Implementation report format

The format below follows the structure of the *CITES Strategic Vision*: 2008-2020 and aims to collect information to enable the Strategic Vision indicators to be implemented.

CITES vision statement

Conserve biodiversity and contribute to its sustainable use by ensuring that no species of wild fauna or flora becomes or remains subject to unsustainable exploitation through international trade, thereby contributing to the significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss and making a significant contribution towards achieving the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Article VIII, paragraph 7 (b), of the Convention requires each Party to submit to the CITES Secretariat a report on legislative, regulatory and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of the Convention.

The report format allows Parties to present information in a standard manner, so that it can be easily collated, with three main objectives:

- i) To enable monitoring of the implementation and effectiveness of the Convention;
- ii) To facilitate the identification of major achievements, significant developments, or trends, gaps or problems and possible solutions; and
- iii) Provide a basis for substantive and procedural decision-making by the Conference of the Parties and various subsidiary bodies.

Information on the nature and extent of CITES trade should be incorporated into the annual report [Article VIII paragraph 7 (a)], whereas the report provided under Article VIII paragraph 7 (b) should focus on measures taken to implement the Convention.

The report should cover the period indicated in <u>Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP16)</u> which urges that the report should be submitted to the Secretariat one year before each meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP). The reason for setting the report to be due a year in advance of the following CoP is to allow information to be collated so it can be considered by the Standing Committee in advance of CoP, and enable publication of the Strategic Vision indicators in advance of CoP.

Reports should be prepared in one of the three working languages of the Convention (English, French, Spanish).

Parties are *strongly* encouraged to prepare and submit their reports in electronic form. This will facilitate timely integration of information from Parties into publication of the Strategic Vision Indicators. If reports are only provided in hard copy, resources will be needed at the Secretariat to make an electronic copy, and this is not good use of Secretariat resources.

The completed report should be sent to:

CITES Secretariat International Environment House Chemin des Anémones 11-13 CH-1219 Châtelaine-Geneva Switzerland

Email: info@cites.org

Tel: +41-(0)22-917-81-39/40 Fax: +41-(0)22-797-34-17

If a Party requires further guidance on completing their report, please contact the CITES Secretariat at the address above.

Party	United States of America
Period covered in this report	July 1, 2015 through December 31, 2017
Department or agency preparing this report	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) Division of Management Authority 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS:IA Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 358 2095 Fax: +1 (703) 358 2280 Email: managementauthority@fws.gov
	Web: http://www.fws.gov/international
Contributing departments, agencies and organizations	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS:IA Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 358 1708 Fax: +1 (703) 358 2276 Email: scientificauthority@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/international
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement (FWS/OLE) 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS:LE Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 358 1949 Fax: +1 (703) 358 2271 Email: lawenforcement@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/le

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 CIT	ES relevant policies or legislation been developed during the period covered in this
	report?	Yes X No □

	If 'Yes', have you shared information with the Secretariat? Yes X No \(\subseteq Not Applicable \(\subseteq \) If 'No', please provide details to the Secretariat with this report:
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 X No If 'No', please provide details of the constraints faced:
	Although the formal process for revising the U.S. CITES implementing regulations takes longer than 90 days following the conclusion of a meeting of the CoP, we are able to implement changes to the CITES Appendices within the 90 day implementation period. The U.S. CITES implementing regulations state that the official CITES list includes species of wildlife and plants placed in Appendix I, II, and III in accordance with the provisions of Articles XV and XVI of the Treaty; and that the official list is maintained by the Secretariat based on decisions of the Parties and can be accessed on the Secretariat's website.

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?	Х						
	Are the procedures publicly available?	Χ						
1.2.1b	Do you have:							
	Electronic data management and a paper-based permit issuance system?	X						
	Electronic permit information exchange between Management Authorities of some countries If 'Yes', please list countries – Email copies of permits to foreign Management Authorities, when requested.	X						
	Electronic permit information exchange to Management Authorities of all countries?		X					
	Electronic permit data exchange between Management Authorities and customs?	X						
	Electronic permit used to cross border with electronic validation by customs?		X					
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please provide information on challenge Electronic validation is different than e-permitting.	ges faced	or issues	overcome:				
	If 'No', do you have any plans to move towards e-permitting¹?	Х						
	If you are planning to move towards e-permitting, please explain what might help you to do so: Moving toward e-permitting but a matter of staffing, financial, and technological capability.							

Indicator 1.2.2: The number of Parties making use of the simplified procedures provided for in Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP16).

1.2.2a	Has your country developed simplified procedures for any of the following?
	Tick all applicable

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.

