

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



Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Bangkok (Thailand), 3-14 March 2013

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation

Rhinoceroses

REPORT OF THE WORKING GROUP

1. This document has been prepared by the Chair of the Standing Committee Working Group on Rhinoceroses, and submitted by the Chair of the Standing Committee. In the time available it has not been possible to circulate this paper as fully as would have been otherwise desirable, and the comments and recommendations below do not therefore necessarily represent the views of all the working group members .

Background

2. At its 15th meeting (Doha, 2010), the Conference of the Parties adopted the following Decisions on the Conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses:

Decision 15.71

The Secretariat shall:

- a) *examine the implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15) in those range States where illegal killing of rhinoceros poses a significant threat to populations of rhinoceros, particularly Zimbabwe and South Africa;*
- b) *examine progress with regards to curtailing illegal trade in rhinoceros parts and derivatives by implicated States, particularly Viet Nam; and*
- c) *report on the implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15) at the 61st, 62nd and 63rd meetings of the Standing Committee.*

Decision 15.72

The Secretariat shall:

- a) *facilitate, as a matter of urgency, and with others partners as appropriate, bilateral exchanges between key rhinoceros range States and rhinoceros horn consumer States, to improve wildlife enforcement cooperation efforts;*

* *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.*

- b) report at the 61st and 62nd meetings of the Standing Committee (SC61 and SC62) on these efforts;
- c) seek funds to convene a joint CITES Ivory and Rhinoceros Enforcement Task Force. Besides the Secretariat, members should include the ASEAN Wildlife Enforcement Network Programme Coordination Unit, INTERPOL, the Lusaka Agreement Task Force, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime, the World Customs Organization and those Parties in Africa and Asia that are currently most affected by the smuggling of ivory and rhinoceros specimens. Priority should be given to including the following Parties: Cameroon, China, Ethiopia, Kenya, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mozambique, Nepal, the Philippines, South Africa, Thailand, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe. The Task Force should undertake an exchange of intelligence regarding smuggling of ivory and rhinoceros specimens and develop strategies for combating illegal trade; and
- d) report on the work of the Task Force at SC61.

Decision 15.73

At its 61st and 62nd meetings, the Standing Committee shall consider the reports of the Secretariat requested under Decision 15.72 and determine what further actions, if any, are necessary.

The Secretariat reported on the continuing high levels of poaching and trafficking in rhino horn at SC61 (SC61 Doc 45.1) and SC62 (SC62 Doc 47.2). The latter document included the conclusions:

“Despite significant resources being invested and commendable efforts by South African authorities to put an end to rhinoceros poaching, the number of rhinoceroses poached on an annual basis continues to rise at an alarming rate. There are clear indications that organized crime syndicates are involved in acquiring and trading in rhinoceros horns across the European Union and elsewhere.”

“The Secretariat continues to believe that the illegal trade in rhinoceros horn is one of the most structured criminal activities currently faced by CITES. It has become a global problem and has an impact on several continents. Clearly, increased international cooperation and a well-coordinated law enforcement response will be required to address this threat effectively.”

3. The Standing Committee, at its 61st meeting (SC61, Geneva, August 2011), concerned at the increasing level of poaching of rhinoceroses, and thefts of rhinoceros parts and derivatives from public and private properties in non-range States, established an intercessional Working Group, to be chaired by the United Kingdom, to identify measures that could be taken by CITES Parties to reduce the impact of illegal trade on the conservation of rhinoceroses and to enhance existing controls on trade in rhinoceros horn products. The group included representatives from the following Parties: China, Ireland, Kenya, South Africa, Uganda, the United Kingdom, USA and Zimbabwe, plus, the Humane Society, IUCN, Safari Club International, TRAFFIC and WWF.

