

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



Eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Colombo (Sri Lanka), 23 May – 3 June 2019

Strategic matters

CITES and livelihoods

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. The Conference of the Parties, at its 17th meeting (CoP17, Johannesburg, 2016), adopted Decisions 17.36 to 17.40 on *Livelihoods* as follows:

***Directed to the Parties and others***

17.36 *Parties are invited to:*

- a) *promote the use of the CITES and livelihoods toolkit, guidelines and handbook to carry out rapid assessments of the impact of the implementation of CITES-listing decisions on the livelihoods of rural communities, the implementation of activities which mitigate any negative impacts;*
  - b) *encourage the conduct of new case studies on how legal and sustainable trade can generate economic incentives for the conservation of wildlife and improvement of livelihoods of indigenous and local communities; and*
  - c) *incorporate issues related to CITES and livelihoods into their national socio-economic and development plans, as well as in relevant projects being developed for external funding, including funding by Global Environment Facility (GEF).*
- 17.37 *Developing country Parties are encouraged to communicate with their national Ministries of finance, development, or other relevant Ministries, to seek the provision of financial support to the work in Decision 17.36.*
- 17.38 *Developed country Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and public and private donors/investors are encouraged to provide financial and in-kind resources in support of the work in Decision 17.36.*

***Directed to the Secretariat***

- 17.39 *The Secretariat shall seek external funding from interested Parties, and intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations to support the work described in Decision 17.36.*
- 17.40 *Subject to the availability of external financial resources, the Secretariat shall:*
- a) *facilitate the organization of workshops and side-events to showcase successful livelihood experiences and exchange lessons learnt, in collaboration with interested Parties and relevant international and regional organizations;*

- b) *continue to update the relevant section on the CITES website to publish experiences and case studies related to CITES and livelihoods submitted by Parties, stakeholders and interested organizations;*
- c) *cooperate with relevant UN agencies and programmes, international and regional organizations to establish ad hoc livelihoods funding and promote capacity-building activities that support Parties to implement the Convention as an important part of enabling livelihoods; and*
- d) *report at the 69th meeting of the Standing Committee and at the 18th meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the work above and other progress made with regard to the implementation of Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) on CITES and livelihoods.*

#### Implementation of Decision 17.36

3. The Secretariat issued Notification to the Parties [No. 2017/066](#) on 5 October 2017 on *New case studies on CITES and livelihoods*, encouraging Parties to inform the Secretariat of completed or planned new case studies. The Secretariat subsequently reached out to members of the Standing Committee's working group on livelihoods and various Parties to discuss potential case studies. The Secretariat also discussed with the World Conservation Monitoring Centre of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP-WCMC) on how best to use the CITES Trade Database to identify potential case studies on most frequently traded animal and plant species in different taxonomic groups and in different geographical regions. Over 30 case studies were received from Parties and organizations.

#### Implementation of Decision 17.39

4. The Secretariat is grateful for the funding from the European Union and China for the workshops in South Africa and China, respectively. It is also grateful for the funding provided by Switzerland for the preparation of new case studies and their review.

#### Implementation of Decision 17.40

5. The Secretariat and South Africa jointly organized a workshop on CITES and livelihoods in George, South Africa from 23 to 25 November 2016 to review successful livelihoods experiences and exchange lessons learnt. Representatives from 13 Parties in Africa, Asia and South America as well as international organizations attended the workshop. The [report](#) and recommendations of the workshop were submitted by South Africa at the 69th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC69, Geneva, November 2017).
6. A [template](#) for new case studies was developed by the Secretariat with inputs from members of the Standing Committee's working group on livelihoods, UNEP-WCMC and specialists of the Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN-SULi). In line with Decision 17.36, paragraph b), the key objective of the case studies was to identify how legal and sustainable trade in CITES-listed species contributes to the conservation of wildlife and the livelihoods of rural communities.
7. A workshop on CITES and livelihoods was held from 6 to 8 November 2018 in Guangzhou, China to review new case studies, identify best practices and lessons learned and prepare for CoP18. This fourth and largest CITES and livelihoods workshop assessed over 20 case studies from Parties in Africa, Asia, Europe, Oceania, North America and South America, including small island developing States, involving the sustainable use of a wide range of species, from mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish to corals and medicinal aromatic plants. The report of the workshop is available in Annex 3 to the present document.
8. The Secretariat has continued to update the [section on livelihoods](#) of the CITES website by publishing reports of workshops and information on new case studies related to CITES and livelihoods submitted by Parties and interested organizations.
9. The Secretariat has been working closely with its partners in the UN system as well as other international and regional organizations on livelihoods issues, including by seeking their inputs on the development of a standard template for case studies, inviting them to participate in workshops on CITES and livelihoods and working with them on the review, analysis and showcasing of new case studies.

