

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

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. The role and responsibilities of the Standing Committee in conducting the Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species are described in paragraphs q) to v) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) on the Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species.
3. The Standing Committee is to be informed about the implementation by range States of recommendations formulated by the Animals and Plants Committees to ensure compliance with Article IV for trade in selected Appendix-II species. The Secretariat's recommendations regarding compliance are presented in this document for the Standing Committee to decide upon. The document also informs about progress in the implementation of recommendations concerning cycads and *Strombus gigas*.

Review of Significant Trade - Flora

**Cycads**

4. At its 10th meeting (Shepherdstown, December 2000), the Plants Committee selected cycads (Cycadaceae, Stangeriaceae and Zamiaceae) for its Review of Significant Trade. At its 14th meeting (Windhoek, February 2004), in consultation with the CITES Secretariat, the Plants Committee categorized cycads as 'species of urgent concern' in China, Madagascar, Mozambique, South Africa, Thailand and Viet Nam, and formulated recommendations for these range States. The deadline for implementing the recommended measures has expired in the case of Madagascar, Mozambique, South Africa and Thailand (the two remaining range States have until September 2005). Only Thailand submitted information within the agreed time-frame. South Africa did so recently, and its response will be reviewed by the Secretariat and the Chairman of the Plants Committee. At the time of writing (May 2005), Madagascar and Mozambique had not submitted any information.
5. In the case of Thailand, the Secretariat determined in consultation with the Chairman of the Plants Committee that the Management Authority had responded to certain issues but that additional information was required to assess full compliance. The Secretariat requested this from the Thai Management Authority. It will report on compliance by Thailand and the other range States to the Standing Committee, and provide recommendations as necessary.

***Pericopsis elata***

6. As directed in Decision 12.74, the Plants Committee undertook a review of *Pericopsis elata* following the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago, 2002). *Pericopsis elata* was categorized as a 'species of least concern' in Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria, and these range States were eliminated from the review. In Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Congo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the species was categorized as being of 'possible concern'. Recommendations for these range States were formulated accordingly, and they were given six months (until March 2005) to take the necessary actions. Subsequently, Cameroon and the Democratic Republic of the Congo informed the Secretariat about their implementation of the recommendations.

7. A summary of the Secretariat's determination, made in consultation with the Chairman of the Plants Committee, regarding compliance with the recommendations directed to these four range States, and its recommendations to the Standing Committee, are presented in Annex 1.

#### Review of Significant Trade - Fauna

##### *Moschus* spp.

8. In 2002, China was given 12 months to implement a series of recommendations of the Animals Committee concerning *Moschus* spp. China reported on actions that it had taken or had initiated in 2003 in response to these recommendations within the agreed timeframes. On the basis of this information and a subsequent meeting with the Management Authority of China in the margins of the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13, Bangkok 2004), the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, determined whether the recommendations had been implemented. Its evaluation and recommendations to the Standing Committee for appropriate action are presented in Annexes 1 and 2.

##### *Strombus gigas*

9. The Animals Committee reviewed trade in *Strombus gigas* in 1995 and again in 2001-2003. The species was determined to be of 'urgent concern' in the Dominican Republic, Haiti and Honduras, and of 'possible concern' in a further 13 range States (12 other range States were eliminated from the process). Pursuant to the provisions of Resolution Conf. 12.8, the Animals Committee, in consultation with the Secretariat, developed in August 2003 a comprehensive set of recommendations directed to these range States with time-frames for their implementation ranging from 4 weeks to 24 months, the latter finishing in September 2005. Following advice from the Animals Committee, the Standing Committee recommended in August 2003 that imports of specimens of *Strombus gigas* be suspended from those range States for which the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, determined that the recommended actions had not been adequately implemented.
10. As announced at the 51st meeting of the Standing Committee (SC51; Bangkok, October 2004), the Secretariat met with representatives of range States of *Strombus gigas* in the margins of CoP13 to assess progress with the implementation of the Review of Significant Trade in *Strombus gigas* in the Caribbean region. It would appear that many if not all range States have reacted favourably to the recommendations that the Standing Committee endorsed, actively engaged in taking remedial measures where necessary, and are making progress in addressing sometimes complex fishery management and conservation issues. Several range States seem to have taken all recommended measures before the final deadline of September 2005. The Secretariat is aware that the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) and Caribbean regional fishery agreements are supportive of this initiative, and are or will be providing targeted assistance.
11. Some range States have however submitted insufficient information for the Secretariat to allow determination, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee, of compliance with the recommendations. This includes the Dominican Republic regarding measures that were to be implemented by March 2005, and Bahamas and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (both of 'possible concern') for measures that were to be taken by August 2004. The Secretariat has written to these range States to remind them of the recommendations and associated time-frames, and to urge them to provide the relevant or missing information. The Secretariat has also been seeking clarifications on trade in *Strombus gigas* that seems to have occurred in 2004 from one or more range States that had agreed to suspend the issuance of export permits. It is continuing to monitor the situation to enable it to propose appropriate actions to the Standing Committee.

