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Periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices

PERIODIC REVIEW OF FELIDAE- PROGRESS REPORT FROM THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

1. This document has been submitted by the Scientific Authority of the United States of America*. The Annex to this document is provided herewith in English only, the language in which it was submitted.

2. At the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee (Geneva, April 2008), the United States provided a progress report on its efforts to coordinate a review of the genus Lynx [see document AC23 Doc. 11.2.1].

3. At the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee, a recommendation was adopted that a meeting be organized for the management and law enforcement authorities of the United States of America, Canada, and Mexico to meet with range States of the Eurasian Lynx (Lynx lynx) and Iberian Lynx (Lynx pardinus) to discuss possible problems of illegal trade of those species [see document AC23 WG3 Doc.1]. The U.S. and The European Commission jointly organized a meeting that was held in Brussels on October 29, 2008. A report on the discussions and outcome from this meeting is presented in the attached report.

4. In collaboration with its State partners and in consultation with Canada and Mexico, the Scientific Authority of the United States conducted in the summer of 2008 a survey of U.S. state and Canadian provincial authorities in order to obtain an updated bobcat (Lynx rufus) population estimate for the U.S. and Canadian populations. The results of this survey will be published in the scientific literature and available soon. Results of the survey reveal that the Lynx rufus range in North America is approximately 8,708,888 km² including 6,186,819 km² (71% of range) in the United States, 1,702,545 km² (20% of range) in Mexico, and 819,524 km² (9% of range) in Canada. With the exception of the state of Florida where bobcat decline is attributed to habitat loss, no jurisdiction in the United States or Canada reported that bobcat populations are declining. Population estimates were available for 27 of the 47 states, representing 66.4% of the total range area (3,975,301 km² of 5,986,819 km²). The current estimated bobcat population for this area is 1,419,333 to 2,638,738 bobcats. Given that population estimates are not available for 20 states representing 33.6%, or 2,011,518 km², this estimate is very conservative and significantly under-represents the true population size in the United States. In 1981 using similar methodology it was estimated there were 725,000 to 1,017,000 bobcats in the United States (USFWS 1982). This population has

* The geographical designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat or the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The responsibility for the contents of the document rests exclusively with its author.
clearly grown considerably since that time. Mexico reported on the status of the populations of *Lynx rufus* at AC23 [see document AC23 document 11.2.2].

5. The U.S. is committed to proceeding forward to address look alike issues raised at the Lynx meeting in Brussels including: (a) development of new identification materials with collaboration from Cornell University researchers for furs lacking ear tufts and tails; and (b) continuing discussions with the European Union and the Russian Federation on the possible illegal trade in *Lynx lynx* furs.

6. In 2007, the United States of America contracted TRAFFIC North America to research and analyze information on trade in *Lynx* spp., including compilation of information on illegal trade in these species and an assessment of the potential for trade irregularities that are likely to occur due to the similarity of appearance among these species (see report at: http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/TRAFFIC%20Lynx%20Trade%20Review%20for%20FWS%20FINAL.pdf). In February 2008, we sought a clarification on the export data analyzed in this report, and have determined that 96% of the *Lynx rufus* furs exported from the U.S. during the years 2000-2004 were full pelts (with identifying ear tufts and tails) (E. Cooper Pers. Comm.).
Minutes

- **Welcome and introductions**

This workshop follows up on the Animals Committee’s (AC) recommendation made in the Felidae working group and adopted by the 23rd Animals Committee that a meeting be organized for the management and law enforcement authorities of the United States of America, Canada, and Mexico to meet with range States of the Eurasian Lynx (*Lynx lynx*) and Iberian Lynx (*Lynx pardinus*) to discuss possible problems of illegal trade of those species. Customs officials of these countries are to also be present. Case studies of illegal trade in *Lynx lynx* and *Lynx pardinus* which have been undertaken are also to be discussed.

This meeting was organized jointly by the U.S. Scientific Authority and The European Commission. The U.S. with assistance from the EC generated and circulated some questions to range States in advance of this meeting so participants could have a meaningful dialogue focused on trade data, case studies/experiences with any illegal trade and identification issues rather than on perceptions of problems (see Annex 1). For practical reasons, only the countries in the European region were approached. Attached in Annex 2 is the list of participants that attended the Lynx species meeting.

For AC24 the U.S. will prepare a document that will report on discussions from this workshop and suggestions to move forward.

- **Descriptive synopsis of U.S. export process for bobcat furs to Europe and globally (U.S. representative)**

Presentation by Kevin Garlick, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s (USFWS), Office of Law Enforcement, Branch Chief for Investigations provided this presentation. Bobcats (*Lynx rufus*) are believed to be at an all time high in terms of population size and distribution in the United States. Vast majority of U.S. exports go to Europe (mainly Italy) as whole skins for processing in Europe. Skins are tagged under the U.S. CITES legislation and, to be exported, tag numbers are reflected on the export permits. Every shipment is checked before export (document check plus physical checks in some cases). All U.S. exporters must fill out a U.S. wildlife declaration form (Document No. 3-177) and these must be cleared and stamped by USFWS.

A case in Nevada-Utah where over 100 Bobcat skins were seized was presented. U.S. Law Enforcement has no evidence of poaching of Canadian lynx in the U.S. for export of products.

Carolina Caceres, from Canada’s Scientific Authority, discussed their efforts for the export of *Lynx* species. Management is done at the provincial level in Canada; different documents are needed all along the chain of custody from harvest to export.