## Discussion

10. The new case studies have shown that positive experiences in CITES implementation and livelihoods exist in countries in all regions and involve a wide range of species. They have demonstrated that engagement of rural communities in the various parts of the value chain of legal trade in CITES-listed species, including harvesting, captive breeding or artificial propagation, processing, storage and trade, may offer an economically viable employment opportunity for rural communities and a direct incentive for wildlife conservation. The engagement of rural communities in this process helps create a positive view of rural communities towards wildlife, thereby reducing the chances of their engagement in poaching and trafficking in wildlife.
11. The over 30 new case studies submitted for review at the workshop in Guangzhou were for the first time presented in a standard format. Each Party and organization was asked to contribute one case study, but there are potentially more good case studies in many of the contributing countries. The Secretariat recommends that all suitable case studies should be documented in the standard format and made available in appropriate platforms such as the livelihoods section of the CITES website. For the purpose of communications and awareness raising, which will be discussed later, the greater number of case studies and the wider the geographical range and taxa to be covered, the more convincing the important role of livelihoods for CITES will be to a broad audience.
12. A guideline on mitigating and minimizing the negative impacts of CITES listings has been developed and now constitutes part II of the Handbook of CITES and Livelihoods. The positive impact of CITES on livelihoods has been shown in many case studies, but there is currently no consolidated information on how to best achieve this. The Secretariat suggests that a Guidance for “maximizing the benefits for rural communities of CITES implementation and trade concerned”, as envisaged in Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) on *CITES and livelihoods*, is well warranted. This can be developed based on a comprehensive and in-depth review of best practices and lessons learned in the case studies by relevant experts from different sectors, including wildlife protection, community-based conservation, markets, trade and economics.
13. The Secretariat created a booklet to observe the 40th anniversary of CITES in 2013. Among other topics, stories about 12 species were featured as “milestones” in the history of CITES. When revisiting these milestones, it was clear that many of the success stories of CITES have strong links with the engagement of rural communities in the process of legal and well-managed trade in CITES species, whose participation in return contributed to the conservation of the species in the wild. The species cited in the booklet include vicuña, Morelet’s crocodile, markhor, queen conch, African cherry, African teak, big leaf mahogany, snowdrop and wax plant (Candelilla).
14. At the recent workshop on CITES and livelihoods, participants expressed concerns that although Resolutions Conf. 8.3 (Rev. CoP13) on *Recognition of the benefits of trade in wildlife* and Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) recognize the benefits of legal and sustainable trade in wildlife especially when it supports the livelihoods of rural communities and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), positive messages showing such recognition are insufficient, particularly in the media. Stories in the media, both traditional and social media, greatly influence public conception about trade in wildlife and their products, as well as decision-making at both national and international levels.
15. While it is widely recognized that habitat loss is the biggest threat to wildlife in the long term, it is worth highlighting that legal and sustainable trade that contributes to the livelihoods of rural communities may offer incentives for securing land use for wildlife conservation, and therefore contribute to the conservation of habitat. This is recognized by Resolutions Conf. 8.3 (Rev. CoP13) and Conf. 17.9 on *Trade in hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I or II*, but deserves a wider recognition.
16. Enhancing the recognition of the benefits of legal and sustainable trade is achievable by highlighting the case studies and success stories on suitable platforms and events with a clear target audience. These are opportunities to raise awareness of the objectives of the Convention and to present it as a true conservation tool. Participants at the workshop agreed that communication about CITES and livelihoods, as discussed in Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17), paragraph 3 b), should be a priority for both the Secretariat and Parties.
17. Since the ultimate objective of CITES is to ensure the survival of the species in the wild, it would seem natural that the survival of the species in the wild must also be the goal of the work on CITES and livelihoods. It would seem to be in the interest of the Parties to the Convention to engage rural communities so that their efforts to conserve wildlife and ensure their survival in the wild is clearly seen as beneficial for their

livelihoods. This recognition and principle should be taken into account in the consideration of various issues surrounding livelihoods and rural communities in the CITES context.