		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.	Х						
	For the issuance of pre-Convention certificates or equivalent documents in accordance with <u>Article VII</u> , paragraph 2.	x						
	For the issuance of certificates of captive breeding or artificial propagation in accordance with Article VII, paragraph 5.	X						
	For the issuance of export permits or re-export certificates in accordance with Article IV for specimens referred to in Article VII, paragraph 4.	X						
	Are there other cases judged by a Management Authority to merit the use of simplified procedures? If 'Yes', please provide details: Issue master files for export where we approve a program file – approve stock of specimens and issue partially completed documents for expedited turnaround of permit applications.	X						
	the Conference of the Parties. All Aichi targets relevant to CITES, particularly Target 9, To							
Objective	the Conference of the Parties.							
ndicator	Decisions of the Conference of the Parties and/or Standin	g Commit	tee recon	nmendations.				
1.3.1a	Has your country responded to all relevant special reporting requirements that are active during the period covered in this report, including those in the Resolutions and Decisions of the Conference of the Parties, Standing Committee recommendations, and Notifications issued by the Secretariat (see [link to location on the CITES website where the reporting requirements are listed])?							
	Responses provided to ALL relevant reporting requirements X							
	Responses provided to SOME of the relevant reporting requirements							
	Responses provided to NONE of the r			•				
	No special rep			• =				
1.3.1b	Were any difficulties encountered during the period covered in the implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the 0	nis report i	n					
	of the Parties?			Yes ∐ No X				
	If 'Yes', please provide details of which Resolution(s) or Decision were / are being encountered?	(s), and, fo	or each, w	/hat difficulties				
Objective	• 1.4 The Appendices correctly reflect the conservation needs of Aichi Target 1, Target12, Target 14 and Target 19.	species.						
	The number and proportion of species that have been found to mee Conf. 9.24 or its successors. This includes both the periodic review							
1.4.1a	Have you undertaken any reviews of whether species would ben on the CITES Appendices?	efit from li	sting	Yes X No 🗌				
	If 'Yes', please provide a summary here, or a link to the report of (or a copy of that report to the Secretariat if the work is not availa):					
	See attachment							

- 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 undertaken by exporting countries based on the sources of information cited in Resolution Conf. 16.7 on Non-detriment findings related to:
 - a) the population status of Appendix-II species;
 - b) the trends and impact of trade upon Appendix-II species; and
 - c) the status of and trend in naturally-occurring Appendix I species and the impact of any recovery plans.

1.5.1a	Have any surveys, studies or other analyses been undertaken in your country in relation to:	Yes	No	Not Applicable	If Yes, How many?
	- the population status of Appendix II species?	Χ			
	- the trends and impact of trade on Appendix II species?	Х			
	- the status of and trend in naturally-occurring Appendix I species?	X			
	- the impact of any recovery plans on Appendix I species?	X			
	Have the surveys, studies or analyses integrated relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities?	Х			

	If there are such studies that you are willing to share, please provide:							
	Species name (scientific)	A brief summary of the results o or other analysis (e.g. population stable / increase, off-take levels links to published reference mat	n status, de etc), or pro	ecline /				
1.5.1b	How are the results of such surveys, studies findings (NDFs)? Please tick all that app	ly						
		Revised harves						
		Stricter d	-	export [] easures X				
		Changed managen						
		Discussion with Mana	gement Au	thorities X				
		Discussion with o						
4.5.4		r (please provide a short summar	ry): 🗆 🗆 🗆 🗆					
1.5.1c	Do you have specific conservation measures plans for naturally occurring Appendix-I listed			X				
	, 3 11	Not Applicable						
		No information						
	If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary, inclining impact:	uding, if possible, an evaluation o	f their					
	We have recovery plans for any Appendix-I and is listed as endangered or threatened un Species Act of 1973. (https://www.fws.gov/er	nder our stricter domestic measur						
1.5.1d	Have you published any non-detriment finding If 'Yes', please provide links or examples to the state of the s	-	o 🗌					
	We provide copies of the United States' non- thresher sharks – links on CITES webpage f		ad, porbea	gle, and				
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,	Χ					
	B. details of any ecological risk assessments	s conducted.	X					
	C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest lo from harvest and other impacts.	cations and at sites protected	Χ					
	D. relevant knowledge and expertise of local	and indigenous communities.	X					
	E. consultations with relevant local, regional	and international experts.	X					
	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.	IEP World Conservation ons on trade, local knowledge	Х					

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

1.5.2a					No
		`	⁄es	No	information
	Do you have standard procedures for making non-detriment findings in line with Resolution Conf. 16.7?		X		
	If 'Yes', please briefly describe your procedures for making nor or attach as an annex to this report, or provide a link to where to on the internet:				found
	Please see the U.S. CITES implementing regulations at – https://dx?SID=afd03c677896daa278c42588e79d6a13&mc=true&no				
1.5.2b	When establishing non-detriment findings, have any of the follows:	owing			
	guidance been used?		Please tick all that apply		
	Virtual 0	Virtual College			
	IUCN CI	hecklist			X
	Resolution Cor	Resolution Conf. 16.7			
	2008 NDF wo	rkshop			X
	Species specific gu	uidance			X
		Other		[
	If 'Other' or 'Species specific guidance', please specify details:				
1.5.2c	How often do you review and/or change your non-detriment findings?	Case by on Annually Every two Less frequency	year		x
		A mix of the	,		X
	Please describe the circumstances under which non-detriment				anged:

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	X
	If 'Yes', do you set quotas based on population survey, or by other means? Please specify, for each species, how		
	quotas are set:		Other,
		Population	please
	Species Name (scientific)	Survey?	specify
1.5.3b	Have annual export quotas been set at levels which will	Yes	
	ensure sustainable production and consumption?	No	
	If 'Yes', please describe how this fits into your non-detriment	finding process:	