- **Descriptive synopsis of EU import process and procedures for *Lynx* spp. furs (EU representative)**

Lucy Swan, European Commission, presented the EU import processes and permitting procedures, and border and internal inspections. The bobcat (*Lynx rufus*) is listed in Annex B of the EU Wildlife Trade Regulations (comparable to Appendix II). EU import permits issued for *Lynx rufus* on a yearly basis are ca. 200 for Canada and 70 for U.S. (2002-2007), which cover about 10,000 specimens imported from Canada per year (plus around 15,000 from the U.S.). The average number of export permits issued for *Lynx lynx* is under 10. Both *Lynx lynx* and *Lynx pardinus* are strictly protected under the EU Habitats Directive, although trophy hunting is allowed in certain Member States. Import of *Lynx lynx* for commercial purposes into the EU is prohibited as it is listed in Annex A in the EU. Through the listing of *Lynx rufus* in Annex B, proof of legal origin can be requested for trade of bobcat products in the EU which enables enforcement authorities to ensure the specimens for sale are not for example, a poached *Lynx lynx*. A concern by the EU is that illegally harvested *Lynx lynx* could end up in products of EU manufacturers and be sold as *Lynx rufus* or *Lynx canadensis* fur.
• **Presentation of cases of poaching and illegal trade in *Lynx* species in EU (EU)**

Amelie Knapp, TRAFFIC Europe, under contract with the European Commission, presented an overview of poaching and seizures of *Lynx lynx* and *Lynx pardinus* in the EU based on information submitted by 14 EU Member States for this meeting (Annex 3). Some seizures of Lynx were made where the specimen was not identified down to species level. Reported data also enables TRAFFIC to evaluate whether the illegal taking (poaching) of *Lynx lynx* is taking place for the fur trade or for other reasons, such as persecution as an unwanted livestock predator.

Various range States on the European continent presented results from their analyses:

Sweden: Sweden has undertaken an in-depth study on poaching of large predators. Although poaching is an important source of mortality of *Lynx lynx* in Sweden, the authorities don’t believe there to be a strong link between poached animals and illegal trade. Most poaching is not aimed at selling the specimens but to kill them because they are predators.

Poland: 50-75% mortality of Eurasian Lynx in Poland is caused by poaching. Most animals are killed for predator control for livestock and reduced competition with other game species. If the fur is sold it is secondary by-catch. Internet advertisements for *Lynx* rarely specify which species of *Lynx* is for sale. By inspections on markets, where only smaller parts of finished products are for sale, such as lining, it is difficult to identify the specimens at species level. Polish authorities found an advertisement for the sale of *Lynx* in Greece claiming to be *Lynx* from Poland.

Known poaching and seizures seem only the tip of the iceberg. Polish authorities expressed concern that even a small increase in poaching will have an important negative impact on populations, and hence any measure that makes it easier to enter skins into trade (e.g., through de-listing of *Lynx rufus* from CITES) may create an incentive to poaching and illegal trade in specimens of *Lynx lynx*. Most poaching is by-catch of hunting for white tailed deer. *Lynx lynx* can be legally harvested in neighboring Russia but not legally traded in the EU. Currently authorities don’t have good tools other than genetics to identify parts. This was identified as an important problem in earlier discussions on de-listing of the *Lynx rufus*. If new identification tools prove to be practical and sufficient to identify different species on the market then the authorities may revise their objection to the de-listing of *Lynx rufus*.

• **Presentation of import/export procedures and cases of poaching and illegal trade in *Lynx* species in non-EU range States**

No interventions made

• **Discussion of *Lynx* species look-alike issues in the context of trade questions**

The primary impetus for this meeting as directed by the Animals Committee was to address the look-alike issue with *Lynx* and to discern if the concerns about *Lynx pardinus* and *Lynx lynx* entering in trade as *Lynx rufus* or *Lynx canadensis* is actual or hypothetical.

In order to facilitate this investigation a questionnaire was circulated to all of the *Lynx lynx* and *Lynx pardinus* range States in the European region prior to the meeting.

- Discussions revealed that in most cases the illegal poaching of *Lynx lynx* and *Lynx pardinus* is related to predator control to protect livestock and game animals.
- Incidents/seizures were reported where *Lynx lynx* were illegally harvested because of predator concerns or imported illegally from the Russian Federation to EU countries.
- No documented incidents were reported by the survey respondents of *Lynx lynx* or *Lynx pardinus* being entered into trade as *Lynx rufus*.

**Other Discussion and Questions/Issues Raised**

**De-regulation of trade**

U.S. questioned why CITES appears to be moving towards deregulating trade in parts and products of certain taxa such as crocodilians, but not for others such as fur bearers. Some other participants agreed
that in general unnecessary administrative burdens without conservation purposes should be reduced, but highlighted that look-alike problems and conservation risks are to be assessed on a case by case basis.

**Identification of Lynx species:** The Identification sheets in the CITES Identification Manual are inadequate for Lynx species identification at species level. The U.S. is developing a new Lynx species Identification manual through a contract with Cornell University that will be ready for the international community soon. The University has gathered models of Identification manuals for other taxa to determine which format is most useful. The European participants expressed the view that if good and easily accessible identification tools are available for skins, the issue of look-alike, which is why Lynx species were listed, may be resolved. Discussions took place as to what level parts and derivatives should be identified (pelts or smaller pieces), depending on the likelihood for illegal trade. While the U.S. expressed its view that it believes the only likelihood of any Lynx species entering trade in significant numbers from Canada and the U.S. would have to be as whole pelts not as small pieces or parts, the EU stated that, considering the conservation status of *Lynx lynx* and *Lynx pardinus*, there would at least need to be identification techniques for pelts without ears and tails. The U.S. pledged that it would look into identification techniques for hair differentiation and techniques for furs lacking ears and tails.

**Look-alike issues and listing on Appendix III/Annex B**

Discussion ensued on identifying problems and issues that would arise if *Lynx rufus* was delisted from CITES. Several EU countries indicated concerns that a simple delisting could allow *Lynx lynx* to enter trade more easily if there is no document trail for *Lynx rufus* entering international trade. One possible option that received significant discussion involved down-listing *Lynx rufus* to CITES Appendix III and having the EU maintain it on their Annex B. This combined approach would allow for the retention of CITES documentation for shipments of *Lynx rufus* leaving the U.S. and other exporting countries and entering EU Member States. The paperwork received on the EU side would not change.