18. Evidently, not all legal and sustainable trade contributes to the livelihoods of rural communities and the preservation of habitats for wildlife. Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) expresses concerns with regards to the “potential” shift from *in situ* to *ex situ* production and the loss of revenues for rural communities as a result. With captive-bred or artificially propagated specimens increasingly dominating trade in CITES-listed animals and plants, it would be advisable to review the impact of such a shift on livelihoods and *in situ* species conservation through the collection of more case studies and through joint work with relevant parties, among other means.

#### Additional issues to consider

19. The Secretariat notes that many documents have been submitted to the present meeting touching upon the participation and the livelihoods of rural, local or indigenous communities (documents CoP 18 Doc.17.1, Doc.17.2, Doc.17.3, Doc.18.1, Doc.18.2, Doc.18.3 and Doc.19). Furthermore, some of these documents propose recommendations along similar lines. The implementation of CITES is better achieved with the engagement of rural communities, especially those which are traditionally dependent on CITES-listed species for their livelihoods.
20. In order to bring these documents together, the proposed decisions contained in Annex 1 to the present document has been revised to reflect the Secretariat’s recommendations found in documents CoP18 Doc. 17.2, 17.3, 18.2, and 18.3, including the proposed amendment to the draft decisions proposed in document CoP18 Doc. 18.2, and to propose an additional task to the Standing Committee to continue its discussion on how to work on this issue in a coordinated manner during the next intersessional period.

#### Recommendations

21. The Conference of the Parties is invited to adopt the draft decisions on livelihoods in Annex 1 to the present document and delete Decisions 17.36 to 17.40.

## DRAFT DECISIONS ON *LIVELIHOODS*

### ***Directed to the Parties***

18.AA Parties are invited to:

- a) collate or conduct new case studies, using the standard template, that demonstrate how the involvement of rural communities who live alongside wildlife in legal and sustainable trade in CITES-listed species contributes to the improvement of their livelihoods and the conservation of the species in the wild and submit them to the Secretariat;
- b) engage rural communities to take part in CITES decision-making processes at the national level to better achieve the objectives of the Convention; and
- c) where appropriate, incorporate issues related to CITES implementation and livelihoods into national wildlife conservation and socio-economic development plans, as well as in relevant projects being developed for external funding, including funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) through the Global Wildlife Programme.

### ***Directed to the Standing Committee***

18.BB The Standing Committee shall, in collaboration with the Secretariat

- a) review the report in Decision 18.DD on the possibility of using registered marks of certification for products of CITES-listed species produced by rural communities; and
- b) monitor the progress made by Parties in implementing Decision 18.AA to engage rural communities in CITES decision-making processes to better achieve the objectives of the Convention.

18.CC The Standing Committee shall review the report of the Secretariat on the progress made under Decision 18.EE and make recommendations, as appropriate, to the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

### ***Directed to the Secretariat***

18.DD Subject to the availability of external financial resources, the Secretariat shall:

- a) support the collation or conduct of new case studies on CITES and livelihoods as described in Decision 18.AA, paragraph a), and assist Parties to present the case studies in appropriate platforms, and in formats and manners that are most effective for targeted audiences;
- b) commission a review, with inputs of experts from different disciplines, of relevant case studies on CITES and livelihoods, both existing and new, as well as existing guidelines on sustainable use of wildlife and engagement of rural communities, to identify best practices;
- c) based on the review, prepare a Guidance on how to maximize the benefits of trade in CITES-listed species to rural communities and the conservation of the species; and
- d) commission an evaluation of the possibility of using registered marks of certification, existing and new, for products of CITES-listed species produced by rural communities consistent with CITES provisions in order to enhance conservation and livelihood outcomes;
- e) facilitate the organization of a workshop to review the guidance developed as described in paragraph b) above, to present new case studies on CITES and livelihoods, and to facilitate the exchange of experiences in collaboration with relevant international and regional organizations;

