1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

2. At the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago, 2002) the Animals and Plants Committees sought and received a mandate to develop terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade. These terms of reference were proposed and adopted at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok, 2004) and can be found in Annex 1 to the Decisions of the Conference of the Parties in effect after its 14th meeting (CoP14, The Hague, 2007). For ease of reference, they are reproduced in Annex 1 to the present document.

3. The terms of reference give the responsibility for overseeing the evaluation to the Animals and Plants Committees, with the help of an advisory working group comprising Committee members, Parties, the Secretariat and invited experts. The Secretariat is responsible for administering the evaluation and for reporting regularly on progress to the Committees. Whilst the evaluation was to commence after CoP14, there is no fixed time by which it must be concluded.

4. The Animals and Plants Committees discussed this matter during their joint session on 19 April 2008 and provided some suggestions to the Secretariat on the composition of the advisory working group for the evaluation. The commencement of the evaluation is contingent on the availability of sufficient funds to ensure its completion and no such funds were available in April 2008. In October 2008, the European Commission made available USD 40,000 for the exercise. The Secretariat takes this opportunity to thank the European Commission for its generous contribution.

5. On the basis of the suggestions from the Committees referred to above, the Secretariat proposes that the advisory working group comprise the following members:

   a) **Animals Committee**: 1 member selected by the Committee
   
   b) **Plants Committee**: 1 member selected by the Committee
   
   c) **Parties**:
      
      Africa (4)
      
      Democratic Republic of the Congo
      
      Guinea
      
      Madagascar
      
      United Republic of Tanzania
Asia (3)
  China
  Indonesia
  Islamic Republic of Iran
Central and South America and the Caribbean (3)
  Guyana
  Jamaica
  Peru
Europe (3)
  Iceland
  Russian Federation
  One Party from the European Union
North America (1)
  United States of America
Oceania (1)
  Fiji

d) Invited experts:
  i) IUCN
  ii) TRAFFIC
  iii) UNEP-WCMC
  iv) European Community

The Parties proposed for each region are selected on the basis of the criteria proposed by the Committees at their last joint session with the numbers from each region based on the balance used for membership of the Standing Committee.

6. Concerning the execution of the evaluation, the Secretariat has suggested a *modus operandi* for each element of the terms of reference in Annex 2 to the present document.

7. The Committee is requested to agree the Parties and experts listed in paragraph 5 to be invited to form the advisory working group and to nominate a representative from the Committee to serve on the group. The Committee is further requested to identify and prioritize the case studies referred to in paragraph 7 b) of the terms of reference and endorse the *modus operandi* for conducting the evaluation set out in Annex 2 to the present document. The Secretariat will commence implementation of these activities, upon availability of resources.
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR AN EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE

Objectives

1. The objectives of the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade are to:
   a) evaluate the contribution of the Review of Significant Trade to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a);
   b) assess the impact over time of the actions taken in the context of the Review of Significant Trade on the trade and conservation status of species selected for review and subject to recommendations, taking into consideration the possible effects of these measures on other CITES-listed species;
   c) formulate recommendations in view of the results and findings of the evaluation and the impact assessment; and
   d) prepare a document on the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade and the resulting conclusions and recommendations for consideration at the first appropriate meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Process

2. The evaluation will commence immediately after the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, contingent on the availability of sufficient funds to ensure its completion.

3. The Animals and Plants Committees will oversee the evaluation, which will be administered by the Secretariat. Consultants may be engaged to assist it in this regard.

4. A working group composed of members of the Animals and Plants Committees, Parties, the Secretariat and invited experts will be responsible for advising on the evaluation process, reviewing the findings of associated research and developing recommendations for wider consideration by the Parties.

5. The Secretariat will regularly report on the progress of the evaluation at meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees.

6. A final report, which may include proposed amendments to existing Resolutions or Decisions, or other recommendations, and which will incorporate the comments of the Animals and Plants Committees and of range States addressed in the report, will be submitted by the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees for consideration at a future meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Chairman of the Animals or Plants Committee may submit an interim report to the Standing Committee when appropriate and considered useful.

Content of the evaluation

7. The evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade should include the following activities:
   a) assess:
      i) the process used to select species for review (including the reliance on numerical data), and the species selected as a result;
      ii) the process and means used to compile and review information concerning the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), for the selected species (including communications with the range States), and the subsequent use of this
information by the Animals and Plants Committees for the categorization of species and the issuance of recommendations;

iii) the types and frequency of recommendations made;

iv) the nature and rate of responses to recommendations, and problems identified;

v) the use of the recommendations by range States as guidance for managing target species and other CITES-listed species with similar characteristics;

vi) the nature and scale of the support provided to range States for implementing the recommendations, including field projects, financial aid and assistance in building local capacities;

vii) the ongoing process to monitor and review the implementation of recommendations, having regard to differing points of view as to where this responsibility should lie; and

viii) the impacts of the process on other aspects of CITES implementation, including how problems identified in the course of the review but not directly related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), were addressed;

b) conduct case studies of a representative range of species and countries subject to recommendations to assess subsequent short- and long-term changes, and whether these could be attributed to the process, in:

i) conservation status of the target taxa in the range States;

ii) trade volumes and patterns of the target taxa, considering trade involving the range States subject to recommendations, other range States and non-range States;

iii) production or management strategies for the target taxa;

iv) market developments of conservation relevance (such as shifts in supply or demand);

v) costs and benefits associated with the management of and trade in the target taxa (such as the effects of trade suspensions and export quotas, shift in trade to non-CITES species or increased illegal trade);

vi) protection status of the target taxa within range States, and regulatory measures outside range States;

vii) trade patterns, conservation status and management for other CITES-listed species that might be suitable ‘substitutes’ for the target taxa; and

viii) changes in conservation policies in range States; and

c) analyse the information to assess the effectiveness, costs and benefits1 of the Review of Significant Trade as implemented so far, by reference to the cost of the process and the time it takes, and identify means to improve the contribution it makes to the objectives of the Convention by reducing the threats to wild species.