#### Implementation of the Paris agreement concerning sturgeon stocks in the Caspian Sea

12. The Secretariat advised the Standing Committee at its 51st meeting that the requirements of the 'Paris Agreement' on Acipenseriformes in Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan could be considered as having been met and that they had been overtaken by the stricter provisions of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish). This Resolution was further strengthened and broadened in scope during CoP13. The Standing

Committee decided that such a consideration should be based on a written report from the Secretariat.

13. The implementation of outstanding recommendations of the Paris Agreement (originally set out in document SC45 Doc. 12.2) was last reviewed in detail at the 47th meeting of the Standing Committee (Santiago, November 2002) where the Committee agreed that:

*the deadline for the implementation of the Committee's recommendations dependent on external agencies be extended by a further 12 months.*

14. Since this time good progress has been made in collaborating with external agencies in their assistance to these range States.
15. FAO has met requests by Caspian Sea range States for capacity building and assistance for the Caspian sturgeon fishery and agreed funding for a project worth USD 400,000 over two years starting early in 2005. The Secretariat participated in a planning meeting for this initiative in September 2004 at which all range States played an active part. The Secretariat also commissioned FAO to prepare a report on "Review of the Survey Methodology, Stock Assessments and Setting of Total Allowable Catches for Caspian Sea Sturgeon Fisheries". This report is being translated from English into Russian for use by all range States concerned.
16. The TACIS programme of the European Union, which provides technical assistance to countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, has also engaged in a plan for enhancing sustainable fisheries in the Caspian Sea worth EUR 900,000 over two years from starting in June 2004. A substantial element of this programme is devoted to Acipenseriformes. TACIS and the Secretariat intend to co-host a workshop under this programme in October 2005 which will peer-review and assess regional data sets currently used in assessing sturgeon fisheries using current international best practices. The Secretariat is in discussion with TACIS to include in this workshop other issues addressed in Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) such as regional preparation for the evaluation of the implementation of the regional conservation strategies and monitoring regimes (due to start in 2006) and the development of a uniform DNA-based identification system for parts and derivatives and aquaculture stocks. The Secretariat understands that TACIS plans follow-up workshops in 2006, and it will continue to support these and encourage full participation by the range States.
17. The Secretariat takes this opportunity to thank FAO and TACIS for their support and cooperation in furthering CITES objectives for these species.
18. Under the provisions of paragraph u) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat recommends that the Standing Committee conclude that with respect to the outstanding recommendations in document SC45 Doc. 12.2, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, the Russian Federation and Turkmenistan have demonstrated that export of specimens of Acipenseriformes comply with the provisions of Articles 2 (a), 3 and 6 of the Convention and that the pending recommendation to suspend imports of all specimens of these species can be withdrawn.

#### Recommendations

19. The Secretariat advises that the Standing Committee act upon the recommendations referred to in paragraphs 7, 8 and 18 above. In compliance with paragraph t) of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat shall notify the Parties of any recommendations or actions taken by the Standing Committee.

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ANIMALS OR PLANTS COMMITTEE FOR SPECIES SELECTED FOR REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE, RESPONSES FROM THE RANGE STATES CONCERNED, AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SECRETARIAT  
(IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ANIMALS OR PLANTS COMMITTEE) TO THE STANDING COMMITTEE

