

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

Fifty-third meeting of the Standing Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 27 June-1 July 2005

Strategic and administrative matters

Relationship with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

REPORT OF UNEP

The Annex to this document contains the UNEP report to the CITES Standing Committee.

Introduction

1. In line with paragraph 16 of the agreement between the Standing Committee of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) of 20 June 1997, UNEP submits an annual report on its provision of , and support to, the secretariat, including an update on the implementation of the agreement and the administration of the secretariat, for consideration at each meeting of the Standing Committee and meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

UNEP continues to deploy its technical and scientific expertise to facilitate the effective Implementation of CITES and the other UNEP-administered global and regional environmental conventions.

A. UNEP SUBSTANTIVE SUPPORT TO THE CONVENTION

I. UNEP's support for MEAs

2. As a follow-up to the 10th meeting of the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements in March 2004, UNEP has established an interdivisional task force to coordinate the work of all UNEP divisions in support of multilateral environmental agreements. A database is being developed to monitor the implementation of decisions of conferences of the parties with respect to which UNEP has been asked to take action. Desk officers have been appointed in the Division of Environmental Conventions to assist convention secretariats in their interactions with UNEP divisions and on administrative matters with the United Nations Office at Nairobi. A meeting of the ad hoc working group on administrative matters was held in May 2004 to discuss pending administrative issues with the UNEP administered multilateral environmental agreement secretariats.

II. Project on issue-based modular approach to the implementation of the decisions of the biodiversity related multilateral environmental agreements at the national level

3. A project on an issue-based modular approach to the coherent implementation of the decisions of biodiversity-related conventions at the national level has been launched with the support of all the major biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements including non-UNEP administered conventions such as the Ramsar Convention and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage (World Heritage Convention). The CITES Secretariat are actively participating in the development of this approach. This project, which would initially involve countries in Africa, would assist countries in implementing the multilateral environment agreements to which they are party by providing them with structured information on cross-cutting topics. Specific products in the form of issue-based modules on cross-cutting topics would be developed to deliver this information. The project would aim at developing a system that could be applied to any cross-cutting topic for any combination of multilateral environment agreements. Following a consultative meeting with the major biodiversity conventions, four issues have been chosen for the development of priority modules: Climate change; inland waters; invasive alien species; and sustainable use. To be properly appreciated, this project should be viewed in the context of biodiversity being one of the priority topics of the World Summit on Sustainable Development and the United Nations Commission on Sustainable Development.

III. Harmonization of national reporting

4. Following completion of the 4 country pilot projects, a workshop was convened by UNEP/WCMC in cooperation with the Governments of Belgium and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at Haasrode, Belgium, on 22 and 23 September 2004. The workshop was attended by representatives of the five global biodiversity-related conventions, eight countries, the European Commission and a number of international organizations with experience in this area. The objectives of the workshop were:
 - a) To review the conclusions and recommendations from the four pilot projects;

- b) To review the conclusions and recommendations of other recent harmonization and streamlining initiatives and the implications of other recent developments in reporting processes;
 - c) To use those inputs as a means for further identifying and clarifying mechanisms to support harmonization at the national level; and
 - d) To develop plans and set priorities for future work in this area.
5. Based on pilot project reports, presentations made at the workshop and subsequent discussions, the workshop developed 12 recommendations for action. Amongst other things, those recommendations called on conventions and agreements to clarify and redefine the information they need in order to assess implementation and outcomes. They should also address the balance between reporting on implementation and reporting on outcomes, particularly in the light of the 2010 target. When requesting reports, conventions and agreements should also explain clearly what the information will be used for and how it will be analysed. The recommendations also stated that the reporting should relate to decisions taken by the governing bodies, both providing information to support the decision-making process and reporting on actions taken to implement decisions and their effect. With this in mind, after each meeting of governing bodies, countries should disseminate the relevant parts of decisions and an analysis of their impacts to all ministries that are affected by those decisions. The liaison group of biodiversity-related conventions should consider establishing a technical task force to develop and promote a streamlined reporting agenda across conventions and agreements, taking into account the issues raised in the pilot projects and in the present report, developments requested by governing bodies, and issues discussed during the Environmental Management Group review. The task force would comprise technical officers from the secretariats supported as necessary by other appropriate experts. It is anticipated that the group and task force would work intersessionally to develop proposals which would be considered and adopted by governing bodies.
6. At the national level, focal points for each of the biodiversity-related conventions and agreements should establish a mechanism appropriate to national circumstances to ensure coordination of all activities to do with the implementation of international obligations at the national level, including reporting. Countries should develop their capacity for managing information more effectively to support implementation of obligations and for reporting. Such approaches should focus on enabling access to information, should build on the experience of the pilot projects and use both existing tools (e.g. the Global Biodiversity Information Facility or the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network) or tools and networks that are being developed. Access to information necessary for implementation of, and reporting to, all biodiversity-related agreements through a single portal or clearing house would significantly facilitate a more harmonized approach.
7. Conventions and agreements should also explore opportunities for taking concrete actions to reduce the reporting burden, for example, by not adding new requests for information without removing existing requests in parallel, by reducing the amount of information requested, by linking reporting more closely to strategic planning, by exploring new mechanisms for reporting, and so on. This could be done within the existing mandates of most secretariats. Capacity-building activities for information management and reporting among local, national, regional and multilateral applications should focus on all three levels of capacity development: individual, institutional and systemic. It is also recommended that steps should be taken to ensure that the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies take fully into account the coordination and information management required to support both implementation and reporting for the various multilateral environmental agreements when financing and implementing programmes.