The EU noted however that with an Appendix III listing the normal procedure would be for EU to list the Bobcat in Annex C in alignment with CITES under which there is no paper work and no proof of legal origin in internal trade required in the EU. It would seem inconsistent for the EU to retain *Lynx rufus* in Annex B for look-alike considerations with Lynx species, while CITES would remove the species from Appendix II on the basis that there are no look-alike risks at stake.

**Resources spent permitting and for NDF’s**

Following a question to the U.S. whether delisting of *Lynx rufus* was considered in order to reduce the administrative permitting burden, the U.S. outlined that this was not the case, hence the willingness to consider Appendix III listing with similar permitting requirements. The U.S. however outlined that the main problem is the considerable time and resources needed in the U.S. to make NDF’s for this look-alike species. The public does not understand how a species that is well managed and abundant with an increasing population at the same time can be listed as a CITES Appendix-II species. Apparently the public perception is that the species must be in trouble because it is listed on Appendix II, even though it’s for look-alike reasons. European participants responded that a better explanation of the look-alike listing which requires much less detailed NDF’s could be another option to proceed to save resources.

**Status in Mexico**

Following an enquiry about the biological concerns for Bobcat in Mexico raised at CoP14, the U.S. responded, though it could not speak for Mexico, that it understands that their biological study has now been completed and populations are healthier than previously thought. Mexico has no commercial and international trade in furs of this species.

- **Ways to move forward with these issues and report to the 24th meeting of the Animals Committee**
  - The U.S. would discuss the issue further with the Russian Federation as one of the main range States for *Lynx lynx*. It was furthermore acknowledged that much more information would be needed on the trade in *Lynx* species between the Russian Federation and China as well as other Asian countries (range States of *Lynx lynx*), including enforcement problems encountered. Furthermore, illegal trade in *Lynx lynx* to the EU from the Russian Federation should be
considered. Finally, it was thought useful to contact the relevant species (Cat) specialist group of IUCN.

- The EU would look into a risk analysis for enforcement cases where data of seizures are known and further consideration would be given on the value of placing *Lynx rufus* on Annex B to preserve the document trail for enforcement purposes if *Lynx rufus* were to be down-listed to Appendix III.

- While discussion of the participating countries today suggested that poaching of *Lynx lynx* is mostly for predator control and domestic animal protection, and that selling the fur is a "by-product," more information was needed from *Lynx* range States not participating in the meeting, to determine whether similar conclusions would apply.

- Explore and develop further what level of identification tools is necessary to address the real risks.

- The U.S. and EU will prepare a report of this meeting and the U.S. will provide feedback information to AC24.
ANNEX I

Lynx spp. Trade Questions for CITES Management Authorities

and Enforcement Agencies

1. What specific types of CITES-related Lynx spp. import/export violations have been documented in your country?

2. Generally speaking, how frequent are Lynx spp. import/export violations in your country (common, occasional, uncommon)?

3. What specific types of Lynx spp. import/export violations would you expect to occur in your country if:
   a) Lynx rufus (bobcat) were to be removed from the CITES Appendices? or
   b) Lynx rufus (bobcat) were to be removed from Appendix II but included in Appendix III by the United States?

4. What is the extent of illegal hunting/poaching of Lynx lynx or Lynx pardinus in your country?

5. Does illegal hunting or poaching pose a threat to Lynx lynx or Lynx pardinus in your country? If so:
   a) What drives these illegal activities? and
   b) For what purpose(s) are the illegally obtained specimens used (e.g., are the specimens most likely discarded, used as trophies, or are they sold domestically or internationally)?

6. Are you aware of cases where illegally obtained specimens of Lynx species are passed off as legally obtained and sold on the market? If so, how does this occur? (Provide examples, and specify which Lynx spp. are involved.)

7. Would the enforcement and control of poaching and trade violations in Lynx spp. be influenced in your country if:
   a) Lynx rufus (bobcat) were to be removed from the CITES Appendices? or
   b) Lynx rufus (bobcat) were to be removed from Appendix II but included in Appendix III by the United States?

8. Would it be most likely for Lynx pelts taken in your country to be illegally entered into trade: a) through shipments of bobcats (Lynx rufus) coming from the United States; b) through shipments of Lynx lynx coming from other Lynx lynx range countries; or c) through shipments of Lynx canadensis coming from Canada?

9. Have customs officers or wildlife police officers in your country experienced difficulties in distinguishing between different species of Lynx skins? If so, provide examples, and specify which Lynx spp. have been problematic with regards to identification.

10. If identification problems have been encountered by customs officers or wildlife police officers, what tools (e.g., more comprehensive identification manual, further identification techniques) would facilitate distinguishing the bobcat (Lynx rufus) from other Lynx species?

11. In your opinion, if Lynx lynx or Lynx pardinus were to be illegally entered into the market in significant numbers, would the initial entry into trade be as whole pelts, pieces/parts, or finished products?
12. In your country, is the current prevalence of illegal trade of *Lynx* spp. products significant enough to affect management or survival of these species?

13. Do you believe adequate CITES safeguards exist in your country to ensure that CITES implementation is adequate to protect *Lynx* species from illegal trade or import to or export from your country? If not, what are the greatest areas of enforcement weakness?
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<td>TAAR, Helena</td>
<td>Estonian Environmental Inspectorate</td>
<td><a href="mailto:helena.taar@kki.ee">helena.taar@kki.ee</a></td>
<td>Tel: +3726962243 Fax: +3726962237</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCOVA, Silvie</td>
<td>Agency for Nature and Landscape Protection</td>
<td><a href="mailto:silvie.ucova@nature.cz">silvie.ucova@nature.cz</a></td>
<td>Tel: +420 241 082 804 fax: +420 241 082 805</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Bobcat *Lynx rufus* was listed in CITES Appendix II in 1977 along with all species of Felidae that had not already been listed. It was, and still is listed in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (b) and Criterion A in Annex 2b i.e. for look-alike reasons. At the 13th and 14th meetings of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13 and CoP14), the USA submitted proposals aiming to delete the Bobcat from the Appendices. The CoP13 proposal was withdrawn by the proponent, while the CoP14 proposal was rejected in a vote. Some Parties, especially the Member States of the European Union (EU), expressed concern about removal from the Appendices owing to potential problems controlling trade in other *Lynx* spp. and similar small cats owing to similarity of appearance with the Bobcat.