| Recommendations formulated by the Animals or Plants Committee  | Summary of responses from range States; evaluation of compliance; actions recommended to the Standing Committee (in bold)  |
|--|--|
| <b>Pericopsis elata</b>  |  |
| <p><u>Cameroon</u></p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by March 2005)</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority of Cameroon needs to clarify to the Secretariat how the existing forestry policies provide the scientific basis for the formulation of non-detriment findings for exports of <i>Pericopsis elata</i>, and confirm that the exports are allowed in accordance with the requirements of Article IV. The information to be provided could include information on: the national forest extent, protected areas, concession policies, species inventories, quotas, current areas of harvesting, information regarding minimum felling diameters and compliance and enforcement measures, efforts to minimize environmental impacts.</p> <p>b) The Management Authority should collaborate with the Management Authorities of other range states to share experiences in the implementation of Article IV, to exchange information on procedures in place and to take common steps to enhance the monitoring of trade of <i>Pericopsis elata</i> from these countries.</p> | <p>The Secretariat informed the Management Authority (MA) of Cameroon in September 2004 about the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p> <p>In December 2004, the MA provided details and figures on the distribution of the species in Cameroon, the legal status of <i>P. elata</i> (exportation of logs has been banned since 1999), the production potential and the annual level of exploitation since 1999. <i>P. elata</i> is said to range over 4,071,857 ha. (19% of the total national forest area), of which 43% is protected, 42% under exploitation in concessions subjected to inter alia 30 years' rotation schemes, and 15% is state-owned multiple use forests. Minimum felling diameters of 100 cm apply (not 80 cm as in neighbouring countries). Inventories in the concessions indicate densities of 0.52 stems per ha. Noting that exploitation stimulates regeneration of this light-loving species, the MA states that only 7.5% of the production potential of the species will be exploited in the concessions over the next 30 years. From the data submitted by the MA, it would appear however that not all concessions have management plans in place and that annually, levels of exploitation in several concessions exceed what is indicated as being the production potential. The MA reports that in one instance, this proved to be caused by illegal felling, and that legal actions have been taken.</p> |

### Conclusion

The MA provides information on important aspects mentioned in paragraph a) of the recommendations. The source of the data is not always very clear (e.g. on production potential and inventories), and little or no information is provided regarding the underpinning scientific research and field work which led to Cameroon's current management policy for this species, which nevertheless seems sound and sustainable if properly enforced. The role of the Scientific Authority in ensuring compliance with Article IV for exports of *P. elata* is not mentioned, and no information is provided on the enforcement of existing forestry policies and regulations, or their actual implementation on the ground.

The MA did not provide information on the recommendation in paragraph b). In the opinion of the Secretariat, it is important that Cameroon and its neighbouring countries collaborate on the management and exploitation of *P. elata* in the context of a regional conservation strategy for the species.

### Recommended action

Cameroon should undertake the following actions before the end of 2005:

- a) Provide information to the Secretariat on the role of the Scientific Authority of Cameroon in the making of non-detriment findings for exports of *P. elata* in compliance with Article IV;
- b) Clarify exiting inspection procedures and enforcement schemes concerning exploitation of and trade in *P. elata*, and the results of these activities (e.g. inspections in concessions and on state-owned land, control efforts, seizures, prosecutions, verification of shipments in harbors, etc.);
- c) establish a cautious export quota for *P. elata* for 2007 in consultation with the CITES Secretariat; and
- d) commit to fully collaborate in the establishment of a regional management strategy for *P. elata*.