---

1 The phrase ‘effectiveness, costs and benefits’ is intended to address issues such as whether or not the funds spent on the process give value for money comparable to that for other CITES activities, and whether the time-scale envisaged in the process is too long for species that are in rapid decline.
**SUGGESTED MODUS OPERANDI FOR THE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE**

### a) Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
<th>Proposed modus operandi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i) The process used to select species for review (including the reliance on numerical data), and the species selected as a result</td>
<td>There is no recorded detailed methodology for the initial selection of species for review [first DIRECTS paragraph b) of Resolution Conf 12.8 (Rev. CoP13)] or for the selection of species for detailed review and categorization [first DIRECTS paragraph g) of Resolution Conf 12.8 (Rev. CoP13)]. In order for the advisory working group to assess the process, the existing procedures could be best described in writing by Secretariat staff in conjunction with the Animals and Plants Committee Chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii) The process and means used to compile and review information concerning the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), for the selected species (including communications with the range States), and the subsequent use of this information by the Animals and Plants Committees for the categorization of species and the issuance of recommendations</td>
<td>As a general rule, compilation of the information referred to in paragraphs g) to i) of Resolution Conf 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) is undertaken by consultants contracted by the Secretariat. With the assistance of an intern, the Secretariat can list the consultants used for recent reviews, detail the terms of reference that they were given and contact the consultants to ascertain the process and means that they used. The methodology for the review of this information and subsequent categorization of the species involved under paragraph k) of Resolution Conf 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) has not been recorded, but in order for the advisory working group to assess the process, the existing procedures could be best described in writing by Secretariat staff in conjunction with the Committee chairs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii) The types and frequency of recommendations made</td>
<td>This information has been provided in documents AC23/PC17 Doc. 8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv) The nature and rate of responses to recommendations, and problems identified</td>
<td>The nature and rate of response from affected countries to recommendations made under the Review of Significant Trade and the problems identified could be determined from the Secretariat’s correspondence archives by an intern.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v) The use of the recommendations by range States as guidance for managing target species and other CITES-listed species with similar characteristics</td>
<td>An assessment of this factor would be a major undertaking and could realistically only be done for those case studies referred to in paragraph b) below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
vi) The nature and scale of the support provided to range States for implementing the recommendations, including field projects, financial aid and assistance in building local capacities

A compilation of the support provided by the Secretariat to range States subject to recommendations could be accomplished by an examination of our archives by an intern. Detailing support provided by third parties (other countries, international donors, and industry groups) may be more difficult as this information may not be held centrally. Affected range States could however be requested to provide this information.

vii) The ongoing process to monitor and review the implementation of recommendations, having regard to differing points of view as to where this responsibility should lie

Responsibility for the assessment of implementation is clearly set out in Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13). The advisory working group can assess this.

viii) The impacts of the process on other aspects of CITES implementation, including how problems identified in the course of the review but not directly related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), were addressed

Documents AC23/PC17 Doc. 8.1 list the nature and frequency of non-NDF recommendations made by the Committees. The advisory working group could reflect on the impact of these and the Review of Significant Trade and on other aspects of CITES implementation.

b) Case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms of reference</th>
<th>Proposed modus operandi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct case studies of a representative range of species and countries subject to recommendations to assess subsequent short- and long-term changes, and whether these could be attributed to the process, in: i) conservation status of the target taxa in the range States; ii) trade volumes and patterns of the target taxa, considering trade involving the range States subject to recommendations, other range States and non-range States; iii) production or management strategies for the target taxa; iv) market developments of conservation relevance (such as shifts in supply or demand); v) costs and benefits associated with the management of and trade in the target taxa (such as the effects of trade suspensions and export quotas, shift in trade to non-CITES species or increased illegal trade); vi) protection status of the target taxa within range States, and regulatory measures outside range States; vii) trade patterns, conservation status and management for other CITES-listed species that might be suitable ‘substitutes’ for the target taxa; and viii) changes in conservation policies in range States</td>
<td>Part D of documents AC23/PC17 Doc. 8.1 Annex 2 suggests some suitable cases, but a selection should be made. Using these documents as a starting point, the Committee is invited to identify, in priority order, case studies which could usefully be undertaken. Parties may be willing to conduct these case studies, but otherwise consultants would need to be hired to undertake these case studies. In line with paragraph c) in the fourth INSTRUCTS of Resolution Conf. 14.1, the Secretariat would welcome suggestions from the Committee about suitable contractors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
c) Analysis

| The above information should be analysed to assess the effectiveness, costs and benefits\(^2\) of the Review of Significant trade as implemented so far, by reference to the cost of the process and the time it takes, and identify means to improve the contribution it makes to the objectives of the Convention by reducing the threats to wild species. | The Secretariat will keep the advisory working group informed of developments and the group is expected to work electronically. Nevertheless, subject to funding, the group could possibly meet for a day or two immediately before AC25 or PC19 at the end of 2010 or in 2011. |

\(^2\) The phrase 'effectiveness, costs and benefits' is intended to address issues such as whether or not the funds spent on the process give value for money comparable to that for other CITES activities, and whether the time-scale envisaged in the process is too long for species that are in rapid decline.