CITES Decision 13.93 (Rev. CoP14) directs the Animals Committee to include the family Felidae in its Review of the Appendices, and in particular to focus initially on reviewing the Lynx species complex, which includes species that are listed because of similarity of appearance, such as the Bobcat. Under this Decision, the Animals Committee is mandated to:

- Evaluate the listings of these species against the criteria for inclusion of species in Appendices I and II contained in CITES Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13);
- Assess the management and enforcement measures available to achieve effective control of trade in these species so as to resolve the continued need for look-alike listings;
- Review trade information to determine whether these species are actually confused in trade or whether the look-alike problem is merely hypothetical.

The Animal’s Committee, at its 23rd Meeting (Geneva, April 2008), recommended that a meeting be organized to bring together management and law enforcement authorities of the USA, Canada, and Mexico with range States of the Eurasian Lynx *Lynx lynx* and Iberian Lynx *Lynx pardinus* to discuss possible problems of illegal trade of those species. The Committee also recommended that Customs officials of these countries also be present and that case studies of illegal trade in Eurasian and Iberian Lynx be discussed at this meeting.

This meeting will take place on 29 October 2008, in Brussels. The following document provides information regarding poaching and illegal trade in Eurasian and Iberian Lynx in the EU. This information was obtained from EU Member States directly, through a request for information on Lynx poaching and seizures.

**Background**

The Eurasian Lynx is distributed throughout Europe, Central Asia, East Asia and Siberia, with approximately 75% of the population ranging within the borders of the Russian Federation. The Eurasian Lynx is classified as Not Threatened in the IUCN RedList 2007, based on an assessment conducted in 2002. Based on estimates of density and geographic range, the species’ total effective population size is estimated at below 50 000 mature breeding individuals, with a declining trend due to degradation of its habitat and prey base, and may possibly qualify as Vulnerable if these trends persist, or if better information on its status and range were available.

---


According to the Guidelines for Population Level Management Plans for Large Carnivores in Europe\textsuperscript{3}, harvest and/or illegal killing are a threat or a potential threat to all populations of Eurasian Lynx (Table 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population Name</th>
<th>Threat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavian</td>
<td>Illegal killing has been documented to be a significant cause of mortality throughout Scandinavia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karelian</td>
<td>Potentially harvest, although current levels are low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltic</td>
<td>Potentially illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpathian</td>
<td>Potentially illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohemian-Bavarian</td>
<td>Illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balkan</td>
<td>Probably illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinaric</td>
<td>Illegal shooting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Alps</td>
<td>Illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Alps</td>
<td>Illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jura</td>
<td>Illegal killing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vosges-Palatian</td>
<td>Illegal killing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textit{Source: Linnell et al. (2008)}\textsuperscript{3}

The Iberian Lynx is restricted to Spain and Portugal. It was included in CITES Appendix II in 1977 along with all Felidae spp. and was transferred to Appendix I in 1990. It is classified as Critically Endangered in the IUCN RedList 2007, based on an assessment conducted in 2002. Based on estimates of density and geographic range, the total effective population size of the Iberian lynx is estimated at 250 mature breeding individuals, with a declining trend due to habitat and prey base loss and persecution, and no subpopulation containing more than 50 mature breeding individuals\textsuperscript{4}.

**Poaching and illegal trade in Eurasian and Iberian Lynx**

Member States were contacted regarding poaching and seizures of Eurasian and Iberian Lynx and their responses are provided in \textit{Annex 1} and summarised in Tables 2 and 3 below.

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information about poaching and seizures of Lynx spp. reported by EU Member States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Member State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Information provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Germany      | * Between 1997 and 2008, the following Lynx spp. seizures were made:  
  -12 seizures of Eurasian Lynx (6 skins, 2 bodies, 3 trophies, 1 skin), of which 4 had the Russian Federation as country of origin and of export.  
  -1 seizure of Iberian Lynx (1 skin), with Peru\(^5\) as country of origin and export  
  -6 seizures of Canadian Lynx (1 garment, 2 skulls, 2 trophies, 1 skin), all with Canada or the USA as country of origin and/or export.  
  -6 seizures of Bobcat (1 trophy, 2 garments, 2 skins and 2 skin pieces), all with Canada or the USA as country of origin and/or export. |
| Greece       | * In 2001, Customs seized 74 whole skins of Eurasian Lynx illegally imported from Russia (origin and destination unknown). |
| Lithuania    | Since January 2004, three incidents involving Lynx spp. were reported:  
  - Two Eurasian Lynx shot in February 2006 in the Northern part of Lithuania (Joniskis district);  
  - Two fur coats made of Lynx spp. were seized from a shop in June 2006;  
  - An advertisement for the sale of a fur coat made of Lynx spp. was found on the internet in April 2008 and the coat was confiscated. |
| The Netherlands | Between January 2007 and August 2008, 4 seizures of Lynx spp. took place:  
  - In October 2007, 1 coat from Eurasian Lynx was seized by Customs (origin China);  
  - In February 2008, 1 taxidermied Bobcat body imported by postparcel was seized by Customs (origin USA, destination The Netherlands);  
  - In August 2007, 1 Eurasian Lynx nail was seized by Customs (origin Singapore)  
  - In May 2008, 4 skulls of Canadian Lynx imported by post parcel were seized by Customs (origin Canada) |
| Poland       | Confiscations:  
  * In 2004, 1 Eurasian Lynx skin was confiscated (from the Russian Federation, destination Belgium);  
  * In 2006, 6 Eurasian Lynx skins were confiscated (imported to Poland from the Russian Federation);  
  * In 2008, 2 confiscations of Eurasian Lynx were reported by Customs (1 tanned skin and 1 taxidermied body, both imported from the Russian Federation);  
  * In 2008, 1 case of an internet auction for a Canadian Lynx skin was investigated.  
Poaching:  
  * According to the CITES Scientific Authority, poaching is an important threat for Polish population of Eurasian Lynx;  
  * 1 dead body, 1 taxidermied specimen were found as well as a cut radio collar which may imply a third poaching incident;  
  * Based on the literature, in Bialowieza Forest 3 out of 11 radio-collared Eurasian Lynx were killed illegally and in the Carpathian population 7 out of 11 Eurasian Lynx losses were due to poaching in 2001. |