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p><u>Central African Republic</u></p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by March 2005)</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should clarify to the CITES Secretariat how its Scientific Authority determines that levels of export of specimens of Pericopsis elata are not detrimental to the wild populations concerned, and are exported in accordance with Article IV of the Convention. The information to be provided could include information on: the national forest extent, protected areas, concession policies, species inventories, quotas, current areas of harvesting, information regarding minimum felling diameters and compliance and enforcement measures, efforts to minimize environmental impacts; and</p> <p>b) Provide information on the measures in place to issue export permits and to monitor that levels of exports are allowed in compliance with Article IV, paragraph 2 (a) and (b).</p> <p>c) The Management Authority should collaborate with the Management Authority of other range States to share experiences in the implementation of Article IV, to exchange information on procedures in place and to take common steps to enhance the monitoring of trade of Pericopsis elata from these countries.</p> | <p>The Secretariat informed the Management Authority (MA) of the Central African Republic in September 2004 about the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p> <p>No information has been received by the Secretariat from the Central African Republic regarding the implementation of these recommendations. The Secretariat considers it appropriate to contact the MA again, including through registered post, and to extend the deadline for response. However, in case that the Central African Republic fails to implement the recommendations, the Secretariat will recommend to the Standing Committee a suspension of trade in P. elata with the Central African Republic.</p> <p><u>Recommended action</u></p> <p><b>The Central Africa Republic should undertake the following actions before the end of 2005:</b></p> <p>a) <b>Provide full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding the recommendations of the Plants Committee;</b></p> <p>b) <b>establish a cautious export quota for P. elata for 2007 in consultation with the CITES Secretariat; and</b></p> <p>c) <b>commit to fully collaborate in the establishment of a regional management strategy for P. elata.</b></p> |
| <p><u>Congo</u></p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by March 2005)</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should clarify to the CITES Secretariat how its Scientific Authority determines that levels of export of specimens of Pericopsis elata are not detrimental to the wild populations concerned, and are exported in accordance with Article IV of the Convention. The</p>   | <p>The Secretariat informed the Management Authority (MA) of Congo in September 2004 about the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p> <p>No information has been received by the Secretariat from Congo regarding the implementation of these recommendations. The Secretariat considers it</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>information to be provided could include information on: the national forest extent, protected areas, concession policies, species inventories, quotas, current areas of harvesting, information regarding minimum felling diameters and compliance and enforcement measures, efforts to minimize environmental impacts.</p> <p>b) The Management Authority should collaborate with the Management Authority of other range States to share experiences in the implementation of Article IV, to exchange information on procedures in place and to take common steps to enhance the monitoring of trade of Pericopsis elata from these countries.</p>   | <p>appropriate to contact the MA again, including through registered post, and to extend the deadline for response. However, in case that Congo fails to implement the recommendations, it will recommend to the Standing Committee a suspension of trade in P. elata with Congo.</p> <p><u>Recommended action</u></p> <p><b>Congo should undertake the following actions before the end of 2005:</b></p> <p>a) <b>Provide full and detailed information to the Secretariat regarding the recommendations of the Plants Committee;</b></p> <p>b) <b>establish a cautious export quota for P. elata for 2007 in consultation with the CITES Secretariat; and</b></p> <p>c) <b>commit to fully collaborate in the establishment of a regional management strategy for P. elata.</b></p>  |
| <p><u>Democratic Republic of the Congo</u></p> <p><u>Within 6 months (by March 2005)</u></p> <p>a) The Management Authority should clarify to the CITES Secretariat how its Scientific Authority determines that levels of export of specimens of Pericopsis elata are not detrimental to the wild populations concerned, and are exported in accordance with Article IV of the Convention. The information to be provided could include information on: the national forest extent, protected areas, concession policies, species inventories, quotas, current areas of harvesting, information regarding minimum felling diameters and compliance and enforcement measures, efforts to minimize environmental impacts.</p> <p>b) The Management Authority should collaborate with the Management Authority of other range States to share experiences in the implementation of Article IV, to exchange information on procedures in place and to take common steps to enhance the monitoring of trade of Pericopsis elata from</p> | <p>The Secretariat informed the Management Authority (MA) of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in September 2004 about the recommendations of the Plants Committee.</p> <p>The MA responded to the Secretariat in January 2005 that the Ministry of Environment, Nature Conservation, Water and Forests is responsible for the management of forests in DRC. Within this Ministry, the Permanent Service of Inventories and Forestry Management undertakes forest inventories and maintains a database which is available to the private sector wishing to exploit concessions and the Scientific Authority (SA) when it establishes quotas for tree species listed in the CITES Appendices. P. elata ranges over 33,650,000 ha. or 26,3% of the total forest area in the country. Forest inventories indicated the presence of 2 m<sup>3</sup> per hectare, or an estimated 67,200,000 m<sup>3</sup> of P. elata. The MA reportedly works closely with the SA. The MA clarified that the annual export quota of 50,000 m<sup>3</sup> of logs was only going to be reached when the timber exploitation companies would have rebuilt the necessary infrastructure, which has been destroyed or was looted during wartime in the country. The MA</p> |

these countries.

provides information on protected areas, the main areas of production, minimum felling diameters (80 cm), concession policies, quotas, controls and enforcement measures (in 2002, an agreement on collaboration against illegal trade in CITES species was signed between the Congolese Customs, the Congolese Office of Control and the MA; these authorities are expected to control all CITES documents; the harbor of Matadi is the only designated port of exit for *P. elata*). New legislation has strengthened sanctions and penalties relating to forestry management.

No information was provided regarding the recommendations in paragraph b). In the opinion of the Secretariat, it is important that DRC and its neighbouring countries collaborate on the management and exploitation of *P. elata* in the context of a regional conservation strategy for the species. Within its capacities and to the extent possible, the Secretariat is prepared to assist in such a regional effort.

#### Conclusion

The MA complied with the actions called for in paragraph a) of the recommendations. However, no actions seem to have been undertaken to comply with the recommendations in paragraph b).