The Standing Committee:

- a) Instructed the working group to:
 - i) taking account of documents SC61 Doc. 45.1 and SC61 Doc. 45.2, the responses to Decisions 15.71 and 15.72, and on the basis of other currently available information, work with the Secretariat to assess how trade patterns have developed since CoP15, and, taking account of illegal activities, consider the drivers for trade and measures that could be taken to prevent rhinoceros horn entering the illegal market;
 - ii) collect and assess available scientific evidence and documented evidence of traditional cultural practices and beliefs that exist relating to the medicinal properties of rhinoceros horn, and in particular any which relates to the curative properties for cancers and strokes;
 - iii) work intersessionally, and by electronic means as necessary, to identify urgent, short-term measures and longer-term measures that can be taken by CITES Parties to reduce the illegal trade in rhinoceroses and their parts and derivatives, and to enhance existing controls on trade in rhinoceros horn products and live rhinoceroses to ensure the long-term conservation of the species;

- iv) allocate tasks to its members to assess specific measures that may reduce the impact of illegal trade and enhance existing controls; and
 - v) report at SC62 with a view to developing recommendations for consideration at CoP16;
- b) Urged Parties to, urgently, introduce precautionary measures to control the trade in rhinoceros horn and live rhinoceroses;
 - c) Urged Parties to provide information on trade in rhinoceroses and their parts or derivatives to IUCN and TRAFFIC, as detailed in Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15); and
 - d) Encouraged Parties to engage in public awareness campaigns highlighting the current serious levels of criminality associated with the illicit trade in rhinoceroses and rhinoceros horn.
4. After SC61, the Secretariat undertook several actions in accordance with the instructions contained within Decisions 15.71 and 15.72. Details of these are set out in document SC62 Doc. 47.2. Several aspects of the Secretariat's work and findings are also of relevance to the work of the working group established at SC61.
 5. To assist the working group, with financial support provided by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Secretariat contracted TRAFFIC in March 2012 to undertake a study to identify available scientific evidence and documented evidence of traditional cultural practices and beliefs that exist relating to the medicinal properties of rhinoceros horn, and in particular any that relate to the curative properties for cancers and strokes. That report was received on 20 April (see the Annex to document SC62 Doc. 47.2). The study included within its conclusions:

“Rhino horn’s long history of use in traditional medicine suggests that it has proved efficacious in the experience of many people, and some scientific research supports this, although negative results have also been reported. However, its medicinal use has been prohibited in the 5 countries/territories studied, and the traditional medicinal field has unquestionably made great advances without it over that period of time. A wide ranging review found that most researchers in the field support application of the modern standards of evidence based medicine to determine the efficacy of tradition medical treatments. These standards have not been applied to rhino horn; without such scientific validation, any future legal use of rhino horn as a medicine to treat illness, and especially life-threatening ones, should be contemplated with caution.”

One working group member expressed concern that the report was incomplete and contained a number of errors and agreed to liaise with TRAFFIC to rectify these. However, at the time this is submitted (4 October 2012) no detailed comments have been provided to TRAFFIC.

6. Furthermore, the Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties No. 2012/014, dated 20 February 2012, on the *Conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses*, inviting all Parties to submit information by 15 April 2012, on:
 - a) the implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15) (recognizing that the Resolution contains a wide range of actions that Parties should undertake);
 - b) measures taken to reduce the illegal trade in rhinoceroses and their parts and derivatives;
 - c) measures taken to enhance existing controls on trade in rhinoceros horn products and live rhinoceroses to ensure the long-term conservation of the species; and
 - d) any other information which Parties believe could assist the Rhinoceros Working Group in fulfilling its mandate. Eight Parties, plus the 27 Member States of the European Union, responded to the Notification. In addition the IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group provided significant information and data.
7. In response to Notification 2012/14, the Secretariat received reports from eight Parties plus the 27 Member States of the European Union, UNEP-WCMC and the IUCN AfRSG. The comments were received too late to be considered ahead of SC62.

