1b	Do you have examples of specific examples of success stories of emerging problems with any CITES listed species?	N	es o o informat	ion 🔲
	If 'Yes', please provide details:			
	Ivory Bill (Success Story):			
	As a result of a public consultation, with the largest response e			
	received, a ban on the sale of Ivory (apart from certain exemptio is currently making its way through the UK parliamentary proce			
	The UK believes that closing the domestic ivory market will redu			

the demand for products which will help to conserve elephants by reducing levels of poaching.

Indicator 3.4.2: The number of Parties incorporating CITES into their National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).

3.4.2a	Has CITES been incorporated into your country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?	Yes No Other	
	In the UK CITES has not been incorporated into the NBSAP. It has been incorporated however in certain UK Overseas Territories. In the Isle of Man, the biodiversity strategy (Managing out Natural Wealth, the Isle of Man's first biodiversity strategy, 2015-2025) includes CITES.	Other	
	The UK ensured International species conservation work featured as our 25 Year Environment Plan was developed (Published Jan 2018).		
3.4.2b	Have you been able to obtain funds from the Global Environment	Yes	
	Facility (GEF) or other sources to support CITES aspects of NBSAP	No	\boxtimes
	implementation?	No information	

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.

Aichi Target 2, Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 10, Target 12, Target 14 and Target 19.

Indicator 3.5.1: The number of cooperative actions taken under established bilateral or multilateral agreements to prevent species from being unsustainably exploited through international trade.

7	3.5.1a	Has your country taken action under established bilateral or multilateral agreements other than CITES to prevent species from being unsustainably exploited through international trade? If 'Yes', please provide details:	Yes No No information	
		 The UK has taken action through established agreements such as the International Whaling Commission (IWC). 		
		 In Montserrat local law requires permits for the possession of partially protected species. Possession of protected species is not allowed unless an application is made and reviewed. 		

Indicator 3.5.2: The number of times other relevant international organizations and agreements dealing with natural resources are consulted on issues relevant to species subject to unsustainable trade.

3.5.2a	Average number of times per year that international organizations or agreements have been consulted by CITES Authorities	Once	2-5 times	6-20 times	More than 20 times	No consultation	Optional comment about which organizations and issues consulted on
	Management Authority(ies)				\boxtimes		NGOs mainly, other MEAs.
	Scientific Authority(ies)						The UK frequently consults international organisations including the IUCN, EU Scientific Review Group and the CITES Secretariat. The UK also consults several International NGOs such as TRAFFIC.
	Enforcement Authority(ies)						EU Enforcement Working group, Europol, Interpol, other Border Force equivalents.

General feedback

Please provide any additional comments you would like to make, including comments on this format.

ltem		
Copy of full text of CITES-relevant legislation if changed	Enclosed	\boxtimes
Web link(s)	Not available	
` '	Previously provided	
Copies of CITES-relevant legislation will have been provided previously as part of the National Legislation Project. Additional copies for certain territories are below.	,	
Falkland Islands – Endangered Species Protection Ordinance (2015): https://legislation.gov.fk/view/html/inforce/2018-10-24/fiord-2015-		
13		
Montserrat (legislation passed during reporting period but not yet come into force):		
http://agc.gov.ms/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/Act-No10-of- 2016-Trade-in-Endangered-Species-Act-2016.pdf		
 Appendix A – Awareness raising materials Appendix B – Forensic Analysis Fund (FAF) Cases – the where forensic testing has been used to sentence those sumples and the sentence that the companion of the sentence and the	uspected of committing CITE for Scottish Agriculture (S	S offences. ASA) – this
Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in	ı Yes	\boxtimes
your country requiring attention or assistance?	No	
	No Information	
If 'Yes', please describe the constraint and the type of attention or a	assistance that is required.	
Many UKOTs have limited resources which constrain their ability Montserrat has reported that due to capacity constraints it is difficult of CITES in a timely manner. As persons are not versed in CITES address queries from the secretariat and the general public.	to assign persons to honour	the obligations
Are there examples of good practice you would like to share with of	ther Yes	
Parties?	No	
	No Information	\boxtimes
If 'Yes' please provide details / links: n/a		
How could this report format be improved?		
 There could be guidance to accompany the questionnaire questions more specific. 		
For question 1.3.1a there should perhaps be an explanation requirements' The state of the		
 For 3.5.2a there could be a definition or explanation of the 	term 'international organisat	ion'

Thank you for completing the report. Please remember to include relevant attachments referred to in the report when it is submitted to the Secretariat.