IV. Expert workshop promoting CITES/CBD cooperation and synergy

8. UNEP, together with the German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation, the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and the United Kingdom's Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, financed a workshop on CITES/CBD cooperation and synergy, which was held from 21 to 24 April 2004. Workshop participants paid specific attention to the issues of sustainable use of wildlife resources, access and benefit sharing, and linking site-based, thematic and species-based approaches to achieving biodiversity conservation and sustainable use. Changes desired within each of these areas were identified, methods and mechanisms to achieve those changes suggested, and

possible constraints to achieving such changes noted. Other areas covered during the workshop included links to the World Summit on Sustainable Development 2010 target on biodiversity loss, the CBD global strategy for plant conservation, and invasive alien species. The workshop report was tabled for consideration during CITES COP-13 in October 2004 in Bangkok, and was brought to the attention of participants at the 10th meeting of the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA), in February 2005, in Bangkok. The full report of the proceedings of the workshop can be accessed at http://www.traffic.org/news/cites_cbd.html.

V. Regional implementation workshops

9. The CITES Secretariat has participated in the six regional workshops organized by UNEP/DEPI between 2003 to March 2005 on Compliance and Enforcement of MEAs where valuable input was received on the review of the Manual on the Guidelines on Compliance and Enforcement of MEAs. They have confirmed participation to the two upcoming regional workshops for Arabic speaking and French speaking African countries in May 2005. CMS has provided cases studies and experiences incorporated into the Manual.

VI. UNEP/Division of Trade Industry and Economics

Economic instruments

10. UNEP has also been active in examining the use of economic instruments to implement MEAs. Today, thousands of species around the globe are threatened as a result of human activities, such as habitat destruction, overharvesting of natural resources, and unsustainable international trade. There is increasing demand to provide national policy-makers, industry regulators, non-governmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders with information regarding the current and potential future use of economic instruments, including property rights, market creation and enhancement, charges, fiscal instruments and liability systems to support the implementation of MEAs.
11. In the context of implementing biodiversity-related conventions, the use of economic incentives has increased significantly over the past years. The Strategic Vision agreed at CITES COP-13 emphasized that in order "for trade to be carried out in a responsible manner based on sustainable use, social and economic incentives are needed". This development indicates a growing understanding that incentive measures can generate financial resources for preserving wild species of fauna and flora.
12. UNEP has worked very closely with the CITES Secretariat on these issues and the Secretariat has been involved actively in the UNEP Expert Group on Economic Instruments. Last year, UNEP, in collaboration with three MEA Secretariats, including the CITES Secretariat, published a study on "*Economic Instruments in Biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements*". It investigates the current and future potential role of economic instruments in the context of three biodiversity-related Multilateral Environmental Agreements: the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna, and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.
13. The main types of economic instruments relevant to protecting biodiversity and the principal provisions and negotiations on economic instruments in the three MEAs are identified. Using numerous examples, the study suggests a range of thematic areas where the use of economic instruments could be further developed, including *in-situ* conservation, sustainable or wise use, and ecosystem services. It also discusses some of the conditions for successful implementation of such instruments, such as integration of local communities, capacity building and valuation of environmental resources and services. In doing so, the study identifies opportunities to realize synergies between the three conventions at the local, national and international level.