\(^5\) Note that Peru is not a range State so it is unclear how this could be the country of origin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Information provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>Since 1981, no poaching incidents or seizures of Iberian Lynx were reported in Portugal. However, during the monitoring of Iberian Lynx distribution between 1994-1997, 7 skins were identified, all belonging to private owners, that were supposedly obtained between 1980 and 1993.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Romania     | * No seizures of Lynx spp. made by the National Customs Authority or the National Environmental Guard.  
* According to the Forest Research and Management Planning Institute, 2-3 Eurasian Lynx are poached per year. |
| Slovakia    | * In October 2006, 4 Eurasian Lynx specimens were seized.  
* In December 2006, 1 case of Eurasian Lynx poaching, the specimen was temporarily seized.  
* In July 2007, 1 Eurasian Lynx specimen was confiscated (source unknown, destination Slovakia).  
* In August 2007, 6 Eurasian Lynx specimens were temporarily seized.  
* In February 2008, 2 Eurasian Lynx specimens were poached and temporarily seized.  
* In May 2008, 1 Eurasian Lynx specimen was seized, it may have been poached. |
| Slovenia    | * To date, Slovene enforcement authorities have not recorded any case of illegal trade in Eurasian Lynx.  
* The Hunting and Fisheries Inspectorate reports that trade does not pose any threat to Eurasian Lynx in Slovenia and poaching of this species is very scarce (no cases were recorded in the last five years).  
* Trade in hunting trophies from neighbouring countries is a reason for concern. |
| Spain       | * No evidence of poaching or seizures for Iberian or Eurasian Lynx. |
| Sweden      | * In an 11 year period, 60 reports involving substantial suspicions of Eurasian Lynx poaching were reported. This compares with researcher’s calculations of an average of 100-150 specimens being poached annually. |
| UK          | * In the last 3 years, there have not been any seizures of Eurasian or Iberian Lynx by Customs.  
* Between December 2006 and April 2008, there were 9 intelligence reports relating to Lynx furs involving:  
* 3 lynx furs for sale on eBay (2 with origin Russian Federation);  
* 1 lynx coat for sale on eBay;  
* 1 possible CITES offences relating to a Eurasian Lynx Skull  
* 1 possible display offences regarding a rescue centre in Peterborough that could have some larger cats such as Lynx;  
* 1 offence relating to a search on a taxidermist house in 2004;  
* 1 company in London selling fur coats including lynx. |

Source: Information submitted by EU Member States in response to a request sent out by the European Commission in July 2008.

Eleven Eurasian Lynx range States within the EU responded to the request for information. Seven of these reported cases of poaching, representing a total of 79 poached animals, plus 65 animals which are strongly suspected to have been poached, 3 additional cases where poaching may have occurred, and 2-3 poached animals a year in Romania. For the Iberian Lynx, Spain did not report any cases of...
poaching while Portugal reported that 7 skins were found which are thought to come from animals poached between 1980-1993 (Table 3).

Of the fourteen EU Member States that responded to the request for information, six reported seizures involving Eurasian and/or Iberian Lynx (as well as one possible CITES offence relating to a Eurasian Lynx in the UK). In total, 104 specimens (skins, coats, bodies, trophies) plus one nail of Eurasian Lynx and one specimen of Iberian Lynx were reported to have been seized (Table 3).

Table 3
Overview of poaching and seizures of Eurasian and Iberian Lynx in the European Union, as reported by EU Member States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Year/period</th>
<th>Eurasian Lynx</th>
<th>Iberian Lynx</th>
<th>Seizures</th>
<th>Seizures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poaching</td>
<td></td>
<td>Seizures</td>
<td>Seizures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>1995-2003</td>
<td>56 skulls found 3 cases + 5 strongly probable cases</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>2 cases</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>2006-July 2008</td>
<td>3 poaching cases 4 investigated + 1 animal shot with a license but outside the area covered by the license.</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1997-2008</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>6 skins, 2 bodies, 3 trophies, 1 skin (of which 4 had the Russian Federation as country of origin and of export).</td>
<td>1 skin, with Peru as country of origin and export</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>74 whole skins from Russia (origin and destination unknown)</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>Jan. 2004-2008</td>
<td>2 cases</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>Jan. 2007-Aug. 2008</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>1 coat (origin China); 1 nail (origin Singapore)</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2001-2008</td>
<td>According to the CITES Scientific Authority, poaching is an important threat for Polish population of Eurasian Lynx; 12 cases + possible additional case (cut radio collar)</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>1 skin (from the Russian Federation, destination Belgium); - 6 skins (imported to Poland from the Russian Federation); - 1 tanned skin</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that Peru is not a range State so it is unclear how this could be the country of origin.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member State</th>
<th>Year/period</th>
<th>Eurasian Lynx</th>
<th>Iberian Lynx</th>
<th>Eurasian Lynx</th>
<th>Iberian Lynx</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>found but not the animal)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 taxidermed body (both imported from the Russian Federation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>1980-2008</td>
<td>Not a range States</td>
<td>7 skins were identified that are thought to relate to poaching in 1980-1993</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>2-3 cases per year</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Oct. 2006-2008</td>
<td>3 case + 1 possible additional case.</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>6 specimens (source unknown) +6 specimens temporarily seized.</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>2003-2008</td>
<td>None reported. The Hunting and Fisheries Inspectorate reports that poaching of this species is very scarce.</td>
<td>Not a range States</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>1997-2008</td>
<td>60 reports involving substantial suspicions of poaching. Researchers calculated that an average of 100-150 animals are poached annually.</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2005-2008</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>Not a range State</td>
<td>1 possible CITES offences relating to a skull</td>
<td>None reported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Information submitted by EU Member States in response to a request sent out by the European Commission in July 2008. Information about which Member States are range States are taken from UNEP-WCMC’s Species Database www.unep-wcmc.org.
Annex 3.1