#### Recommended action

**The Democratic Republic of the Congo should before the end of 2005 commit to fully collaborate in the establishment of a regional management strategy for *P. elata* and formally request the Secretariat to provide assistance in this regard.**



Moschus spp.

China

Primary Recommendations (to be implemented within 90 days)

1. The Management Authority of China should provide the results of the national musk deer population surveys, conducted from 1995 to 2000, to the Secretariat.
2. The Management Authority of China should clarify the level of harvest of wild musk deer in the country, including the annual harvest, the regions in China where animals are harvested from the wild, and the estimated production of musk from these animals. In as much as possible, this information should be species specific.
3. China should establish conservative harvest quotas based on the results of its population surveys and its knowledge of the biology of the species and should demonstrate how quotas were derived from this information.
4. The Management Authority of China should initiate the following activities and projects as soon as possible, taking into consideration the time-frame of 12 months provided for in the Secondary Recommendation:

- i) Establish a national conservation and management strategy for wild musk deer populations, which addresses the implementation of effective mechanisms to prevent illegal harvesting of musk deer for domestic consumption and/or international trade, the adoption of standardized and verifiable population monitoring techniques, measures to adequately protect musk deer and their habitats, and harvesting programmes that are compatible with the maintenance or improvement of the conservation status of wild populations.
- ii) Implement law enforcement programmes to combat

The Secretariat communicated the recommendations of the Animals Committee regarding Moschus spp. to the Management Authority (MA) of China in November 2002. These recommendations had been formulated in the context of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.) [now repealed and replaced by Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13)]. The MA provided information on the implementation of the recommendations in February and September 2003. The Secretariat and the Chairman of the Animals Committee met with the MA of China in October 2004 to obtain further clarifications. Annex 2 presents details of China's responses to each of the individual recommendations, and an evaluation thereof by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Animals Committee.

Conclusion

China seems committed to improve the conservation status of Moschus spp. and to enhance the control of trade in musk and medicines containing natural musk, particularly through increasing legal protection of musk deer. Not all recommended measures were taken within the agreed time-frames, while information on others remained too short or vague to allow proper evaluation. Most responses from the MA were not supported by verifiable figures or data, and remained short on factual and scientific information. It would appear that in some instances factual data exist but were not communicated to the Secretariat.

- The available information indicates that the recommendations mentioned in paragraphs 2 and 3 became redundant in view of the new legal status of Moschus spp. in China, providing full protection to wild populations of these species since October 2002, and that the one in paragraph 4 v) has been complied with.
- China has initiated actions to comply with the recommendations in paragraph 4 x). However, the identification of Chinese medicines for which natural medicines are considered vital ingredients is likely to take a