- f) organize the production of outreach materials, including publications and short videos based on the case studies, to raise awareness of and promote best practices in CITES implementation and livelihoods including its contribution to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and to share such materials on appropriate platforms, including the CITES website, social media channels, external media, and exhibitions;
  - g) make efforts to establish global partnerships with relevant international and regional organizations, including conservation organizations and development agencies to work together in activities under CITES and livelihoods; and
- 18.EE The Secretariat shall report to the Standing Committee on progress made with regard to the implementation of Decisions 18.AA and 18.DD and Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) on CITES and livelihoods.

TENTATIVE BUDGET AND SOURCE OF FUNDING  
FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS OR DECISIONS

In Resolution Conf. 4.6 (Rev. CoP16) on *Submission of draft resolutions, draft decisions and other documents for meetings of the Conference of the Parties*, the Conference of the Parties decides that any draft resolutions or decisions submitted for consideration at a meeting of the Conference of the Parties that have budgetary and workload implications for the Secretariat or permanent committees must contain or be accompanied by a budget for the work involved and an indication of the source of funding.

The costs of the consultancy work as envisaged in the draft decisions, the organization of workshops and the production of promotional materials including short films and the support to Parties for the development of new case studies are estimated to be USD 60,000 each year. This does not include the staff time of the Secretariat.



## Report on the Workshop on CITES and Livelihoods

6 to 8 November 2018

Guangzhou, China





## 1. Introduction

As mandated by Decision 17.40 adopted at the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP17, Johannesburg, September 2016), a CITES and Livelihoods Workshop was held in Guangzhou, China from 6 to 8 November 2018. Over 80 participants CITES authorities around the world and experts from United Nations organizations, leading conservation organizations including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), TRAFFIC, the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) etc.

The workshop was convened by the CITES Secretariat and hosted by the CITES Management Authority of China. It was the fourth and largest workshop on CITES and livelihoods following previous workshops in Peru (2013), Colombia (2015) and South Africa (2016). The workshop aimed to review new case studies on CITES and livelihoods, identify best practices and lessons learned and review enabling environment for successful livelihoods, prepare draft decisions for consideration at CoP18 and discuss ways to best communicate about CITES and livelihoods.

The key objective of new case studies is to demonstrate the mutual benefits between the legal, well-managed international trade in CITES-listed species and the livelihoods of rural communities that live alongside wildlife. New case studies were conducted the basis of a standard template developed by the CITES Secretariat with inputs of experts from leading experts, including IUCN specialist groups. Four IUCN specialist groups were represented at the workshop.

## 2. Opening remarks and background overview

Mr Wu Zhimin, Director General of the Department of Wildlife Conservation, State Forestry and Grassland Administration of China, welcomed all participants on behalf of the host country of the workshop, stressing that the promotion of sustainable development through improving people's livelihoods and the conservation of species at national and global level is one of the most important issues in the context of CITES. The Director General emphasized that there must be a way to strike a balance between the protection of plants and animals, and the livelihoods to people in order to save them for future generations. He referred to China's engagement in several CITES and livelihoods workshops in the past.

On behalf of the CITES Secretariat, Mr. Liu Yuan welcomed all participants from all six continents, mentioning that this was the largest CITES and livelihood workshop so far, having attracted over 30 case studies from all over the world. He noted that Parties to CITES recognize that well-regulated legal trade can benefit both local communities and species. The various case studies in the CITES and livelihoods programme will showcase examples of a successful nexus between local livelihoods and wildlife conservation. When local communities gain benefits from wildlife, it offers a long term self-supporting solution for improving livelihoods and achieving conservation benefits.