8. At SC62, the working group met at lunchtime on 23 July 2012 to consider how to proceed, with a view to being able to identify and recommend short and medium term actions to tackle the continuing crisis facing rhinos in the wild, as requested of the group under its terms of reference paragraph 3 a) iii), as well as how to complete the task identified at paragraph 3 a) ii). The group noted that whilst the crisis was continuing, several good stories were emerging both in terms of cooperation, effort and outcomes in some countries and these needed to be learnt from and built upon. The group concluded that measures to improve enforcement efforts in source, transit and destination countries and demand reduction strategies focused on destination countries and their nations, were necessary.
9. To that end the group identified the following key actions as necessary for the group to be able to deliver recommendations for the Standing Committee and CoP to consider:

- i) The development of ideas for a demand reduction strategy based on its current understanding of the evidence of traditional cultural practices and beliefs about the medicinal and beneficial properties of rhino horn, and other modern/more contemporary uses, taking account of but not limited to the experts' meeting on messaging to reduce consumer demand for tigers and other endangered wildlife species, convened by TRAFFIC and WWF and endorsed by the Global Tiger Forum, in Hong Kong, 22-23 November 2011. The strategy should also take account of the recent TRAFFIC study into the evidence of the medicinal properties of rhino horn, and its conclusions, updated as necessary. http://www.traffic.org/generalreports/traffic_pub_gen47.pdf.

TRAFFIC submitted a draft demand reduction strategy to the Secretariat and the Chair of the Working Group on 9 September 2012 and this was distributed to the working group members for comment on 19 September. The draft demand reduction strategy is attached at Annex A.

- ii) Taking opportunities to raise the crisis that is currently facing rhinos in the wild, at the highest possible level to gain support for action, including but not limited to the forthcoming 67th Ordinary session of the UN General Assembly.
- iii) That, whilst the group welcomed the information provided to it in response to Notification 2012/14, by eight countries and the Member States of the European Union, it further requested information from those countries, and others, detailing the outcomes of actions implemented to try to tackle the ongoing crisis. Information on outcomes of the efforts taken would assist the group in assessing what measures were or could be more or less successful when transferred to or adopted by other countries. To obtain this information, the Secretariat further issued Notification 2012/053 on 27 August 2012. Following that notification, responses were received from four Parties, plus the 27 Member States of the European Union. These were circulated to the working group members on 19 September.

10. Additionally the Standing Committee called on Viet Nam, a country that the working group acknowledged was a key player in the ongoing trafficking crisis, to provide the working group with information requested in Notification 2012/14, together with the additional information requested at 3 above. To that end the Secretariat contacted Viet Nam on 15 August 2012 to request that it answer to some or all of the following questions:

- a. the legislation governing rhino horn trade and penalties for illegal trade
- b. measures implemented to prevent illegal import and trade in rhino horn
- c. current ongoing activities to combat illegal rhino horn trade.
- d. specific enforcement actions over the past three years to prevent illegal trade in rhino horn and the results of such operations.
- e. is a multi disciplinary approach followed to prevent illegal rhino horn trade and if so which authorities are involved?
- f. measures implemented to prevent rhino horns from going into commercial trade. For example, are owners of such horns mandated to hold possession licenses? Are they allowed to give away or sell the horn in their possession? Are there specific legislation for this purpose?
- g. what measures are in place to monitor the retail market?
- h. efforts to curtail advertising of rhino horn, including via Internet; and
- i. are the use of rhino horn as a palliative medicine for cancer in any way allowed?
- j. what are being done to curtail the use of rhino horn as an additive to drinks, etc.?
- k. provision, in a table, detailing how many seizures of rhino horn they have made, how many people have been arrested, how many convictions and the sentences rendered, etc.
- l. feedback with regard to progress made in the stock check of rhinoceros hunting trophies to verify the use of such trophies .

- m. details of steps taken where results of such verifications indicate that individuals are no longer in possession of the horns imported as trophies.
- n. are there legislation in place to facilitate international cooperation?
- o. information of measures implemented to facilitate international cooperation with all other countries in the region as well as South Africa.
- p. challenges experienced in ensuring effective international cooperation.

On 4 September Viet Nam responded to the request by the Secretariat, and a copy of its response was circulated to the working group on 19 September.

