

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



Sixty-ninth meeting of the Standing Committee  
Geneva (Switzerland), 27 November -1 December 2017

NIAP PROCESS

This information document has been submitted by the in-session working group on NIAPs in relation to agenda item 29.3 on *National ivory action plans process: Report of the Secretariat.*\*

The NIAP process is a new process and Parties are learning as the process evolves. For this reason there is a need to reflect upon the NIAP process, to consider how the process can be further improved.

Matters to consider	Comments
NIAPs place a significant reporting burden on Parties. Where Parties are affected by more than one issue and reporting is requested on more than one issue, this could also lead to duplication in reporting.	The example of Mozambique, requested by the Standing Committee to develop a National Ivory Action Plan (NIAP) and a National Rhinoceros Action Plan (NIRAP), was highlighted as a possible example of how reporting burden and duplication could be mitigated. Mozambique combined reporting on rhinoceroses to SC69, with its reporting on NIRAP implementation, in its report submitted in accordance with the provisions of the Guidelines to the NIAP Process.
There is a need to better distinguish between Parties of origin, transit and destination, as these Parties are affected by illegal ivory trade in different ways, e.g., some have illegal domestic markets, others are exclusively affected as transit countries, etc.	The way in which a Party is affected by illegal trade in ivory, should be reflected by the actions in its NIAP. The NIAP should be tailored to the circumstances of each country and respond to illegal ivory trade as it affects the country.
It might not be appropriate to rely on ETIS exclusively as mechanism that serves as the basis for Parties to be identified as possible new Parties to the NIAP process.	ETIS might not be perfect, but it continues to provide a valuable available analysis of illegal ivory trade. It is also noted that Step 1 Paragraph b) of the NIAP Guidelines makes provision for additional information to be considered.
There is a need to consider if and how NIAPs can be used to respond to emerging and new matters swiftly.	This is a matter that deserves further consideration.

\* 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.

<p>There is a need to review and further refine the exit strategy from the NIAPs process for Parties that substantially achieved their NIAPs.</p>	<p>This is a matter that deserves further consideration.</p>
<p>It is difficult to measure the results of NIAP implementation due to the lack of performance indicators and targets directly related to the actions required and which measure the impacts of the actions in the NIAP.</p>	<p>Indicators should be included in the NIAP.</p>
<p>The Secretariat could consult more extensively with relevant experts when monitoring and evaluating NIAP implementation</p>	<p>Wider consultation could put a significant burden on the limited resources of the Secretariat.</p>
<p>A mechanism should be established to determine the impact and value of NIAPs over time.</p>	<p>It is too premature to do this at present, but is an important issue that would deserve further consideration.</p>
<p>All NIAPs should be made public.</p>	<p>This will be done for all NIAPs developed after CoP17, in accordance with the Guidelines adopted at Cop17. For NIAPs developed prior to CoP17, no such requirement existed, so it can only be done with the explicit agreement of the Party concerned.</p>