Mr. Han Xu, Deputy Director General of the Bureau of Fisheries in the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs stressed that the Chinese government attaches great importance to the protection of endangered species and aspires to have a leading role in their protection, referring to the Chinese slogan of green development and ecological civilization. Mr. Han added that the Chinese government is making every effort to address the livelihoods of rural and coastal communities while protecting terrestrial and aquatic species, and looks forward to learning from the suggestions and best practices at the workshop.

Following the opening remarks, Mr Liu Yuan provided an overview of the work on CITES and livelihoods, including its background, achievements and current mandates. Mr. Liu reminded the audience of common misconception among the media and the general public about CITES with all the attention that illegal trade in wildlife attracts. In fact, 97% of CITES-listed species can be traded legally provided that the rules are followed.

He recalled that the CITES and livelihoods work started at CoP11 in 2000 with Devil's claw listing proposal, which was rejected due to concern on the negative impact on livelihoods of rural communities. This resulted in the development of the CITES and Livelihoods Handbook for assessing and mitigating CITES listings on livelihoods.

Stories about how international trade in the fine wool of CITES-listed vicuña from the Andes mountains in South America contributed to the protection and recovery of the species and the livelihoods of rural communities is relatively well known. But there are many more examples on local community involvement in conserving wildlife through sustainable use. He said this fourth CITES and livelihoods workshop, as mandated by CoP17 decisions,

was going to assess new case studies from countries in Africa, Asia, Europe, Oceania, North America and South America, including small island developing States such as the Solomon Islands, a wide range of species, from mammals, reptiles, amphibians and fish to corals and medicinal aromatic plants. This workshop is therefore hugely important for showcasing best practices and demonstrating CITES as a powerful conservation tool.

### 3. Presentation of new case studies

As the workshop was not able to accommodate all the over 30 case studies, selected case studies from Bolivia, Brazil, China, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Malaysia, Mexico, Nepal, Peru, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uganda, Vietnam were presented at workshop, representing 10 of the 17 mega biodiversity countries in the world. These countries, from all six continents, also represent the largest exporters in CITES for live mammals, reptiles, birds, fish, corals, cacti and plants excluding cacti and orchids.

#### **The contribution of the sustainable management of and international trade in wildlife to indigenous peoples - the cases of Lagarto (*Caiman yacare*) and Vicuna (*Vicugna vicugna*) in the Plurinational State of Bolivia. (Presented by Ms Maria del Pilar Becerra Cardona, Ministry of Environment and Water, Bolivia)**

Two important programmes were created in 1997. The ministry regulates both programmes. Objectives were: Conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing with indigenous populations. They took place in different parts of the country, with different climate, and different indigenous populations. Lowlands have access to natural resources, but roads are bad, and provide limited access to markets. Organizational structure of the vicuna fiber program is a national association of vicuna managers. They are organized in community management bodies, each of which connects several communities. There is an adaptive management cycle from population estimates to distribution of benefits. Currently, there are 21 associations in 33 municipalities, covering 5 departments and benefitting 5500 families. Benefits reach 12-16 USD per two person working days. 10-15% of received benefits go to communities, departments, associations, and municipalities. Indirect benefits include capacity building, training technicians, etc. Harvest quotas are set annually, but the total CITES quota for the country is never reached. In the lagarto skin program, harvesters receive 70% of the total generated cashflow, 5-10% is reinvested. The rest goes to communities and governments. Removing incomes from this trade would significantly impact on life systems of affected communities and weaken conservation efforts. This happened in one community, when an Italian buyer ended buying skins.

#### **How trade in Pirarucu (*Arapaima gigas*) benefits rural communities in the Amazonas state in Brazil and the conservation of this iconic freshwater fish species (Presented by Cristina Isis Buck Silva, Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources, Brazil)**