Discussion

11. Whilst not particularly numerous, the responses by Parties and others to notifications 2012/014 and 2012/053 contained useful information about a range of measures that different countries have taken forward.
12. Several countries provided details of robust legal and regulatory systems which, in compliance with CITES rules, makes it an offence to import for commercial purposes rhino horn which does not have an export permit. Several countries have instigated additional controls. Penalties in several countries, including for example Zimbabwe, have been reviewed and increased.
13. South Africa, currently the primary source for illegal rhino horn in light of the number of animals that continue to be poached there, has introduced additional measures in terms of the regulation of the hunting of rhinoceros. These include all applicants being required to provide proof: that they belong to hunting associations in their country of residence; that they have hunted African species before; and, and that they provide a Curriculum vitae in this regard. In addition, South Africa considers whether the country of usual residence has legislation that will enable them to monitor the use of the trophy once exported from South Africa. In this regard, South Africa liaises with the importing countries as soon as applications are received. Since the introduction of these measures there has been a significant reduction in the number of applications to hunt rhinoceros and the applications received are from countries that historically hunted in South Africa. Permits are currently not issued to Vietnamese citizens and this restriction will remain in place until Viet Nam can confirm whether the rhino horn trophies exported to Viet Nam are still in the possession of the hunters. However, this approach could be abused if, as the Czech Republic reports, third country nationals claim to be the exporter whilst they are just middle men. To avoid this loophole, all countries should be encouraged to cooperate with the precautionary screening being undertaken by South Africa of all countries claimed as destinations, to ensure that rhino horns are only exported where the aforementioned requirements have been met.
14. Swaziland only allows the export of live rhino.
15. One working group member noted that, given the increasingly fluid nature of rhino horn trade routes, an additional approach could be for CITES to consider making provision, applicable to all Parties, for regulating re-exports of rhino horn trophies with regard to (a) the definition of hunting trophies with respect to Personal and Household Effects and (b) the adoption of a resolution by the Parties laying down stringent rules governing the re-export of rhino horn trophies. This could include controls, applicable to rhinoceros horn, on any re-exports of trophies for any purpose without forensic determination of their probity, or a presumption that any re-export of rhino horn should be scrutinised further to ensure that it is not contrary to the restrictive annotation to the South African Appendix II listing, unless valid evidence to the contrary is produced. These ideas were not, however, considered in any depth by the working group.
16. The EU and its Member States reported that they had ratcheted up restrictions on re-exports such that permits would only be issued in 3 circumstances; where the items was part of a house move, where it was moving from museum to museum, or the item was part of a bona fide research project. Intra EU movements were allowed under its Single Market but no individual Member State should be issuing re-export permits unless the movement met with one of the three aforementioned exceptions. This approach is due to be reviewed at the end of 2012.
17. Australian legislation bans the import or export of any personal or commercial live rhino or rhino horns, unless it either comes from South Africa or Swaziland or is proven to be pre-Convention. However, whilst imports and exports can therefore occur, Australia in recognising that China may be a major destination so regularly corresponds with the Chinese CITES MA to seek their confirmation that the import is legal. China

has banned the commercial import or sale of rhino horn since 1993. However, hunting trophies and personal or household effects are like in most other countries still permitted.