APPENDICES

<u>APPENDIX A</u> – Awareness Raising Materials & Information (relevant to 3.2.1a)

Documents provided below in appendix A will be attached to the email when submitting the implementation report.



<u>APPENDIX B</u> – Forensic Analysis Fund (FAF) Cases

Conviction Date	Outline of offences for which convicted	Sentence	Forensic Methods Used
07-Dec-15	Selling taxidermy and animal parts contrary to COTES regulations	24 weeks imprisonment	Number of wildlife products being offered for sale seized by police. Radiocarbon dating confirmed that leopard skins were from animals post 1947. The charges regarding these specimens were discontinued though the skins were forfeited by the court. Supported by FAF.
13-Sep-16	Offering elephant ivory for sale contrary to COTES regulations	Seven months jail suspended 18 months	Adverts offering 'Cow bone carvings' appeared on eBay with claim imported from Africa in 1947. Items seized, suspect accepted the items were ivory but maintained claim regarding age and submitted for radio carbon testing, this confirmed they were modern and from an elephant living after 1947. Supported by FAF.
29-Sep-16	Offering tiger skin for sale contrary to COTES regulations	Information not available	Javan tiger skin advertised on Ebay. Advert stated the skin was pre 1947. From appearance it looked newer. Police seized the skin and sent it for radiocarbon dating. The result was positive, the animal died either around 1962 or between 1977 and 1979, the latter period being more likely. Supported by FAF.

<u>APPENDIX C</u> – Cases Submitted to Science and Advice for Scottish Agriculture (SASA)

Case ref	Description	CITES species involved	Date samples received	Result
WDF_132	Species ID from DT content of poisoned red kite - WIIS-14168	Red kite - Milvus milvus	04/02/2015	Bait material probably pigeon
WDF_134	Species ID fromDT of poisoned peregrine, WIIS-15011	Peregrine falcon, Falco peregrinus	04/02/2015	Bait material probably red grouse
WDF_135	Species ID from DT of 2 poisoned buzzards, WIIS-15060	Buzzards, Buteo buteo	08/04/2015	Bait material probably wood pigeon and pheasant
WDF_137	Species ID from DT of poisoned red kite (carb) - WIIS- 15069	Red kite - Milvus milvus	17/04/2015	Bait material probably red grouse
WDF_144, WDF_145 and WDF149	Species ID from DT of poisoned buzzard - WIIS -15155, 15172 and 15184	Buzzards, Buteo buteo	23/09/2015	Bait material probably rabbit
WDF_151	Big cat species ID from claws for sale.	Tiger - Panthera tigris	01/12/2015	Tiger DNA identified from one claw
WDF_154	Powdered product which may include bear bile - test for bear DNA requested.	Bear sp	23/03/2016	No results from testing. This could mean there is no bear product present, or it could mean that any bear DNA present is too degraded or dilute for detection.
WDF_159	Anguilla japonica shipment - supplier has previously shipped Anguilla anguilla - species ID requested	European eel	08/06/2016	Identified as Anguilla japonica
WDF_161	Illegally set pole traps - test for raptor DNA. Kestrel and merlin DNA identified on the traps.	Kestrel, Falco tinninculus	16/06/2016	Kestrel and Merlin DNA identified on the traps.

WDF_162	Peregrine persecution - test of 12 items for raptor DNA. Peregrine DNA positively identified on two items submitted.	Peregrine falcon, Falco peregrinus	28/06/2016	Peregrine DNA positively identified on two items submitted.
WDF_165	Test for rhino DNA from bracelet	Rhino sp	07/07/2016	No result from rhino DNA test. Yak DNA identified, bracelet likely made from Yak horn.
WDF_168	Species ID from possible bear gall bladder	Bear sp	28/07/2016	No bear DNA identified, but domestic cat DNA is present. The gall bladder is likely to be from a cat.
WDF_170	Species ID from DT of poisoned buzzard - WIIS -16161	Buzzard, Buteo buteo	24/10/2016	Bait material probably pheasant
WDF_173	Test for raptor DNA from traps baited with phesant. Buzzard DNA identified from the traps.	Buzzard, Buteo buteo	22/11/2016	Complete- buzzard DNA identified in some case samples
WDF_176	rhino-horn cup possibly (360g) - 12- 13cm across. Species ID	Rhino sp	29/11/2016	No results from testing. This could mean there is no rhino horn present, or it could mean that any rhino DNA present is too degraded or dilute for detection.
WDF_181	Short-eared owl persecution - confirmation of species from blood sample recovered from the scene and examination of boots of suspect. Scene sample identified as short-eared owl.	Short-eared owl - Asio flammeus	01/06/2017	Sample from the scene was confirmed as short-eared owl. Samples taken from the boots gave no results.
WDF_184	Mammal and raptor persecution - snares and traps. Otter DNA identified from one of the snares.	Otter - Lutra lutra	27/06/2017	Multiple snares and traps examined and tested. Among other results, otter DNA was identified from one of the snares.
WDF_185	Ivory carving - species identification requested. Identified as originating from African elephant, Loxodonta africana.	African elephant, Loxodonta africana	04/08/2017	Tusk identified as originating from African elephant, Loxodonta africana.
WDF_189	Species ID from DT of poisoned buzzard - WIIS -17139	Buzzard, Buteo buteo	12/12/2017	Bait material probably pheasant
WDF_190	Species ID from DT content of poisoned red kite - WIIS-17141	Red kite - Milvus milvus	12/12/2017	Inconclusive results, only red kite DNA amplified from stomach content.