Objective	1.6 Parties cooperate in managing a Aichi Target 4, Target 5, Target 6					12 an	d Target 19.
Indicator 1.	6.1: The number of bilateral and management of shared CITES						pecifically provide for co-
1.6.1a	Is your country a signatory to any bilateral and/or multilateral agreements for co-management of shared species?Yes X No If 'Yes', please provide brief details, including the names of the agreements, and which other countries are involved: ICCAT, Polar Bear Range States Agreement, Migratory Bird Treaty Act.						
Indicator 1.		nageme		<u> </u>			y plans, in place for shared
1.6.2a	Do you have any cooperative manag in place for shared populations of CIT	•		•	ecove	ery pla	ans Yes 🗌 No X
	Although the United States does not extensively with other range States for						
	If 'Yes', please list the species for whi to a published plan for each species.	ch these	e plans a	are in pla	ace a	nd pro	ovide a link or reference
	Species Name (scientific) Link of	r referer	nce to a	publishe	ed pla	ın	
	00000 0000						
Indicator 1.	6.3: The number of workshops and ot to address the conservation and r						
1.6.3a	Have the CITES authorities receive activities provided by external source		enefited	from ar	ny of	the f	ollowing capacity-building
	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
				ш. ю			sources ¹ ?
	Staff of Management Authority						
	Staff of Scientific Authority						
ļ	Staff of enforcement authorities						
	Traders						
	NGOs						
	Public						

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

Other (please specify):	Х	Χ	
Shark identification, tarantula, and fresh water turtle & tortoises Workshop for North American Species (shared/traded by Canada, Mexico, and the United States)			Commission on Environment Cooperation (CEC) CITES Listed Project

1.6.3b	Have the CITES authorities been the other range States?	ies been the <i>providers</i> of any of the following capacity-building activities to					
	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		Х				
	Staff of Scientific Authority		Х				00000
	Staff of enforcement authorities		Х				00000
	Traders						
	NGOs						00000
	Public						00000
	Other Parties/International meetings						
	Other (please specify) □□□□□						00000
1.6.3c	In what ways do you collaborate with	other C	CITES P	arties?			
		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	Alwavs	Further detail / examples
	Information exchange				Х		
	Monitoring / survey		Χ				
	Habitat management		Χ			E	
	Species management		Χ				
	Law enforcement				Х		
	Capacity building				Χ		

Other (please provide details). Technical assistance and training undertaken during the reporting period, in addition to those already reported to the Standing Committee and the scientific committees, include:

- FWS/OLE wildlife inspectors participated as trainers at three separate CITES training workshops that were held in Costa Rica, El Salvador, and Panama. In addition, a wildlife inspector and a special agent conducted a shark identification and CITES implementation workshop in Senegal.
- An FWS/OLE wildlife inspector provided training to U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers and Agriculture specialists stationed at Vancouver International Airport, Canada.
- In Canada, two FWS/OLE forensic scientists co-chaired and delivered scientific presentations at the concurrent annual meetings of The American College of Veterinary Pathologists and The American Society of Veterinary Clinical Pathology.
- The Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Forensics Laboratory travelled to Austria and provided expert technical input concerning the establishment of international guidelines on best practices for timber and wood identification in order to curtail illegal logging.
- In France, an FWS/OLE forensic scientist trained global law enforcement officers on identifying shahtoosh products.
- The Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Forensics Laboratory travelled to Kenya to support Kenya Wildlife Service's newly established forensics laboratory. OLE forensics scientists collaborated with their Kenyan counterparts to create this lab.
- In 2015, together with the National Association of Conservation Law Enforcement Chiefs (NACLEC), FWS created the National Conservation Law Enforcement Leadership Academy. State conservation law enforcement executives received training to prepare them to effectively carry out their job responsibilities adaptively in a rapidly changing world.
- In 2016, FWS with NACLEC, co-created the International Conservation Chiefs Academy (ICCA). During this reporting period, two ICCAs were successfully completed. Eighty-one international law enforcement officials representing 17 countries received training focused on adaptive leadership, CITES, investigation intelligence sharing, wildlife forensics, evidence training, and case studies. Training also included a one-week overlap where state and international officials trained together with federal counterparts facilitating.

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?	Χ				
	formal international cooperation, such as an international enforcement network?	Χ				
	– a national enforcement strategy and/or action plan?	Х				
	– formal national interagency cooperation, such as a national interagency enforcement committee?	Х				
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please specify the level of engagement and provide additional details:					
	FWS routinely shared intelligence on potential CITES violations with the CITES Secretariat, appropriate enforcement authorities of other CITES Parties, and Interpol during the reporting period. Examples of FWS cooperative enforcement efforts during the reporting period, in addition to those already reported to the Standing Committee and the scientific committees, include:					

- Provided intelligence to South Korea concerning a Virginia (U.S.) business owner and a Korean buyer who sold, bought, and smuggled squirrel monkey blood falsely labelled as human blood.
 Worked with Mexican law enforcement to extradite a fugitive of a four-year manhunt who smuggled arapaima.
 Repatriated seven offspring from a rare, white boa constrictor, which were illegally taken from the wild in Brazil and smuggled into the United States. The repatriation request came from the Government of Brazil.
 Met with representatives from the Russian Federation and the Alaska Nanuug Commission
- Met with representatives from the Russian Federation and the Alaska Nanuuq Commission concerning a polar bear treaty.
- Conducted cooperative inspection blitzes with Canadian wildlife and customs authorities at various ports of entry along the U.S.-Canada land border.
- Expanded the wildlife law enforcement attaché program to include seven attachés stationed at U.S. embassies in global areas where wildlife trafficking is high.