18. All Parties that reported indicated that they had harsh penalties in place and were dedicating resources towards catching those involved in trafficking rhino horn. Swaziland reported that it does not issue fines for poaching or trafficking offences, either international or internal, but only custodial sentences. Several countries report international cooperative actions, including bilateral agreements between South Africa and Viet Nam, and collaboration with Interpol (Australia, Swaziland, the USA, and the EU). Several countries, including Australia, China, the EU, the USA report numbers of arrests, but little information about penalties given has been provided.
19. China, Kenya, South Africa, and Viet Nam in particular make reference to educational and training programmes which have been increased in recent years to assist rangers and customs officials as well as to educate the public. In some cases, however, it is not fully clear how those programmes were developed or the potential for such experiences to be shared amongst those and other countries, and in some cases it is too early to judge the effectiveness of such programmes. All countries have though expressed a willingness to share their experiences and this should be welcomed and encouraged.
20. Kenya, South Africa and Zimbabwe in particular have increased considerably the resources available to protect their rhino populations and to identify horn smuggled through or out of their countries.
21. Efforts to assist in the monitoring and tracking of legal horns have been developed and are beginning to be implemented, most notably micro-chipping and forensic recording.
22. Viet Nam's response is though perhaps the most interesting and may provide the most useful focus for further work. On the one hand Viet Nam claims that rhino horn is not particularly prevalent in the country, whereas NGOs regularly claim that it is (a claim apparently supported by the Secretariat's film *Rhinos Under Threat*). Greater dialogue and information sharing between NGOs and Vietnamese authorities may assist in both resolving this apparent uncertainty and identifying the pathways and areas to be targeted. Nevertheless, Viet Nam does acknowledge that whilst it has comprehensive legislation and penalties this is not enough to stop the determined trafficker, and they suggest several measures to assist in tackling this criminality. They suggest in particular that hunting trophies can present problems most noticeably once they have been imported and they suggest that the working group (or CoP) should consider and provide guidance on how to control and monitor rhino horn hunting trophies after their import. They also call for a collaborative study of the presence and use of rhino horn in Viet Nam, and greater international cooperation between enforcement agencies. Viet Nam reports that it has stepped up its scrutiny of flights coming direct from South Africa, but it is not clear that all rhino horn that may be entering the country will be using this route.
23. **In summary**, all those countries that reported provided evidence that they had stepped up their efforts to try to tackle the poaching and trafficking of rhino horn, most noticeably China, Kenya, South Africa and Viet Nam. However, poaching, trafficking and laundering of rhino horn appears to be continuing. Several countries reported seizures and arrests but those appear, when measured against the number of animals poached, just to be the tip of the iceberg. So, where are all the other horns going? Increased restrictions on the export or re-export of rhino horn by several countries, appears to have reduced the "visible" trade, but the challenge is now to tackle the underground or invisible trade. How does it work, what pathways does it use, is not yet known or confirmed. Continued resolve to try to contain the level of poaching is clearly necessary and responses provided to the working group suggest that resolve exists. Increased and consistent controls and enforcement measures such as those taken in the EU and the USA appear to have reduced trade through those countries. Although the uncertainties surrounding the trade in hunting trophies is flagged both by the Czech Republic and Viet Nam as a route which appears to present several loopholes that can be exploited. No party or NGO that responded suggested that the worst is over. All recognise the problem and want to tackle it. CITES and the international community must now consider how they can do so.
24. The contents of this document were circulated to the working group for consideration and agreement and text reflect several iterations and comments, made specifically by South Africa, USA, HSI, TRAFFIC and WWF. The chair of the working group would like to record his thanks to these commentaries and those provided by others at earlier stages.

Recommendations

25. Parties and the international NGO and enforcement communities should continue their efforts to eradicate the illegal trade in rhino horn, in particular:
 - a) Source, transit and destination countries should place the strongest level of restrictions on the international movement of rhino horns, commercial or otherwise, including a renewed focus on re-exports,
 - b) Investigating and prosecuting criminal acts to the highest possible level should occur, working with the legal services to ensure awareness of the links to serious organised criminal gangs.
26. Parties should consider, and strengthen, the existing text of Resolution 9.14 (Rev CoP15), which urges Parties *“to adopt and implement comprehensive legislation and enforcement controls, including internal trade restrictions and penalties, aimed at reducing illegal trade in rhinoceros parts and derivatives”*, or make a Decision, to ensure that sufficient and appropriate measures are put in place to restrict and control the movement of legally imported Appendix II rhino horn trophies. In particular, Parties should be urged to adopt legislation, where necessary, to authorise the conducting of inspections to ensure that trophies remain in lawful possession, a requirement that the horns are accompanied by permits which must be produced on request, and that they remain in the condition as described in those permits.
27. All Parties seeking to improve their legislation prohibiting international commercial trade in products labelled as, or purporting to contain, rhino parts and derivatives, should include penalties adequate to deter illegal trade and consider introducing national measures, such as voluntarily prohibiting internal trade in such parts, derivatives and products, as provided for in Resolution Conf. 9.6 (Rev.). It should be made clear that legislation and enforcement controls to deter illegal trade in rhinoceros parts and derivatives should include products that are labelled as or sold as containing or purported to contain such parts or derivatives, whether or not they are rhinoceros horn.
28. South Africa should maintain its rigorous approach to screening destination countries willingness and ability to monitor the movement of rhino horn, and all other CITES parties should adopt a similar approach.
29. Parties should consider the level of penalties and ensure that they are a sufficient deterrent. Greater national and international publicity of prosecutions and penalties should occur.
30. Parties who have imported live rhinoceros [since 2005] should, in addition to nationally recording the status of the animals (births, deaths and movements), be invited to report this information to Standing Committees 65 and 66 and CoP17.
31. Range states should continue to use all possible resources to monitor and protect rhinos both in protected areas and elsewhere,
 - a) giving priority to consideration of the movement of rhinos to the safest possible areas,
 - b) including bids for such monitoring and protection within their national Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans with appropriate bids for support to funds such as the GEF (as Viet Nam has just secured); and
 - c) the international community should consider what assistance it can give to range states to achieve this.
32. Consideration should be given at CoP16 to the adoption of a draft Decision calling for the development and, where possible, implementation of the draft demand reduction principles included in the Annex to the present document. Parties should provide reports to the Secretariat on their experiences in addressing demand reduction with a view to improving the draft demand reduction principles to enable recommendations to be made to Standing Committees 65 and 66 and CoP17.
33. Viet Nam in particular, but also other source and alleged destination countries, should seek to review and if necessary increase their surveillance at ports and airports, for instance by the greater use of sniffer dogs.