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>domestic musk deer poaching and illegal musk trading, and report on the results of the programmes in terms of enforcement efforts, seizures and prosecutions.</p> <p>iii) As urged in Resolution Conf. 11.7, paragraph e) under URGES, collaborate with neighbouring countries to improve musk deer conservation and management in the region, to strengthen cross-border enforcement efforts aimed at reducing illegal trade in specimens of musk deer, and to share information on national strategies and activities concerning the conservation and management of musk deer.</p> <p>iv) Develop a system to register and regularly inspect all musk deer farms in the country, and to require that each musk deer farm documents and reports on: the species, numbers and origins of the animals; ages; sexes; births, deaths, and the newly added or removed individuals; the amount of musk produced; and the quantities of musk in stock and traded.</p> <p>v) Make efforts to improve non-lethal techniques for effectively collecting musk from live animals.</p> <p>vi) Register all importers and exporters, retailers, and companies that trade or process raw musk of <i>Moschus</i> spp., develop a programme to record legal stockpiles of raw musk of <i>Moschus</i> spp. currently held in the country, and institute a system to monitor and control these stockpiles to reduce the risk of illegal musk entering trade.</p> <p>vii) Assess the current labelling of musk-containing patented medicines in China, and initiate a labelling system ensuring that products and medicines containing musk from <i>Moschus</i> spp. are clearly labelled.</p> <p>viii) Ensure that CITES export permits and re-export certificates are only issued for products and derivatives containing musk from legal sources (including stockpiles), and taking into consideration the measures outlined in paragraphs iv), vi),</p> | <p>considerable amount of time. In the Secretariat's opinion, the structure to act upon this recommendation in the coming years is in place in China, and there is thus no need to pursue this issue further in the context of the Review of Significant Trade. The Secretariat recommends that China includes information on progress in this matter, as well as on compliance with the recommendation in paragraph 4 iii), in its future biannual reports, particularly when reporting on actions taken in compliance with Resolution Conf. 11.7.</p> <p>– The information called for in the recommendations in paragraphs 1 (results of national musk deer surveys), 4 ii) (results of targeted enforcement efforts, seizures and prosecutions) and 4 ix) (documentation on the quantities of synthetic musk produced and sold) has not been provided.</p> <p>– China seems to have partially complied with recommendation in paragraph 4 iii), although factual information on collaboration with neighbouring countries was minimal. Noting that enforcement-related aspects of trade in <i>Moschus</i> spp. could be addressed during a regional workshop in China in August 2005, the Secretariat recommends that China fully consider the possibility to convene a workshop with neighbouring countries to address management and conservation issues concerning <i>Moschus</i> spp. in the context of this recommendation.</p> <p>– The information provided by the MA regarding recommendations in paragraphs 4 i), iv), vi) and vii) suggests that certain measures were initiated to establish a national conservation and management strategy for <i>Moschus</i> spp., register breeding farms, manufacturers, trading companies and musk stockpiles, and label medicines containing natural musk. However, the reporting was insufficiently detailed and lacked the necessary factual data, figures and results to determine the level of compliance. The Secretariat notes that good information on these measures might be particularly useful for other countries in Asia with musk processing industries or stockpiles, and would help clarify the source of the natural musk that is used in medicines exported from China.</p> <p>– The MA did not fully address the clarifications required for in the recommendation in paragraph 4 viii), which is connected to recommendations in paragraphs 4 iv), vi) and vii).</p> |
|---|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>vii).</p> <p>ix) Document the production and use of synthetic musk, including quantities produced and quantities sold, and the products and medicines in which synthetic musk is used.</p> <p>x) As urged in Resolution Conf. 11.7, paragraph d) under URGES, develop alternatives for natural musk, and consider limiting the use of musk from Moschus spp. to selected Chinese medicines for which natural musk is considered to be a vital ingredient that cannot be replaced by synthetic musk.</p> <p><u>Secondary Recommendation (to be implemented within 12 months)</u></p> <p>5. The Management Authority of China should, to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and in consultation with the Animals Committee, have taken action to implement the Primary Recommendations.</p> | <p><u>Recommended action</u></p> <p>By the end of 2005 at the latest, China should undertake the following actions:</p> <p>a) Provide factual information, figures and verifiable data to the Secretariat on the implementation of the recommendations mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 4 i), iv) and vi) including: the results of China's national musk deer population surveys; status of China's national conservation and management strategy for musk deer, and the text of this strategy; results of the registration schemes for musk deer farms and musk stockpiles (including number of farms registered and their annual production; size of the legal or registered stockpiles); the operational details of these registration schemes; the current status of the registrations; and a description of the associated monitoring and control activities;</p> <p>b) Address the recommendations in paragraphs 4 vii), viii) and ix) by inter alia providing an update on the progress in the development of the labelling schemes, with target dates and actions for full compliance; clarifying the control systems regarding the (re-)exportation of musk and derivatives containing musk; and documenting the quantities of synthetic musk that are produced and consumed in the country;</p> <p>c) Provide information on the results of enforcement programmes to combat poaching of musk deer and illegal trade in musk since 2002, including enforcement efforts, seizures and prosecutions;</p> <p>d) Clarify China's policy regarding the importation and (re-)exportation of natural musk of Moschus spp. and of medicines and other derivatives containing such musk;</p> <p>e) Give information on the amount of natural musk of Moschus spp. that is annually consumed in China, and a clarification of how the national annual demand for natural musk is to be met by musk from legal origins; and</p> <p>f) Fully consider the possibility to convene a workshop with its neighbouring countries to address management and conservation issues concerning Moschus spp. in the context of the implementation of the recommendation in paragraph 4 iii).</p> |
|---|---|

EVALUATION BY THE SECRETARIAT, IN CONSULTATION WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE, OF RESPONSES FROM CHINA TO PRIMARY AND SECONDARY RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING *MOSCHUS* SPP. (N BOLD)