Wildlife trade policy reviews

14. The importance of conducting reviews of national wildlife trade policies was noted by CITES Parties at COP-12 and COP-13. Both Decision 12.22 and Decision 13.74, *inter alia*, called for the CITES Secretariat to conduct, in cooperation with the Parties, a review of national policies regarding the use of and trade in CITES-listed species, to compile and synthesize the information provided by the

Parties, and to produce a report analysing the impacts of such policies in terms of socio-economic and conservation benefits and costs.

15. In collaboration with the CITES Secretariat, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Graduate Institute of Development Studies at the University of Geneva, UNEP has submitted a funding application for a project to enhance national capacities to assess, design and implement sustainable national wildlife trade policies, in support of the implementation of CITES and Decisions 12.22 and 13.74.
16. The proposed project will support four developing countries and countries with economies in transition assess the environmental, social and economic impacts of wildlife trade policies and provide national policymakers with information and methodologies to aid the design of policies which benefit the environment, the community, and the implementation of CITES. These country projects will be entirely country driven, being led by national institutions in close cooperation with relevant national government ministries. There will also be a strong emphasis on active participation by relevant stakeholders. An International Steering Committee will guide project implementation at the international level and the project partners, including UNEP, will support the national institutions and government ministries through training and ongoing technical advice.
17. The first step in the project will be the development, at the international level, of a general framework and toolkit of wildlife trade policy assessment methodologies. These methodologies will then be refined and customized by the national institutions to reflect their country's particular circumstances. The national institutions, with the support of the international project partners, will then assess the economic, social and environmental impacts of their national wildlife trade policies. Based on the outcomes of these integrated assessments, integrated national responses, including regulations, economic instruments and voluntary measures, will be developed. Results gathered during the integrated assessments will be set out in a country project report and later compiled into a final synthesis report. The results of the project will be disseminated at an international meeting at the end of 2007.

Promoting mutually supportive trade and environmental policies

18. UNEP is also currently finalizing a paper for publication on "Trade-Related Measures and Multilateral Environmental Agreements". The aim of the paper is to support ongoing discussions on trade-related measures in MEAs taking place in different multilateral fora, such as the WTO Committee on Trade and Environment. The paper provides an analysis of trade-related measures used in six MEAs (CITES, the Montreal Protocol, the Basel Convention, the Rotterdam Convention, the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety of the CBD and the Stockholm Convention), and the function these measures play within the MEAs. The paper concludes by comparing and contrasting the use of trade-related measures in these MEAs in light of their specific objectives. UNEP has worked closely with the CITES Secretariat in the development of this paper.

VII. Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora (Lusaka Agreement)

19. In July 2003, the Lusaka Agreement on Cooperative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora (the Lusaka Agreement), requested UNEP to undertake a review and evaluation of the work of the Lusaka Agreement since its adoption in September 1994. The draft review report underwent internal review, peer review and revision. The revised report was submitted to a regional stakeholder workshop comprising the Parties to the agreement and others to review and comment on the report. The Report was finalized, considered by the Lusaka Agreement Governing Council in January 2005 and recommendations approved for implementation.
20. CITES Secretariat has participated in the six regional workshops organized by DEPI between 2003 to March 2005 on Compliance and Enforcement of MEAs where valuable input were received on the review of the Manual on the Guidelines on Compliance and Enforcement of MEAs. They have confirmed participation to the two upcoming regional workshops for Arabic speaking and French speaking African countries in May 2005. CITES has provided cases studies and experiences incorporated into the Manual.

VIII. Great Apes Survival Project (GRASP)

21. The CITES Resolution Conf.13.4 (Conservation of and trade in great apes) adopted at its 13th meeting (Bangkok, 2004) concerns great apes and GRASP. In particular, it requires the CITES secretariat to implement measures towards eliminating the illegal trade in great apes and to assist range states with the implementation of national plans and measures to eliminate illegal trade. The resolution directs the standing committee to consider measures such as technical missions organized in cooperation with GRASP.
22. The GRASP secretariat is already working closely with the CITES secretariat to plan technical missions to range states to look at measures to combat illegal trade such as border control measures. The government of the United Kingdom has provided funds for such activities and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service have expressed interest in funding these activities.

Collaboration with the other Multilateral Environmental Agreements

23. GRASP has a good working relationship with the other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and the World Heritage Convention (WHC), which are GRASP partners. GRASP is also in discussion with the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands secretariat about their joining the partnership.
24. GRASP is working with the CMS secretariat and the International Gorilla Conservation Programme (IGCP) to develop a CMS Article IV agreement between Rwanda, Democratic Republic of Congo and Uganda for the conservation and management of the transboundary mountain gorilla and its habitat. This is particularly timely following Rwanda's recent ratification of CMS, which means all the three range states are now parties.