Incidences of poaching and seizures of Iberian and Eurasian Lynx reported by EU Member States

Czech Republic

Poaching:

The majority of poachers have been recruited from legal organized association of huntsmen, which has a long-time history in our country. One of the reasons for poaching of large beasts (bear, wolf and lynx) is that the huntsmen consider these animals to be their competitors in hunting for other forest animals (such as roe deer, which are allowed to be hunted by the huntsmen legally).

The scientific institution – the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic - conducted recently an anonymous survey concerning poaching of the large beasts among the members of this association. For this purpose, two hundred and four huntsmen were involved in this research, which covered 1,68% of huntsmen from the area of occurrence of *Lynx lynx*. The main results of the survey (incl. the questions and answers) concerning the Lynx only are given below:

*Does the Lynx belong to the nature of the Czech Republic?*

- Yes 11,1%
- Yes, but . . . 40,5%
- No 48,4%

*Should be hunting of the Lynx allowed?*

- Yes, all year 9,3%
- Yes, limitedly 84,8%
- No 5,9%

*I know about illegal hunting of the Lynx (at least one case).*

- Yes 37,2%
- No 62,8%

*I have hunted a Lynx illegally.*

- Yes, once 8,3%
- Yes, more than once 1,5%
- No 89,7%
- Without answer 0,5%

The competent authorities have registered reports about poaching of Lynx from all the areas of its occurrence in the Czech Republic with the majority coming from the areas of Southern and Western Bohemia, where is the largest Lynx population. It was also being collected 56 skulls of illegally hunted Lynx in the period 1995 – 2003 in this region. Apart from that, the scientists of the Academy of Sciences
of the Czech Republic have observed 16 specimens of Lynx using the method of radiotelemetry; three Lynx were hunted illegally without fail, five Lynx most probably. The research reveals that poaching participates on mortality of Lynx specimens in 80% of all recorded cases in Southern and Western Bohemia. *Lynx lynx* belongs to the animals prohibited from hunting according to our national law (since July 2002). On the other hand, it is very difficult to produce evidence of concrete cases of illegal hunting. One of the reasons is that huntsmen are not willing to provide their testimony testifying against their acquaintances. No poacher has been convicted of illegal hunting of Lynx in the Czech Republic yet.

**Seizures:**

In the time period 2004 – 2008 there have been recorded three seizures of Lynx specimens. It concerned two specimens of Lynx lynx (skin – unknown origin, house search and body – seizure at the airport Ruzyně, import from Russia) and one specimen of Lynx rufus (skin - unknown origin).

**Source:** Silvie Ucová, CITES Scientific Authority for the Czech Republic

**Finland**

-Customs: no seizures involving any lynx species or specimens between 2002-2007.

-Police: four lynx poaching cases investigated between 2006-July 2008. One of these cases was regarded as a 'borderline case', since there was a hunting license but the animal was felled outside the area covered by the license.

-Police: stashing of illegally hunted lynx: between 2006-July 2008 no investigated cases, but one noted as 'borderline case', where the skin(?) 'was bought from an unknown Russian man'.

One earlier case (2002) caught some headlines in the papers, when the meat stash of a quite organised league (it seems that the action revolved around a small company registered as a meat and fish trading company established in 1999) in easternmost Finland was uncovered: it seems that they shot most 'game' coming their way, also protected species (birds). At least one lynx carcass was found in their cold stores at the time of capture.

-I also talked to one of our leading game expert, Ilpo Kojola at the Finnish Game and Fisheries Research Institute: the individual marking of live lynx specimens is only starting in Finland the coming winter, which means that there is no way to estimate the amount of poaching at the moment. It will take Finland ca 10 years to obtain the same level of data as Sweden has today, and to draw any conclusions about the levels of poaching via this method.

The lynx population is increasing in Finland, and it is also legally hunted each year (max 20 animals this year, and only with licenses issued with the aim of decreasing 'very serious damages').

Finally, FYI, the data and the experts' gut feeling about poaching of wolf and bear seems to be more substantial, for various reasons. According to my recollection, these species were the ones we more or less spontaneously commented on at the EG meeting in April this year.