<u>APPENDIX D</u> – Table of Demand Reduction Activities

Ref	Title	Organisation	Partner organisations	Start / End Date Value Awarded	Country(ies)	Focus species	Summary (from GOV.UK)
IWT002	Cutting out the middleman: combatting wildlife trafficking in Vietnam	Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)	Vietnam CITES Management Authority (MA) National Environmental Police (Southern Office)	01/04/2014 31/03/2017 £279708	Vietnam	Elephant Rhino	This project aims to build the capacity, political interest, and longer-term commitment of government, media and civil society to reduce illegal trafficking in wildlife. It also aims to strengthen enforcement and prosecution of wildlife trafficking crimes and help disrupt and dismantle the criminal networks driving the illegal trade.

IWT004	Reducing rhino horn demand through behaviour change in Vietnam	Save the Rhino International	TRAFFIC - East and Southern Africa Population Services International (PSI)	01/04/2014 31/12/2016 £280780	Vietnam	Rhino	This project will develop a model approach for a behaviour-change campaign incorporating a strong science-based approach to tackle the demand for illegal wildlife products in Asia that will be available to other organisations working specifically on reducing consumption of rhino horn and other illegal-traded wildlife products.
IWT006	Educational Children's Videos Reduce Endangered Species Demand in Viet Nam	Humane Society International	CITES Management Authority Vietnam	01/02/2015 31/01/2017 £59762	Vietnam	Elephant Pangolin Rhino Tiger	This project will build on experience with a recent rhino horn demand reduction campaign. It will produce three new illustrated 16-page children's booklets in Vietnamese and English, one each on elephants, tigers and pangolins, and prepare electronic versions of these. It will produce animated videos of 10 minutes for each of the four booklets (including the rhino booklet that already exists) for dissemination in Vietnam. The videos will be broadcast at least 100 times over the course of a year on national television. Surveys will be used to measure the impact of the material.
IWT015	A Recipe for Reducing Ivory Consumption in China	Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)	College of Life Science (CLS), Beijing Normal University China Wildlife Conservation Association (CWCA)	15/04/2015 15/09/2017 £238891	China	Elephant	This project will build on the foundation of previous demand reduction campaigns, aiming to activate the public to engage in anti-ivory campaigns themselves. This will include: harnessing the power of social media, building on a pilot ('voices of China'); working with corporate leaders; research work to further explain the rationale for restricting the legal market

							for ivory and promoting this work to Chinese officials and the Chinese public.
IWT025	Saving Pangolins by Reducing Demand in Vietnam and China	WildAid	CHANGE (Center of Hands- on Actions and Networking for Growth and Environment)	01/04/2016 31/03/2018 £195600	Vietnam, China	Pangolin	This project will dissuade Vietnamese and Chinese consumers from purchasing pangolin products by debunking the false medicinal value of their scales and making the consumption of pangolin meat socially unacceptable, and also build capacity for more effective enforcement of trade bans.
IWT045	Research and pilot campaign to reduce demand for pangolins	Zoological Society of London (ZSL)	Eco-bridge Continental, Beijing Forestry University	01/04/2017 31/03/2021 £386945	China	Pangolin	This project will pilot demand reduction programmes in Guangdong, China, targeting consumers of pangolin products. Using a best-practice framework, the project will conduct indepth research into specific triggers/drivers of consumption, and develop marketing programmes, including social media, with stakeholder input, to change behaviours, thereby reducing demand. Having demonstrated impact, the programme will be scaled-up and expanded to additional pangolin markets (post-project). Reducing demand for pangolins will remove incentives for trafficking, and reduce exploitation of wild populations and adjacent communities in low-income pangolin range states.