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	Yes No, but review is under	X			
	your strategy(ies)?	consideration				
		No				
		No information				
	If 'Yes', what do you do?					
	FWS/OLE has in place a Strategic Plan through 2020 for enforcer against which we assess the achievements of those goals. This place our website: www.fws.gov/le/pdf/OLE-Stategic-Plan.pdf.					
	If 'Yes' or 'No, but review is under consideration', which tools do yo	ou find of value? □□□□□				
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 X	r			
		No 🗌				
		No information				
	If 'Yes', please provide feedback on the parts of the toolkit used and how useful the toolkit or equivalent tools have been. Please specify improvements that could be made:					
	If 'No', please provide feedback on why not or what is needed to make the toolkit or equivalent tools useful to you:					
	FWS/OLE implements a variety of methods for illegal wildlife detection, investigations, evidence management, and case presentation. Although the ICCWC toolkit is helpful, the methods in it have already been developed and utilized within our enforcement agencies. We welcome the continued partnerships with other countries to enhance their capacities to counter wildlife trafficking efforts.					

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,	Yes	Х
	prosecuting, and penalizing CITES offences as a crime?	No	
		No information	
	If 'Yes', please provide the title of the legislation and a summary of the penalties available		

	The United States implements CITES under the Ends	angoro	٨		
	The United States implements CITES under the Enda				
	Species Act. However, other national wildlife-related				
	as the Lacey Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, Marine M				
	Protection Act, etc. can be utilized, as well as other no				
	laws, including smuggling, conspiracy, and other Fede				
	statutes. These laws and their associated penalties ca				
	on our website, https://www.fws.gov/le/laws-regulation				
1.7.3b	Are criminal offences such as poaching and wildlife tr	affickir	ng	Yes	X
	recognized as serious crime ¹ in your country?			No	
				No information	n 🗌 📗
	If 'Yes', please explain what criteria must be met for p	oachin	na or w	•	
	treated as serious crimes:	odoriii	19 OI W	mamo tramotting	g offerfices to be
	trodica do seriodo orimico.				
					£
	In the United States, there are two levels of wildlife law				
	the State level. The States establish their own laws, a				
	treated differently from State to State. Generally spea was taken illegally and that the individual had knowled				
	with the added criteria of individual rights provided in				
	component is almost, if not always required. Federal				
	more complex, and involve cross border (state to state				
1720				1	
1.7.3c	Do you have capacity to use forensic technology ² to s investigation of CITES offences?	suppor	ı ıne	Yes	X
	investigation of Cri E3 offences?			No	
				No information	n 📙
	If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary of any sample	es fron	n CITE	S-listed specie	s that were
	collected and submitted to an appropriate forensic an	alysis i	facility	(located in you	r country and/or
	another country) during the period covered in this rep	ort:			
	If 'Yes', and your country has an appropriate forensic	analye	ic faci	lity for CITES lie	stad species
	please indicate which species it applies to:	ananys	15 1461	illy for GTTES-ill	sieu species,
4 = 0 1				.,	
1.7.3d	Did your authorities participate in or initiate any multi-			Yes	X
	law enforcement operation(s) targeting CITES-listed s	species	S	No	
	during the period covered in this report?			No information	n 🗌
	If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary, including any	/ lesso	ns lea	rned which mig	ht be helpful for
	other Parties:	•		3	'
	Multi-disciplinary law enforcement operations targetin	a CITE	-S-list	ed species durir	na the reporting
	period already reported to the Standing Committee ar				
170-				1	
1.7.3e	Do you have a standard operating procedure among			Yes	
	agencies for submitting information related to CITES INTERPOL and/or the World Customs Organization?		35 IU	No	X
	INTERPOL and/or the World Customs Organization?			No information	n 📙
					If yes, how many
	Do you have legislative provisions for any of the				times was this
	following that can be applied to the investigation,				used during the
	prosecution and/or sentencing of CITES offences			No	period covered
1.7.3f	as appropriate?	Yes	No	information	by this report?
	General crime ⁴	Χ			

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.

² 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).

³ 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.

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	X				
	Asset forfeiture ²	X				
	Corruption ³	Χ		X		
	International cooperation in criminal matters ⁴					
	Organized crime ⁵	X				
	Specialized investigation techniques ⁶	Χ				
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please explain how each is used for CITES offences? Please provide a brief summary, including any lessons learned which might be helpful for other Parties: We use all laws and regulations available to us to combat wildlife trafficking. We do not track our investigations in general terms. However, all cases involve one or more of the above categories.					
1.7.3g	Do you have institutional capacity to implement the provisions listed in question 1.7.3f against CITES of	fences?		Yes No No information	_	
	If 'No', please provide a brief summary of your major capacity-building needs: □□□□□					

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	X
		Sometimes	
		Rarely	
		Never	
		No information	
1.7.4b	Do you have capacity to analyse information gathered on illegal trade in CITES-listed species?	Yes	Χ
		No	
		No information	
1.7.4c	Do you use criminal intelligence ⁷ to inform investigations into	Always	
	illegal trade in CITES-listed species?	Very often	Χ
		Sometimes	
		Rarely	
		Never	
		No information	

¹ 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.

⁷ 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.