**Source:** Stella From, CITES Management Authority for Finland

**Germany**

Legally valid confiscations of specimens from Lynx spp., imported into Germany without the required documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of confiscation</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Country of origin</th>
<th>Country of export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>LYNX LYNX</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PC</td>
<td>SKU</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>BY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1997 LYNX PARDINUS 1 PC SKI PE PE
1997 LYNX CANADENSIS 1 PC TRO XX CA
1998 LYNX LYNX 1 PC SKI AE AE
1998 LYNX LYNX 1 PC SKI KZ KZ
1998 LYNX LYNX 1 PC SKI RU RU
1998 LYNX LYNX 1 PC TRO PK PK
2000 LYNX LYNX 1 PC SKI RU RU
2000 LYNX RUFUS 1 PC SKI US US
2000 LYNX RUFUS 1 PC TRO US US
2001 LYNX CANADENSIS 1 PC SKI XX CA
2001 LYNX CANADENSIS 1 PC SKU US US
2002 LYNX LYNX 1 PC BOD MN MN
2002 LYNX LYNX 1 PC SKI RU RU
2003 LYNX LYNX 1 PC TRO RO RO
2003 LYNX RUFUS 2 PC SKP XX US
2004 LYNX LYNX 1 PC TRO RO RO
2005 LYNX LYNX 1 PC BOD KZ KZ
2005 LYNX RUFUS 1 PC SKI XX US
2006 LYNX RUFUS 1 PC GAR US US
2006 LYNX CANADENSIS 1 PC GAR CA US
2006 LYNX CANADENSIS 1 PC SKU CA CA
2006 LYNX CANADENSIS 1 PC TRO CA CA
2007 LYNX RUFUS 1 PC GAR US US
2008 LYNX LYNX 1 PC SKI RU RU

Source: Mario Sterz, CITES Management Authority for Germany

Greece

In 2001, the E’ Customs Office, located at the International Airport of Thessaloniki, seized 74 whole skins of Lynx lynx species illegally imported from Russia (their origin and destination were unknown).

Source: G. Vardakis, CITES Management Authority for Greece

Lithuania

During the last few years (since 01.2004) in Lithuania are registred tree accidents with Lynx spp.:

1. In 14.02.2006 in Northern part of Lithuania (Joniskis district) hunter during the legal hunting shot two animals Lynx lynx. Against this person was initiated criminal case. Both animals were confiscated and Person was penalized for 1700 LTL (~500 Euros). After this incident Government of Lithuania speedily has adopted decision for caused damage and raised fine up to 15000 LTL (~4335 Euros).

2. In 06.2006 during inspection in furshop were found two furcoats with details (in total 10 pieces) made from Lynx spp. fur. Any documents of origin for these furcoats were presented. These details were removed from coat and confiscated. Shop owner was penalized for 500 LTL (~150 Euros).

3. In 13.04.2008 in Internet was found an announcement for sale of Lynx spp. furcoat. Person was identified, Any documents of origin for these furcoats were presented. Furcoat was confiscated and person was penalized for 200 LTL (~60 Euros).
Source: Eugenijus Leonavicus, CITES Management Authority for Lithuania

The Netherlands

For all seizures from the Customs and the General Inspection Service we are the caretaker for these goods. Herewith we give 4 seizures in the period from 1 January 2007 till 31 August 2008:

Number: 6-21587
1 coat from Felis Lynx
Land of origin: China
date seizure: 3th October 2007
Place: airport Amsterdam.
Seizure by: Customs

Number: 6-21903
1 prepared Lynx rufus
land of origin: USA / Destination in the Netherlands
date of seizure: 18th of February 2008
Place Central Post office Customs, Amsterdam
Seizure by: Customs
Remarks: import by postparcel.

Number: 6-22355
1 nail of Lynx lynx
land of origin: Singapore
date of seizure: 29th of August 2007
Place: Airport Amsterdam
Seizure by: Customs

Number: 6-22587
4 skulls Lynx Canadensis
Land of origin: Canada
date of seizure: 30th of May 2008
Place: Central Post office Customs, Amsterdam
Seizure by: Customs
Remarks: together with 6 skulls of Ursus americanus and 2 skulls of Lontra Canadensis
Imported by postparcel
There are no seizures of living Lynx.
Source: Henk Vonk, IBG Confiscated Goods in the Netherlands
Poland

In 2008 Polish Customs have reported 2 cases of confiscations of dead specimens (tanned skin and taxidermied body) of Eurasian Lynx (*Lynx lynx*). Both of these cases involved transports from Russia, for display (in Poland – ethnic festival, and in Austria). In one of these cases only export permit was presented, in second both import and export permits were missing. In both cases specimens were presented for customs clearance, the perpetrators were unaware of the need for permit(s). Since Polish accession to the EU (1 May 2004) several other cases of confiscations have appeared: one in 2006 (six skins of Eurasian Lynx (*Lynx lynx*) imported to Poland from Russia), in 2004 (one skin of Eurasian Lynx for theatrical purposes exported from Russia to Belgium without proper documentation, not presented to customs clearance).

As for the internal confiscations connected with offering to purchase, only one criminal suit concerning Lynx appeared, in 2008, and it is still ongoing. The case involved offering for sale skin of Canadian Lynx (*Lynx canadensis*) on internet auction portal.

CITES MA of Poland have contacted relevant regional nature conservation authorities for information on poaching on Eurasian Lynx (*Lynx lynx*). Three cases
of supposed poaching were reported: one dead body, one taxidermied specimen and one radio collar cut with sharp tool were found. According to the CITES Scientific Authority of Poland, poaching is an important threat for Polish population of Lynx. Basing on literature they mentioned illegal killing 3 out of 11 radio-collared Lynxes in the Białowieża Forest and 7 out of 11 known losses in the Carpathian population in 2001 as being the effect of poaching.

We have also contacted CITES enforcement authorities concerning identification procedures. Materials which enable identification of Lynx specimens are available in Customs Offices and Police units. They include identification manuals of the CITES Secretariat, materials from workshops concerning identification of Felidae prepared by experts from zoological gardens. Also information from the Internet is used. In case of necessity experts are contacted (zoological gardens, universities).

Polish population of Eurasian Lynx is estimated at 230 specimens (Białowieża Forest including National Park, Kampinoski National Park and Tatrzaska National Park in Tatra Mountains). Eurasian Lynx is a protected species in Poland. All native protected species require permit for purchasing, exchanging, donating, acquisition from nature, transport, possession, taxiderming (on the basis of the Nature Conservation Act of 2004). They and their habitats cannot be disturbed in nature. Exemptions from above mentioned prohibitions can be granted by the Minister of the Environment or Province Governors. Similarly, crossing the Polish border to other EU countries have to be authorised by the Minister of the Environment.