34. Decision 15.71 should be retained, *mutatis mutandi*, and in addition, CoP 16 should consider adopting a decision requiring Viet Nam to report to SC 65 and SC66 on measures it has taken to tackle illegal trade in rhino horn, including the following:

- a) Measures that it has undertaken to regulate the possession of rhino hunting trophies, including a requirement that all relevant permits be retained with the trophy and that it not be altered from the condition in which it was imported;
- b) Updated details of seizures and prosecutions, including details of penalties imposed.

The decision should also mandate the Standing Committee to make recommendations accordingly.

35. The CITES rhino working group should be urged to continue to undertake the work requested of it at SC61, as a matter of priority, with adequate resources made available for it to do so.

COMMENTS FROM THE SECRETARIAT

The Secretariat suggests that the present document be considered together with the report of the Secretariat on rhinoceroses in document CoP16 Doc. 54.2 and that, following the discussion, the Conference of the Parties consider establishing a drafting group to prepare a single set of draft decisions from the two documents to reflect the general view of the Parties.

A STRATEGY FOR REDUCING THE DEMAND FOR RHINO HORN PRODUCTS OF ILLEGAL ORIGIN

BACKGROUND

Rhino poaching and illegal rhino horn trade are posing a significant threat to the numbers of rhinos in the wild. Despite increased law enforcement efforts, poaching levels in South Africa have seen dramatic increases in recent years, with 448 rhinos poached in 2011 compared to 13 poached in 2007.

Enforcement action to identify and apprehend poachers and illegal traders play the primary role to stem this illicit trade. However, without a complementary effort to effectively address the persistent market demand that drives this trade, enforcement action alone may not be sufficient to eliminate this threat. A key long-term solution to address rhino poaching in Africa and Asia lies in curbing demand for the horn.

CITES has recognized that demand reduction is a key element in addressing poaching and illegal rhino horn trade. Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP15) on Conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses by urging "the implicated States, as a matter of priority, to work with all user groups and industries to develop and implement strategies for reducing the use and consumption of rhinoceros parts and derivatives"

At the 62nd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee, the Committee agreed to a Recommendation by the Working Group on Rhinoceroses for "the development of ideas for a demand reduction strategy based on its current understanding of the evidence of traditional cultural practices and beliefs about the medicinal and beneficial properties of rhino horn, and other modern/more contemporary uses."

This document outlines a possible strategy.