1.74d	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	x
1.7.46	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 No information	×

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

During th	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?	Х						
	If 'Yes', please indicate how many and for what types of offenc details:	es. If avai	lable, pleas	e attach				
	You can find the details in the Seizure section of this report.							
1.7.5b	Have there been any criminal prosecutions of CITES-related offences?	X						
	If 'Yes', how many and for what types of offences? If available,	please at	tach details	3:				
	Most are for commercial actions in violation of CITES. However, the charges may also been under other criminal laws to effect higher penalties commensurate with the violation.							
1.7.5c	Have there been any other court actions against CITES-							
	If 'Yes', what were the offences involved and what were the result	s? Please	attach deta	ils: 🗆 🗆 🗆 🗆				
1.7.5d	1.7.5d How were any confiscated specimens disposed of? Tick a							
	Return to country of export							
	Public zoos or botanical gardens			Х				
	Designated rescue centres							
	Approved private facilities							
	- Euthanasia							
	Other (please specify): Destruction							
	Have you encountered any challenges in disposing of confiscated specimens?							
	Some facilities are reaching capacity for certain species and those species have become difficult to place. For plants, some large commercial shipments are difficult to place at a single facility and we rely on the cooperation of the institutions participating in the U.S. Plant Rescue Center program to distribute plants to other facilities.							
	Do you have good practice that you would like to share with other Parties?							
	We work with relevant stakeholders and undertake due diligence to determine suitability of placement, including considering a facility's ability to house and care for the animal, any past interactions with the organization or its personnel, etc. In September 2016, confiscated rhinoceros horn, worth an estimated \$1 million on the black market, was burned at an event co-hosted by FWS, San Diego Zoo Global, and the California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Destroyed items included whole horns, ornate objects carved from horns, and items labelled as medicinals, and all items had been seized by FWS. Many of the products were seized during federal search warrant executions, while other products were seized as they were being smuggled into or out of the United States. The burn signalled the US commitment to end the illegal rhinoceros horn trade, the severe poaching threat to rhinoceroses, and the overall wildlife trafficking crisis. Media coverage included a live social media feed that was watched by viewers around the world.							
	The U.S. Plant Rescue Center program functions very rapidly and efficiently. Plant seized by U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA/APHIS) inspectors are							

typically placed at a participating facility within 24 hours of when the U.S. Management Authority (FWS) is notified. FWS works closely with USDA/APHIS plant inspectors who request placement for CITES-listed plants imported into the United States in violation of CITES. The program would serve as a good model on which to base placement of seized wildlife. In 2015, we placed 37 shipments consisting of 6,074 plants, 13 envelopes of seeds, and 19 cactus skeletons at 17 participating facilities. No plants were returned to the country of origin but 898 plants from three shipments had to be destroyed. In 2016, we placed 51 shipments consisting of 4,522 plants and 51 cactus skeletons at 21 participating facilities. No plants were returned to the country of origin but 159 plants from one shipment had to be destroyed. In 2017, we placed 37 plant shipments consisting of 21,148 plants and 20 cactus parts, at 16 participating facilities. 20,000 of these plants were placed at one participating facility, which then distributed them to several others. No plants were returned to the country of origin and only two plants from one shipment had to be destroyed. Typically, plants are destroyed because of an infestation of insects or disease and rarely, if ever, because we could not find a participating facility that could take

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? X Permit officers? X Senforcement officers? X Senforcement officers? X Senforcement officers? X Senforcement 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?	Yes No No information	
	For some CITES trainings, we will use the CITES Virtual College materials as a starting point and then tailor the presentations to suite our needs.		
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?	Yes No No information	X

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.

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

2.2.1a	Do you have an approved service standard(s) ¹ for your Management Authority(ies)?		Yes No	X
	If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d.		NO	Ш
	If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards?			
	Our U.S. CITES implementing regulations provide information concerning the process for applying for permits. Additionally, our permit application forms provide information concerning the estimated amount of time required to review a completed application.			
	If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards ² ? If 'Yes', what are your performance targets?		Yes No	X
	We strive to meet the timeframes indicated in our regulations and our on permit application forms.			
	Do you publish your performance against service standard targets?		Yes No	X
	If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report:			
	If you did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall a result of:	Yes		No
	availability of funding?			
	– number of staff?	Χ		
	a shortage of skills?			
	If 'Yes' to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of? □□□□□□			
2.2.1b	Do you have an approved service standard(s) ⁴⁷ for your Scientific Authority(ies)?		Yes No	X
	If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d.			
	If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards?			
	If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards ⁴⁸ ?		Yes	
	If 'Yes', what are your performance targets?		No	
	If necesible, please provide your performance against convice			
	If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report:			
	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? □□□□□□			

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.

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

2.2.1c	Do you have an approved service standard(s) ⁴⁷ for your enforcement authority(ies)? If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d. If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards? Service standards for enforcement authorities are generally internal documents, but please see - https://www.fws.gov/le/about-le.html and https://www.fws.gov/le/careers.html.					X
	If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards ⁴⁸ ? If 'Yes', what are your performance targets? If possible, please provide your performance against service				Yes No	
		ease provide your performating the period covered in t				
	If you did not a result of:	meet your performance tar	gets then was this shortfall	Yes		No
	availability	of funding?				
	number of	staff?				
	a shortage	of skills?				
	If 'Yes' to a sh	ortage of skills, which skill	s do you need more of?			
2.2.1d			ur answered 'No' to the first pee of approved service stand			s:
	Do you have	sufficient of the following fo	or your authorities to function	effectively?		
		Management Authority(ies)	Scientific Authority(ies)	1	ement ity(ies)	
	Funding?	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	Staff?	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	
	Skills?	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌 No 🗌	Yes 🗌	No 🗌	

Indicator 2.2.2: The number of Parties that have undertaken one or more of the following activities:

- changed the budget for activities;
 hired more staff;
- developed implementation tools;
- purchased technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement.