**Primary Recommendations (to be implemented within 90 days)**

- 1. The Management Authority of China should provide the results of the national musk deer population surveys, conducted from 1995 to 2000, to the Secretariat.**
  - No information has been submitted concerning these or other musk deer population surveys in China. The Secretariat was informed in October 2004 by the Chinese Management Authority (MA) that a report with updated data on the status of wild populations of *Moschus* spp. exists in Chinese.
- 2. The Management Authority of China should clarify the level of harvest of wild musk deer in the country, including the annual harvest, the regions in China where animals are harvested from the wild, and the estimated production of musk from these animals. In as much as possible, this information should be species specific.**
  - In October 2002, *Moschus* spp. was up-listed from Category II to Category I of National Key Protected Wild Animals (Administrative Act No.7 of 21 February 2003). The harvest, hunting or killing of musk deer from the wild for commercial purposes thereby became prohibited. Under exceptional circumstances, such harvest may be authorized under a license system for scientific research or captive breeding purposes only. This recommendation has therefore become redundant.
- 3. China should establish conservative harvest quotas based on the results of its population surveys and its knowledge of the biology of the species and should demonstrate how quotas were derived from this information.**
  - Under the new legal status of *Moschus* spp., harvesting of musk deer from the wild is no longer authorized and no hunting quotas are established. This recommendation is redundant.
- 4. The Management Authority of China should initiate the following activities and projects as soon as possible, taking into consideration the time-frame of 12 months provided for in the Secondary Recommendation:**
  - i) Establish a national conservation and management strategy for wild musk deer populations, which addresses the implementation of effective mechanisms to prevent illegal harvesting of musk deer for domestic consumption and/or international trade, the adoption of standardized and verifiable population monitoring techniques, measures to adequately protect musk deer and their habitats, and harvesting programmes that are compatible with the maintenance or improvement of the conservation status of wild populations.**
    - The MA reported that in 2002, China drafted a national conservation strategy for *Moschus* spp. in the context of a "national project of wild fauna and flora conservation and construction of nature reserves", for which musk deer had been identified as priority species. The MA also announced the creation, enlargement or restoration of several nature reserves to protect the habitat of musk deer, and that other conservation efforts would be undertaken such as monitoring of wild populations, setting up captive-breeding farms, etc.
    - In October 2004, the MA clarified that the conservation strategy for musk deer was fully prepared and should be finalized for publication later that year.
    - No details or factual information were received from the MA on the measures called for in recommendation 4 i). It is therefore unclear which actions have actually been implemented

and how, which ones are still in planning or drafting phases, or what effect these measures may have on the ground in terms of enhancing musk deer conservation. No information was received on the population monitoring techniques that would be used.

**ii) Implement law enforcement programmes to combat domestic musk deer poaching and illegal musk trading, and report on the results of the programmes in terms of enforcement efforts, seizures and prosecutions.**

- In 2003, the MA committed to crack down on illegal activities such as poaching of musk deer or selling of musk or musk products without licenses. No further information was received on these enforcement efforts or on eventual seizures or prosecutions since 2002.

**iii) As urged in Resolution Conf. 11.7, paragraph e) under URGES, collaborate with neighbouring countries to improve musk deer conservation and management in the region, to strengthen cross-border enforcement efforts aimed at reducing illegal trade in specimens of musk deer, and to share information on national strategies and activities concerning the conservation and management of musk deer.**

- The Chinese MA reported on plans to hold bilateral meetings in 2003 with the MA of Viet Nam to discuss cross-border controls of wildlife, enhance enforcement cooperation and stimulate information exchange. It stated that it would collaborate with other border countries to reduce cross-border smuggling whenever opportunities were presented. It also stated that in 2005, it would organize a workshop on CITES enforcement issues in central Asia, and suggested that musk deer be included in the agenda of this workshop.
- In October 2004, the Chinese MA indicated that it had met with Vietnamese CITES authorities on cross-border wildlife trade issues. It expressed interest in holding a meeting between China, Korea, Mongolia and the Russian Federation on the scientific aspects of managing and conserving musk deer, addressing *inter alia* taxonomy, management plans, conservation strategies, setting of harvest and export quotas, population status, population monitoring, different production systems for musk, wild vs. synthetic musk, etc.
- No concrete information was provided on China's implementation of this recommendation, and it therefore remains unclear what the practical results have been of the collaboration with neighbouring countries or whether this has affected controls of cross-border trade, regional enforcement efforts and exchange of information.

**v) Develop a system to register and regularly inspect all musk deer farms in the country, and to require that each musk deer farm documents and reports on: the species, numbers and origins of the animals; ages; sexes; births, deaths, and the newly added or removed individuals; the amount of musk produced; and the quantities of musk in stock and traded.**

- The MA reported in 2003 that all musk deer farms should apply for new licenses from the State Forestry Administration and report full details of their operations because *Moschus* spp. was included in Category I since October 2002. The registration was reportedly in progress.