STRATEGY PRINCIPLES

This strategy is based on five key principles:

1. **Objective and science-based approach, based upon the latest available research:** Research must be conducted to provide an objective and scientific basis for identifying and prioritizing those target consumer groups, products and drivers of consumption that need to be addressed and provide data for designing and developing interventions. Some aspects of this research would be difficult and a sound methodology for such research needs to be identified, bearing in mind that the consumers to be researched would likely be aware that their activities are illegal.
2. **Targeted solutions, aimed at key user groups:** Proposed actions will vary for different consumer groups and products. Each of these target groups will have different motivations for using the same product and the strategies needed to address these motivations will be different. Solutions need to prioritize and target those consumer groups that have the most significant influence on illegal consumption.
3. **Wide and comprehensive stakeholder involvement:** There are likely to be diverse interests and social groups that need to be represented in any effort to reduce demand for illegal rhino products. These include governmental agencies involved with CITES management, enforcement, health and public awareness and education; traditional medicine practitioners and their associations; consumer groups; and key 'influencers' who can reach out to consumers, such as those from the corporate sector and from youth groups. The entire range of stakeholders will need to be involved to confirm that approaches taken are the most appropriate and effective to accomplish the demand reduction objectives.
4. **Draw upon diverse expertise:** Changing human behaviour is no doubt a very complex area of work and there is a wide palette of behavioural sciences that could inform conservation efforts. Research, planning and development will need to involve different partners, agencies, research institutions and other actors to fill knowledge gaps. This should include participants from a wide range of professional and institutional backgrounds, including representatives from various governmental departments, the corporate sector, advertising and marketing companies, universities, social research groups, conservation organizations and inter-governmental organizations. The collaboration of this diverse range of expertise and experience is essential to the success of the process.

5. **Government-led:** it is essential that 'ownership' and implementation of the process must be led and driven by the governments of the countries concerned, rather than by international or non-governmental organizations. Country stakeholder workshops and meetings convened by the government, in partnership with others, would be critical to the successful implementation of this programme. International partners could provide support in the form of international coordination and technical expertise and facilitation. High-level support from government would be crucial to the success of the process.

OBJECTIVES

- Influencing consumer behaviour to eliminate consumption of illegal rhino horn products by developing effective demand reduction strategies that can be implemented on a scale adequate to have an impact or long enough duration to achieve measurable change.
- Identifying specific messaging approaches and methods for specific target audiences.
- Strengthen the legal and enforcement deterrent by creating greater awareness of legislative provisions and penalties prohibiting trade in rhino products.
- Create greater awareness of the negative consequences and impact of poaching and consumption of illegal rhino products, particularly on wild rhino populations.

PROPOSED ACTIVITIES

- Using market surveys and desk research, conduct activities to get a clear understanding of the landscape and dynamics of the illegal rhino horn market, documenting the key rhino horn products in prevalent use, uses being employed and factors driving their use. This may involve examining consumption of a variety of products and for a variety of uses, and identifying the products and uses having the most detrimental impact on the species in the wild.
- Gathering of information through surveys, focus groups and other social research methods, to identify key illegal rhino horn consumer groups and illegal rhino horn products in prevalent use, in order to gain insight into the attitudes, drivers and socio-demographics of these consumer groups
- Use attitudinal surveys, focus groups and other social research methods, to analyse the awareness of legislative provisions and penalties prohibiting trade in rhino products amongst these target groups, in order to gain insight into the attitudes, deterrents and socio-demographics of these consumer groups
- Analysis of the effectiveness of other demand reduction campaigns with the purpose of identification of possible best practices.
- Convene a consortium of relevant experts to analyse and discuss the research findings, involving key stakeholders such as the relevant government departments, enforcement agencies, scientific institutions, traditional medicine practitioners, corporate sector representatives, social researchers, behavioural scientists, marketing and communications professionals and conservation NGOs.
- Convene country workshops to design and develop targeted solutions to the research findings, including the development of communications and marketing strategies and campaigns aimed at eliminating demand for rhino products of illegal origin among the key consumer groups
- With the assistance of the relevant partners and experts, implement, monitor and evaluate the communications and marketing strategies, plans and campaigns to deliver the targeted solutions identified by the country workshops.
- Development of ways to measure behaviour change over time and to adapt communication and marketing strategies as necessary on the basis of ongoing evaluation.
- Encourage Parties, inter-governmental organisations and non-governmental organisations to provide technical or financial support and assistance to these efforts, if requested
- Report on progress made to meetings of the CITES Standing Committee