2.2.2a	Have any of the following activities been undertaken during the period covered in this report to enhance the effectiveness of CITES	
	implementation at the national level?	Tick if applicable
	Hiring of more staff	X
	Development of implementation tools	Χ
	Purchase of technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement	X

	Other (please specify):							
	Expanded the wildlife inspection canine teams from four to seven. Canine teams now work at the following ports: Anchorage, Alaska; Chicago, Illinois; Honolulu, Hawaii; Houston, Texas; Los Angeles, California; Miami, Florida; and San Juan, Puerto Rico.							
	In 2016, the FWS National Forensics Lab acquired a computed tomography (CT) scanner, which allows pathologists to see the injuries within minutes and prior to physical manipulation of the carcass.							
	On July 29, 2016, the FWS, Branch of and 22 new wildlife inspectors.	Training an	d Inspections	s, graduated 38 n	ew special agents			
	In 2016, FWS, in collaboration with the Chiefs, created the International Conserelationships between U.S. state and fe counterparts.	ervation Ch	iefs Academy	to train and build	d long-term working			
	In 2015, wildlife inspectors received tra system that uses infrared scanning, an quickly. This technology assists them i detecting organic threats and explosive	d can detec n locating o	ct temperature organic contra	e fluctuations to i band behind nor	nterpret images n-metallic surfaces;			
2.2.2b	During the period covered in this report budget for your:	t, was the	Increased	Stable	Decreased			
	Management Authority(ies)		Х					
	Scientific Authority(ies)		Х					
	Enforcement authorities		Х					
2.2.2c	Have you been able to use international development funding assistance to include level of implementation of your		Yes	No	Not applicable			
	Management Authority(ies)?				Χ			
	Scientific Authority(ies)?				Χ			
	Enforcement authorities?				Χ			
2.2.2d	What is the respective level of priority f the national level through the following		ng the effectiv	eness of CITES	implementation at			
	Activity	High	Medium	Low	Not a Priority			
	Hiring of more staff	Χ						
	Development of implementation tools		Χ					
	Purchase of new technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement	X						
	e-permitting	Χ						
	Other (please specify): □□□□□							
2.2.2e	Do you have an operational system (e. electronic database) for managing	g.	Yes	Under development	No			
	Species information		X					
	Trade information		Х					
	Non-detriment findings		Х					

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: Tic	k all that are appl	icable
	Administrative procedures		Χ
	 Issuance of CITES documents (e.g. for import, exports, re-export, or into the sea) – fee charged for processing of applications; not purchasing CI documents; fees charged do not cover all costs associated with reviewing and issuing CITES documents. 	ITES	X
	 Shipment clearance (e.g. for the import, export, re-export, or introduction of CITES-listed species) 	n from the sea	X
	Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species		Χ
	 Harvesting of CITES-listed species – harvesting of CITES-listed species U.S. States and any associated fees would be charged by the relevant 		
	Use of CITES-listed species		
	Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species		
	Other (please specify): □□□□□		
2.2.3b	Is a fee schedule publicly available?	Yes X N	lo 🗌
	If 'Yes', please provide an internet link, or a copy of the schedule to the Sec US CITES permit application fees can be found at: https://www.gpo.gov/fdstitle50-vol1/pdf/CFR-2010-title50-vol1-sec13-11.pdf.)_
2.2.3c	Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wil	dlife conservation	1?
		Entirely	
		Partly	Χ
		Not at all	
		Not relevant	
2.2.3d		Yes	No
	Do you raise funds for CITES management through charging user fees?		Χ
	Do your fees recover the full economic cost of issuing permits?		Χ
	Do you have case studies on charging or using fees?		
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please provide brief details: □□□□□		
	Do you use innovative financial mechanisms to raise funds for CITES implementation?		Х
	If 'Yes', please provide brief details: □□□□□	_	
Indicator 2	.2.4: The number of Parties using incentive measures as part of their imple Convention.	ementation of the	
	Do you use incentive measures¹ such as those described in <u>CoP14 Doc 32</u> to Convention? Yes No	implement the	
	Due diligence X		
	Compensatory mechanisms		
	Certification		
	Communal property rights X		
	Auctioning of quotas X		
	Cost recovery or environmental charges X		
	Enforcement incentives	Р. Г.	
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, or if you use other measures, please provide a su	mmary or link to	

further information: United States charges fees for inspection of shipments of CITES-listed

specimens. See also information above concerning CITES permit application fees.

Have incentives harmful to biodiversity been eliminated? N/A

2.2.4b

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.

Not at all ☐	
Very little☐	
Somewhat _	
Completely <u></u>	

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	How many training and capacity building you run during the period covered in this				Without from the Secreta	е	stance Conducted or assisted by the Secretariat
			N	lone			
				1			
				2-5			<u>X</u>
				6-10		X	
		,	1 [.] More tha	1-20			
	Please list the Resolutions or Decisions			_	Statos	io oot	ively engaged in improving
	the capacity of Parties to implement CIT in CITES training workshops.						
2.3.1b	What sorts of capacity building activities	have ta	aken pla	ce?			
	CITES training workshops for Managem workshops have been on both general (
2.3.1c	What capacity building needs do you ha	ve?					
	Please tick all boxes which apply 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		X				Modernizing permitting system
	Staff of Scientific Authority						
	Staff of enforcement authorities						
	Traders / other user groups	Х					Record keeping
	NGOs	Χ					
	Public	Х					
	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 3CONTRIBUTE 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: □□□□□		
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?						Yes No No	X
	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)
	FWS has provided funding for on- the-ground conservation projects involving CITES in numerous countries. Summaries can be found at - https://www.fws.gov/international/gr ants-and-reporting/project- summaries.html. Other U.S. government agencies also provide funding for CITES projects around the world.	X	Х	X	X	X		
	00000							
	00000							

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.

