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

Twenty-eighth meeting of the Animals Committee
Tel Aviv (Israel), 30 August-3 September 2015

Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species [Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13)]

EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE [DECISION 13.67 (REV. COP14)]*

This information document has been submitted by the Co-Chairs of the Advisory Working Group (AWG) on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade in relation to agenda item 9.1.[1]

---

* *This agenda item is addressed to the Animals and Plants Committees.*

[1] *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.*

EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE (ERST) - OBJECTIVES, PROCESS & PROGRESS

Carolina Caceres (Animals Committee) & Noel McGough (Plants Committee)

28th Meeting of the Animals Committee, Tel Aviv (Israel), 30 August - 3 September 2015

ToR - ERST Objectives

- Evaluate RST contribution to implementation Art. IV 2 (a), 3 & 6 (a)
- Assess impact of RST on trade & conservation status of species selected for review & recommendations
- Formulate recommendations
- Prepare document with recommendations & conclusions for first appropriate CoP

ToR - ERST Process

- AC and PC oversee the evaluation
- Advisory Working Group (AWG = selected AC & PC members, Parties, Secretariat, experts) to carry out evaluation
- Final report will be submitted to CoP by Chairs of AC & PC & may include a revised Resolution

ToR – ERST Content

Assess

- Process used to select species for Review
- Process & means used to compile information on these species, its use in formulating recommendations & process of communication with Range States
- Types and frequency of recommendations made
- Responses to recommendations & any problems
- Use of recommendations made by Parties

ToR – ERST Content (continued)

Assess

- Nature & scale of support provided to Parties to implement recommendations
- Ongoing process to monitor implementation
- Impact of process on other aspects of CITES implementation

Conduct

- Case studies for a representative range of species/countries to assess impact

Analyse

- Information to assess effectiveness & costs & benefits of RST

Implementing the ERST

2 Meetings Held

- Isle of Vilm Germany, 24 - 28 June 2012 & reported to 27th Animals Committee & 21st Plants Committee

  Goal - Review current process & identified key areas for attention based on ToR. "RST should be proportional, timely & simple"

- Shepherdstown, West Virginia, USA, 27 April – 1 May 2015 & is reporting to 28th AC and 22nd PC

  Goal – Revised Resolution & recommendations for AC/PC and review of progress on ToR

Vilm Outcomes

Recommended *inter alia*

- Transparency of RST should be improved
- Process should be shorter, streamlined & stricter criteria for species selection established
- Communication & consultation with Range States should be a priority and be clear & informative
- Produce standard “menu” of RST recommendations
- RST cases should have a clear end point
- Need clarity over determination as to when recommendations have been met and process to deal with partially met recommendations which includes interaction with the Scientific Committees

Shepherdstown Outcomes

Revised Resolution - concentrated on

1. Criteria for species/country selection
2. Initial letter/communication to Range States
3. Standardisation of RST recommendations
4. A general streamlining & improved transparency of the RST process from start to finish

Shepherdstown Outcomes

- Selection Criteria: UNEP-WCMC provided the results of a test of a proposed new method & AWG agreed a revised process with increased guidance (Annex 3 of Report)

- Initial letter to Range States: Substantive revision and inclusion of significant guidance and explanations for the Parties concerned, e.g. “User- friendly” guide to RST, detailed information on why the country/species was selected, simple guidance on how to respond (Annex 1 of Report) and what should be included in their response (Annex 2 of Report)

Shepherdstown Outcomes

- Standardisation of Recommendations: the AWG developed guidance based on the criteria that recommendations should be ”time bound, feasible, measurable, & be proportionate to conservation risk & that they promote capacity-building” Also have a final recommendation to allow Range States to report on process. (Annex 3 of Report)

Shepherdstown Outcomes

- Streamlining & Transparency – revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.8: The overall timeline has been reduced to allow the substantive work to occur between 2 meetings of the CoP with increased transparency for all stakeholders (Annex 3 of Report).