Source: Sylwia Jurzyk, Deputy Director of the Department of National Forms of Nature Conservation, Ministry of Environment

Portugal

Since Portugal signed and ratified CITES (1981) no poaching or seizures of Iberian Lynx were registered.

However, we have knowledge of 7 skins identified during the monitoring of Iberian Lynx distribution that occurred under the LIFE project "Conservation of the Iberian Lynx (Lynx pardinus) in Portugal" (1994-1997), that were supposedly obtained between 1980 and 1993. All those skins belonged to private owners kept confidential as a condition to allow access of researchers to genetic material. Since that we have no information on other specimens.

Source: João José Loureiro, CITES Management Authority for Portugal

Romania

The National Customs Authority and also National Environmental Guard have informed the Management Authority that they haven’t seized specimens of Lynx spp. According to the information received from the Forest Research and Management Planning Institute, the poaching incidences is insignificant, with only a few cases reported every year (2-3 specimens/year).

Source: Roxana Cazacu, CITES Management Authority for Romania
### Slovakia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of specimens</th>
<th>origin</th>
<th>destination</th>
<th>date</th>
<th>type of violation</th>
<th>penalty</th>
<th>served office</th>
<th>status of the case</th>
<th>additional information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>20/10/2006</td>
<td>did not prove the source (national legislation)</td>
<td>fine 8000 Slovak crowns (266 Eur)</td>
<td>Slovak environmental Inspection</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>wild</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>17/12/2006</td>
<td>breaking the animal protection (protected species)</td>
<td>specimens temporarily seized (not confiscated)</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>ongoing - petition to the submission of the prosecution</td>
<td>specimen shot in the yard of the firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>SK</td>
<td>24/07/2007</td>
<td>did not prove the source and did not keep records (national legislation)</td>
<td>confiscated</td>
<td>Slovak environmental Inspection</td>
<td>completed</td>
<td>violator was Municipality Stropkov - Center of the free time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 + 4</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>30/08/2007</td>
<td>breaking the animal protection (protected species)</td>
<td>specimens temporarily seized (not confiscated)</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>ongoing - petition to the submission of the prosecution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>wild</td>
<td>probably SK</td>
<td>8/02/2008</td>
<td>poaching</td>
<td>specimens temporarily seized (not confiscated)</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>ongoing - petition to the submission of the prosecution</td>
<td>illegally hunted by the person, who was not the member of the Slovak hunting union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>wild</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>25/05/2008</td>
<td>breaking the animal protection (protected species)</td>
<td>seized</td>
<td>Police</td>
<td>ongoing - beginning the prosecution</td>
<td>specimen found at the edge of the highway</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Silvia Rusnáková, CITES Management Authority for Slovakia
**Slovenia**

Up to date Slovene enforcement authorities (customs, police and inspectorates) have not recorded any case of illegal trade in this species. The Hunting and Fisheries Inspectorate (Simšič, 2006) reports that trade does not pose any threat to lynx in Slovenia. According to Simšič, poaching of this species is also very scarce (no cases were recorded in the last five years).

6. **Are there other identified threats to the species?**

The main threats to lynx population in Slovenia can be classified as follows:

- Insufficient lynx’s basic prey (roe deer) owing to its reduction caused by hunting and other activities such as forestry and agriculture
- Insufficient population size of lynx with regard to viability, and weak links between population nuclei in the Alps to the north and the Dinaric Mountains to the south
- Inbreeding as a consequence of the founder effect
- Fragmentation of habitat, which is severely limited by the oldest motorway section in Slovenia, as well as the potential fragmentation of large forest complexes in several regions.
- Opposition from certain interest groups (e.g. sheep and goat farmers) to lynxes’ presence in a certain area, combined with low awareness of general public on this species and its role in the ecosystem
- Traffic. In Slovenia, losses caused by traffic represent 3.1 % of all specimens taken from the wild by all causes

**Poaching**

7. **Is this species being adversely impacted by trade, or is it likely to become so without continued listing in the Appendices?**

According to available information, trade does not pose a threat to the population of this species in Slovenia. However, trade in hunting trophies from neighbouring countries is a reason for concern. Precautionary principle should be applied when considering possible exclusion of Lynx lynx from CITES Appendix II.

**Source**: Robert Bolješič, CITES Management Authority for Slovenia

**Spain**

No evidence of poaching or seizures for Iberian or Eurasian Lynx.

**Source**: Rosa Tortajada Perrote, CITES Management Authority for Spain

**Sweden**

We have discovered 76 reports of suspected poaching for lynxes. In 16 cases, the police or prosecutor judged has decided to drop the investigation because no crime is considered to have been committed. This consequently leaves 60 reports involving substantial suspicions of lynx poaching. The dark figure for illegal hunting appears to be even larger for lynxes than for wolves, when we look at 60 reported cases where there are substantial suspicions of illegal hunting over 11 years, compared with researchers calculations of 100-150 poached lynxes annually.

UK

-There have not been any seizures of Eurasian or Iberian Lynx by Customs in the last three years.  

Source: Peter Macnab, Customs & International CITES Policy, Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs

-However, there were 9 intelligence reports relating to Lynx furs dated between December 2006 and April 2008.

1. Lynx fur being for sale on eBay – seller was living in Cornwall
2. Russian lynx fur for sale on eBay – seller was living in London
3. Russian lynx fur for sale on eBay – seller was a fashion boutique in London
4. Lynx coat for sale on eBay – seller was living in Dorset
5. Possibly CITES offences relating to a Eurasian Lynx Skull
6. Lynx coat for sale on eBay - seller was living in London
7. Possibly display offences regarding a rescue centre in Peterborough that could have some larger cats such as Lynx
8. Relating to a search on a taxidermist house in 2004 in Norfolk

Source: Natalie M. O. Smith, Criminal Intelligence Analyst, National Wildlife Crime Unit