**v) Make efforts to improve non-lethal techniques for effectively collecting musk from live animals.**

- The MA explained in October 2003 that all musk deer farms had adopted non-lethal techniques for musk harvesting, and that the use of these techniques had been encouraged by the Chinese Government.

**vi) Register all importers and exporters, retailers, and companies that trade or process raw musk of *Moschus* spp., develop a programme to record legal stockpiles of raw musk of *Moschus* spp. currently held in the country, and institute a system to monitor and control these stockpiles to reduce the risk of illegal musk entering trade.**

- Upon the request of the MA, provincial authorities checked and reported musk stockpiles in their region. These provincial authorities are to regularly monitor the stockpiles, and register

all consumption of musk from stocks or captive bred source. Any movement of musk from these stocks requires prior authorization from the State Forestry Administration. In October 2004, the MA clarified that the recording of musk stockpiles in the country had been completed, and that the country needed between 400 and 600 kg of natural musk per year.

- Factual details of the registration scheme, including its *modus operandi* and the size of legal stockpiles, were not communicated to the Secretariat. Apparently, musk stockpiles are monitored through a computer database, but how this functions in practice, and what monitoring and controls take place at national or provincial level remain unclear.
- The MA did not clarify whether importers were registered, if the importation of natural musk remains authorized, or if such imported musk could subsequently be used to manufacture medicines and if these medicines could then be (re-)exported.
- It is not clear from the information received whether the legal sources of natural musk in China (i.e. legal stockpiles and musk produced in captive-breeding operations; eventually combined with legal imports) meets the annual demand for natural musk in the country. This is one of the reasons why it remains difficult to determine if the current monitoring and control systems are sufficient to reduce (or eliminate) the risk of illegal musk entering trade.

**vii) Assess the current labelling of musk-containing patented medicines in China, and initiate a labelling system ensuring that products and medicines containing musk from *Moschus* spp. are clearly labelled.**

- In February 2003, the MA stated that the Chinese Government would label all patented medicine containing musk. In October 2003, the MA reported that a labelling system for wild animal products had been initiated, but that further assessments were required before this system could be adopted for musk products. In 2004, the MA clarified that the labelling system for wildlife products mainly aimed at food products, and that discussions with the industry on labelling products containing wild musk were ongoing.
- The development of a fully operational labelling system for medicines containing natural musk is likely to take a considerable amount of time, but it would seem appropriate to indicate a realistic timeframe and associated actions to reach the labelling target.

**viii) Ensure that CITES export permits and re-export certificates are only issued for products and derivatives containing musk from legal sources (including stockpiles), and taking into consideration the measures outlined in paragraphs iv), vi), vii).**

- The Chinese MA reported in 2003 that the use of natural musk in China was prohibited with the exception of the manufacturing of medicines, and only allowed if it came from registered stockpiles or captive-breeding operations. Manufacturers should obtain authorization each time that they want to use natural musk, providing details on the medicine, the quantity and the source of the musk to be used, and comments from the Medicinal Agency.
- The MA stated that exporters should always provide full documentation with their export application attesting the legality of the medicines containing musk to be exported.
- Not sufficient factual information concerning recommendations in paragraphs iv), vi) and vii) (see above) was received to assess compliance with this recommendation.

**ix) Document the production and use of synthetic musk, including quantities produced and quantities sold, and the products and medicines in which synthetic musk is used.**

- The Chinese MA indicated in 2003 that synthetic musk had been used by medicine manufacturers in the country for over 10 years, and that the Government encouraged this.
- The use and production of synthetic musk in the country had reportedly been documented by the State Food and Drug Administration, but no further factual data were received by the Secretariat.

x) As urged in Resolution Conf. 11.7, paragraph d) under URGES, develop alternatives for natural musk, and consider limiting the use of musk from *Moschus* spp. to selected Chinese medicines for which natural musk is considered to be a vital ingredient that cannot be replaced by synthetic musk.

- In October 2004, the Chinese MA explained that investigations were ongoing regarding the genuine need for raw musk in different traditional medicines. A scientific committee had to determine which medicines should be allowed to continue using natural musk. This was recognized to be a slow and complicated process.

**Secondary Recommendation (to be implemented within 12 months)**

5. The Management Authority of China should, to the satisfaction of the Secretariat and in consultation with the Animals Committee, have taken action to implement the Primary Recommendations

- See overall evaluations under paragraphs 1 to 4 above.