- Four CoP Decisions drafted - on a new RST Tracking & Management Database, preparing a simple guide to the RST and a training module, and continue reviewing value of country-wide reviews

The Revised Resolution

Annex 3 of Report to AC28

Process now streamlined into 4 sections – 4 key stages in the RST

1. Selection
2. Range State Consultation and Information Compilation
3. Categorisation & Recommendations by Animals Committee or Plants Committee
4. Implementation Measures

The Revised Resolution

- Stage 1 Species/Country Selection: Revised process with clear selection criteria, allows immediate selection of species/country combinations & retains option of exceptional case inclusion

- Stage 2 Consultation & Compilation: Range States notified and provided with more guidance on how to respond, including on information that should be provided. At same time report prepared on biology, management and trade in the species for next AC/PC with preliminary “action” categories assigned

The Revised Resolution

- Stage 3 Catergorisation & Recommendations:

- AC/PC review reports, responses from Range States and preliminary categorisations

- AC/PC confirms or amends categorisations, formulates recommendations (time bound, feasible, measurable, proportionate, transparent, building capacity) for Species/Countries that remain in review

The Revised Resolution

- Stage 4 Implementation Measures: Secretariat in consultation with AC/PC will determine if recommendations are:
  - Met - Countries exit RST - in consultation Chair Standing Committee (SC)
  - Not Met & no new data - Secretariat in consultation AC/PC will recommend action to SC & SC will decide on appropriate action
  - Not Met/Partially Met & new data ➔ recommendation update AC/PC will prepare a revised recommendation to the State concerned

Support to Range States

- Draft Decision: Directs the Secretariat to develop & regularly update a User-Friendly Guide to the RST
- Draft Decision: Directs the Secretariat to develop a comprehensive training module on RST
- Resolution: Urges funding & use of regional workshops, funding of field studies, Secretariat to include RST training as part of NDF capacity building programme

Review & Monitoring the RST

- Resolution Directs: The AC/PC in consultation with the Secretariat to regularly review the RST by, for example, exploring impact of recommendations on Species/Country combinations to ascertain if the desired result was obtained

- Draft Decision: Directs the AC/PC with the assistance of the Secretariat to explore potential benefits and disadvantages of country wide significant trade reviews drawing on results/lessons learned from previous such reviews

Summary

The Advisory Working Group on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade:

- Has reviewed the process, attempted to assess its effectiveness, drawn conclusions and revised the process keeping in mind that it should be "proportional, timely & simple"
- Invites the Animals Committee to endorse the results as recommended in paragraph 30 of the Report to AC28

Questions to the Animals Committee

- The AWG had some lingering questions on the “menu” approach to recommendations; is the “menu” approach to recommendations functional?
- Would it be preferable to remove the “menu” tables from the resolution at this time? These could be retained as separate guidance to the AC/PC for a possible testing phase
- Does the AC agree that more review of the country-wide approach to RST would be useful (draft Decision)?
- The AWG saw a need for careful presentation of the results at the CoP; does the AC agree that a side event at CoP would be helpful?

Doc. 9.1: Summary of contents

- AC28 Doc 9.1 (Paragraph 30: Action requested of the Animals Committee)
  - Annex 1 of Doc. 9.1 (Guidance to Secretariat)
  - Annex 2 of Doc. 9.1 (Inclusion to letter to Range State)
  - **Annex 3 of Doc. 9.1 (REVISED Resolution 12.8)**
    - Annex 3a of Doc. 9.1 (Track change version)
    - Annex 3b of Doc. 9.1 (Clean version including new Annexes)
      - Annex A of revised Resolution (Resolution timeline)
      - Annex B of revised Resolution (Selection criteria)
      - Annex C of revised Resolution (Standard recommendations)
        - Parts A, B, & C and 5 tables
  - Annex 4 of Doc. 9.1 (Comparison of current and revised Resolution)