00000				
0000				

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	Wider public	Relevant User
	requirements by the wider public and relevant user groups?		Groups
	Press conferences		X
	- Press releases	X	
	Newspaper articles, brochures, leaflets	X	
	Television appearances	X	Χ
	Radio appearances	X	
	- Presentations	X	Χ
	Public consultations / meetings	X	Χ
	Market surveys		Χ
	- Displays	X	
	Information at border crossing points		
	Telephone hotline	X	
	Website(s) – if so please provide link(s) www.fws.gov	X	
	Other (specify): □□□□□		
	Please attach copies of any items or describe examples:		

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

3.2.2a	How regularly do your Authorities consult the Cl	TES wel	osite?			
	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	Χ				
	Staff of Scientific Authority	Χ				
	Staff of enforcement authorities	Χ				
3.2.2b	What has been your experience with using the	CITES v	vebsite?	Exc	ellent	
				Goo	d	Χ
				Ave	rage	
				Poo	r	
	Very Poor					
				No i	nformation	
	Any further comments on the CITES Website? (e.g. useful aspects, any difficulties encountered, which authorities find which functions/tools most useful, what is missing, etc): The new CITES					

website format has been difficult to get used to, and sometimes it is still difficult to find topics on it.

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? If 'Yes', please give a brief description:	Yes No No information	X
--------	---	-----------------------------	---

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.

3.3.2a	How many international projects which integrate CITES issues has your country contributed towards?		
3.3.2b	In addition to 3.2.2a, how many national level projects has your count implemented which integrate CITES issues?	ry	~10
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?		X
	Agencies for trade?	Χ	
	Provincial, state or territorial authorities?	Χ	
	Local authorities or communities?	Χ	
	Indigenous or local peoples?	Χ	
	Trade or other private sector associations? See Attachment 2 for details of working with the trade.	X	
	NGOs?	Χ	
	Other (please specify)		
3.3.2d	Are CITES requirements integrated into?	Yes	No
	National and local development strategies? N/A		
	National and local poverty reduction strategies? N/A		
	Planning processes?	Χ	
	National accounting? N/A		

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.

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 to / from:	Tick if applicable	Which organizations?
	Inter-governmental organizations?	X	Commission for Environmental Cooperation
	Non-governmental organizations?	X	Various

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						
				'es	No	Not Applicable	
	Appendix I			X			
		Appen	dix II	X			
		Appen	lll xib	X			
	If there are such studies that you are willing to share, please provide:						
	Species name (scientific) Link to the data, or a brief summary						
3.4.1b	Do you have examples of specific examples of success stories or emerging problems with any CITES listed species?			Yes No	nform atio		
	No information X If 'Yes', please provide details: □□□□□						

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 No information	x
3.4.2b	Have you been able to obtain funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) or other sources to support CITES aspects of NBSAP implementation?	Yes No 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 action to prevent species from being un							ments
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	X			
Indicator 3.9	5.2:	The number of times other relevenatural resources are consulted							
3.5.2a	that agre	erage number of times per year international organizations or eements have been consulted CITES Authorities	Once	2-5 times	6-20 times	More than 20 times	No consultation	Optional comment which organization issues consulted	ns and
	Man	agement Authority(ies)				Х			
	Scie	ntific Authority(ies)				Х			
	Enfo	prcement Authority(ies)				Х			
Please prov	vide a	ny additional comments you would	neral fee		ncludir	ng com	ment	s on this format.	
		Item							
Web link(s	s): w.ecfr	of CITES-relevant legislation if ch	hanged Enclosed						
idx?SID=6	312d0	75319574c4e5bee945ba7c55578 n=div5#sp50.9.23.a	&mc=tr	ue&nod					
Please list	any r	materials annexed to the report, e.	.g. fee s	chedule:	s, awa	areness	raisi	ng materials, etc:	
		raints to implementation of the Coquiring attention or assistance?	nventio	n arisen	in	Yes No No Ir	nform	X nation	
If 'Yes', ple	ease c	describe the constraint and the typ	e of att	ention or	r assis	tance t	hat is	required.	
Parties?		ples of good practice you would lik	e to sha	are with	other	No	nform	X nation	
-		rovide details / links: □□□□□							
How could	I this r	report format be improved?							
Many of th		estions do not seem to address the	e issue	relevant	to the	objecti	ive. T	Γhe format is unwield	lly

The U.S. CITES Implementation Report 2015 - 2017

1.4.1a CoP17 proposals to amend the CITES Appendices that the United States co-sponsored:

- Indian Pangolin (*Manis crassicaudata*) CoP17 Prop. 9, India, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the United States of America Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I.
- Philippine pangolin (*Manis culionensis*) CoP17 Prop. 10, Philippines and the United States of America Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I.
- Sunda pangolin (*Manis javanica*) and Chinese pangolin (*Manis pentadactyla*) CoP17 Prop. 11, the United States of America and Viet Nam Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I.
- Giant pangolin (*Manis gigantean*), South African pangolin (*Manis temminckii*), Long-tailed pangolin (*Manis tetradactyla*), and White-bellied pangolin (*Manis tricuspis*) CoP17 Prop. 12, Angola, Botswana, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Togo and the United States of America Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I
- African grey parrot (Psittacus erithacus) CoP17 Prop. 19, Angola, Chad, the European Union, Gabon, Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo and the United States of America Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I.
- Pygmy chameleons (*Rhampholeon spp.*, *Rieppeleon spp.*) CoP17 Prop. 27 Central African Republic, Chad, Gabon, Kenya, Nigeria and the United States of America. Inclusion in Appendix II.
- Trionychidae: Nubian flapshell turtle (*Cyclanorbis elegans*), Senegal flapshell turtle (*Cyclanorbis senegalensis*), Aubrys flapshell turtle (*Cycloderma aubryi*), Zambezi flapshell turtle (*Cycloderma frenatum*), Nile soft-shell turtle (*Trionyx triunguis*), and Euphrates soft-shell turtle (*Rafetus euphraticus*) CoP17 Prop. 36, Burkina Faso, Chad, Gabon, Guinea, Liberia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Togo and the United States of America Inclusion in Appendix II.
- Myliobatidae: Devil rays (*Mobula spp.*) CoP17 Prop. 44, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, European Union, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka and the United States of America Inclusion in Appendix II.
- Nautilidae: Nautilus (*Nautilidae spp.*) CoP17 Prop. 48 (Rev.1), Fiji, India, Palau and the United States of America Inclusion in Appendix II.
- New Mexico fishhook cactus (*Sclerocactus cloverae*), Siler's fishhook cactus (*Sclerocactus sileri*), and Blaine's fishhook cactus (*Sclerocactus spinosior blainei*) –CoP17 Prop. 52, the United States of America Transfer fishhook cacti *Sclerocactus spinosior* ssp. *blainei* (= *Sclerocactus blainei*), *Sclerocactus cloverae* (CITES-listed synonym of *Sclerocactus parviflorus*), and *Sclerocactus sileri* from Appendix II to Appendix I.
- Agarwood (*Aquilaria* spp., *Gyrinops* spp.) CoP17 Prop. 60, the United States of America Amend the listings of *Aquilaria* spp. and *Gyrinops* spp. in Appendix II: Amend Annotation #14 with the underlined text:
 - All parts and derivatives except:
 - a) seeds and pollen;
 - b) seedling or tissue cultures obtained in vitro, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers;
 - c) fruits;
 - d) leaves;
 - e) exhausted agarwood powder, including compressed powder in all shapes; and
 - f) finished products packaged and ready for retail trade, this exemption does not apply to <u>wood</u> chips, beads, prayer beads and carvings.

Holy wood (*Bulnesia sarmientoi*) – CoP17 Prop. 6, the United States of America - Amend the listing of *Bulnesia sarmientoi* in Appendix II. Amend Annotation #11 with the underlined text: Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood, powder and extracts. <u>Finished products containing such extracts as ingredients, including fragrances, are not considered to be covered by this annotation.
</u>

1.4.1a Periodic Reviews Conducted:

• At the 24th Meeting of The Plants Committee, the United States submitted a periodic review for *Lewisia serrata*.

1.5.1a - Surveys of Appendix I and Appendix II species

The Division of Scientific Authority itself does not conduct surveys. Rather, State wildlife agencies, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (including U.S. Forest Service), and academic scientists at museums, universities, and other organizations undertake such work. They are too extensive to list here and the specifics/description of many are not known to us until we are making a non-detriment finding and do a literature search and/or query our State wildlife agency partners.

3.4.1a – Data on Native (U.S.) Appendix I, II and III species.

Too extensive to list here.

Working with the Trade

In 2016, in Detroit, Michigan, a wildlife inspector participated in the annual Customs and Border Protection (CBP) Detroit Field Office Trade Day, which allows government agencies to present material and answer questions from the trade community. Over 300 attendees from a diverse group of U.S. and Canadian customhouse brokers, carriers, importers, and other trade groups networked with commodity teams, specialists from the Centers for Excellence and Expertise, and frontline officers from CBP and other partner agencies. In addition to FWS, other participating government agencies included Homeland Security Investigations, Immigration and Customs Enforcement; U.S. Department of Agriculture; U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA); Canadian Border Services Agency; and the Canadian Food Inspection Service.

In 2016, wildlife inspectors in California participated in an import/export forum to educate National Association of Music Merchants members who are impacted by plant or animal products import/export regulations. The presentations focused on wood import regulations, electronic documentation requirements, the Lacey Act, ivory regulations, and CITES regulations. Following the forum, the wildlife inspectors scheduled one-on-one meetings with distributors and suppliers to discuss FWS regulations and practices and explain what constitutes a wildlife product.

In 2015, a wildlife inspector from Newark, New Jersey, along with the Food and Drug Administration and CBP's Centers of Excellence, presented an overview of FWS and federal laws at the Luxury Fashion & Beauty Products Trade Seminar in Bryant Park, New York. The inspector explained the FWS's laws that pertain to wildlife in fashion and beauty products, the process and required documentation, and included a discussion concerning the ITDS integration and how the "one-stop" Internet interface should, and will, be used by the trade. The focus of this trade seminar was to educate U.S. and international importers associated with the fashion and beauty products industries.

In 2015, wildlife inspectors performed numerous outreach events where FWS wildlife inspectors participated included the Seattle-Tacoma (SeaTac) International Airport Air Cargo Stakeholders Meeting; the Dallas Safari Club convention; the Chicago CBP Trade Show; the convention of the National Association of Music Merchants; multiple Smithsonian's National Zoo events; the Turtle Mountain Band of the Chippewa Indians Reservation; Alaskan furriers; and an Earth Day weekend event at the Aquarium of the Pacific in Long Beach, California, which was attended by thousands of visitors.