Strengthening the GRASP partnership

25. The GRASP partnership has been progressively growing and now includes 38 NGOs and private sector organizations as well as countries and UN organizations. The Intergovernmental Meeting (IGM) on great apes and GRASP will be held from 5-9 September 2005 in Kinshasa, Democratic Republic of Congo. President Kabila of DRC recently announced his government's commitment to host the IGM. The meeting will bring together representatives of range states, donor states, representatives of NGOs and the private sector. Outcomes of the meeting are expected to be the adoption of a global strategy for the survival of great apes, a high level declaration recognizing the importance of great apes, a series of significant pledges of financial support and the full operationalization of GRASP as a WSSD type II partnership
26. The GRASP Interim Executive Committee, of which the CITES secretariat is a member, has met five times already and is very instrumental in guiding the work of the GRASP secretariat and its Technical Support Team. An Interim Scientific Commission (ISC) to provide independent scientific advice to GRASP was established in November 2004. It met with the GRASP secretariat and the TST in London from 4-5 April 2005 to get fully involved in GRASP work.

Other recent GRASP activities

27. In November 2004, Rwanda, home to mountain gorillas and chimpanzees, became the first of the 23 great ape range states to officially endorse and distribute its National Great Ape Survival Plan (NGASP). Funding for the implementation of the identified priority activities is being sought.
28. GRASP Technical Support Team missions have been undertaken to Guinea, Conakry, from 28-29, October 2004, Cameroon, Republic of Congo and Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) between 24 January and 7 February 2005 and in Malaysia from 2-8 March 2005. A fund raising tour of Australia held from 9-22 March 2005 helped raise funds for orang-utan conservation and at the same time raised public awareness of the plight of the great apes and the role of GRASP.

B. UNON ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SUPPORT TO CITES

CITES administrative issues

29. UNEP/UNON continue to work closely with the CITES Secretariat in the providing administrative services to the Secretariat by providing support and guidance on all administrative and financial issues when needed.
30. In line with the Governing Council decision 23/4, UNEP as the trustee, will explore possibilities for further improving the financial information flows to ensure that the convention secretariats have up-to-date and accurate information available to them at all times. In this regard, UNEP/UNON is installing IMIS in UNEP administered convention secretariats to facilitate easy access to information, as needed.

Personnel issues

31. As of March 2005, the following vacancies were advertised and the recruitment has been finalised:
 - a) Information Network Officer P3 -selection process of LIU Yuan from China was completed on 19 April 2004. This is a temporary OTA post established by the Executive Director and will be funded at 50% from the 13% Programme Support Costs and 50% from the CITES Trust Fund. This post was approved by the Conference of the Parties at its last meeting and is now under the staffing table of the CITES Trust Fund.
 - b) French and Spanish translators' posts (2): were reclassified from P-3 to P-4 and were advertised in Galaxy. Recommendations of candidates have been made as of April 2005 and await the endorsement of the Central Review Committee.
 - c) A P4 Training Officer position became vacant as of 1 April 2004 after Mr. Van Vliet's separation from service (31 March 2005) and the vacancy announcement has been finalized and posted on Galaxy as of 8 April 2005.

Accounting and financial management services

32. There continues to be good co-operation and consultation between the Secretariat's administrative staff and their counterparts in UNON in this area. The Secretariat and/or UNON prepare all financial reports in consultation.
 - a) A website has been established for the Secretariats/Administrative Fund Management Officers to have immediate access to official status of contributions at any given time.
 - b) The accounts for the year 2004 were closed by 15 March 2005 and the audit by the UN Board of External Auditors is scheduled for the month of April 2005.

Funding provided to CITES from 13% Programme Support Cost

33. Funding was provided in 2004 and will continue to be provided from the 13% programme support cost. This is done through direct support by funding the staff for the CITES administration in Geneva, for IT support, and other sundry operational expenses such as protocol.
34. The Executive Director agreed that excess funds received as programme support levied on voluntary contributions in support of CITES activities will be allocated for funding of CITES projects. In accordance with this, funding is being provided from 13% levied on voluntary contributions to support substantive backstopping and providing bridging funds for CITES projects such as the MIKE project. During 2004, \$100,000 was contributed through CITES for the MIKE project.