Pirarucu is the largest freshwater fish in world, which can reach 3m and 300kg. It is a predator, living in the Amazon river. Since 1970, populations were overexploited. Population management involves communities in 11 conservation units, 3 indigenous lands and 11 fishing agreements areas. Most catch is extra income, since the fish does only occur during short time in the year. Indigenous knowledge was used for counting individuals, using a method that was scientifically validated. Women were involved for collecting and recording biological data and handling the fish. The programme started in 1999 with only one conservation unit. In 2018, 35 catch authorizations were issued. The fishermen can count the fish, since it has to emerge every 20 minutes to breathe with their modified swimming bladders. IBAMA issues catch authorizations based on annual counts from each management area. Catch quotas are 30% of counted individuals above 150cm. Extra income per family is between 700 and 1350 USD. Communities also benefit from food security. The fish harvest tripled since 2011 in both specimen numbers and harvest quantity almost tripled. Exports go to US, Japan and Italy, among others. Fish population increased in some areas, on average fourfold since 2011. Preserving the fish preserves entire food chain, since Pirarucu does not like disturbance. You also protect the traditional life in these areas. Thus, participatory management is possible! Sustainable use can generate income and include traditional communities in decision making processes.

#### ***Dendrobium officinale* (orchid) and livelihoods. Luo Yibo, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China**

*Dendrobium* orchids are used in traditional Chinese medicine (TCM). They are endemic to Asia, the genus encompasses more than 1000 species, 100 of them in China. Most of them are medicinal. The genus is used since at least 1500 years, about 30 are used in recent TCM. Several species are endangered, some critically so. There is a lot of artificial propagation. One village grows *dendrobium* since 1984. We research *Dendrobium* populations and traditional use and teach how to grow it locally. Benefits in both case villages in which we work mostly go to elderly people. Their income from artificial propagation is growing. Planting those in every corner of

their villages has become custom for 30 years, without acceptance problems. By now, offshoots grow on stones, and rocks in `wild`. It also makes villages more beautiful.

**Trade in *Galanthus woronowii*, source of livelihoods for rural communities in western Georgia. (Presented by Teona Karchava, Ministry of Environment Protection and Agriculture, Georgia)**

Population assessments of the species were conducted in 2009, 2014 and 2018. Trading is ongoing since 1997, for decoration purposes, and in the past also for medicinal purposes. The status of the population is at least stable, latest assessment show an increase. We still check what the reason is: Methodology of the survey and information collection, or a reduction of wild collection? The annual export quota since 1997 has been 15 m bulbs. Cultivation takes place in 24 sites (18 households), managed by 4 intermediate traders. The trade is important cash source, since the area is the poorest in the country, and only 60-75% of populations are employed, mostly self-employed in agriculture. Prices are locally low, most gain remains in middle countries (Turkey or Netherlands). We would like to know if we can consider the use of a certification process such as FairWild.

**Livelihoods associated with Kuth (*Saussurea costus*) in Indian Himalaya and future strategies. (presented by Gopal Singh Rawat, Dean, Wildlife Institute of India, India)**

The Kuth range extends from Pakistan to Himachal Pradesh. 80% of the wild population occurs in Indian Jammu and Kashmir. No records from Himachal Pradesh for 70 years. It is critically endangered. Since 1985, it is listed in App I, before that it was listed in App. II. In India, the species is protected, and may not be collected from the wild without special permission. A license is required for cultivating it, and export without permit is prohibited. On paper, this is a strict policy. But many farmers obtained cultivation licenses. India exported 250-300 megatonnes per year prior to trade restrictions. The annual domestic market is 150-200 megatonnes. Most of current demand is from artificial propagation. Farmers in Jammu and Kashmir find licenses to worrisome, but in Himachal Pradesh there is a farmer association. Ca. 260 farmers cultivate Kuth in India. Most farmers have small areas and earn 2-3 USD per kg dry weight. Uttarakand provides some subsidy to farmers, but cost is 400 USD per hectare. Harvest takes place once in 3 years. The profit per ha is 2250 USD once every three years. In 2016-2018, Jammu & Kashmir had 5 farmers, in total 1.5ha. Himachal Pradesh had 190 farmers (26ha), producing 46.800kg. Uttarakand had 62 famers (6.25ha), producing 11.300kg. Issues are that Kuth is only a buffer crop and not economically sustainable, there are too many barriers to cultivation, and no evidence that cultivation improved status in the wild (except in one national park in Uttarakand). Kuth from China and Myanmar is cheaper than the Indian one. Licenses should be able to be acquired more easily, and we need to downlist the species to Appendix II.

**The role of coral trade in sustainable livelihoods of coastal communities and species conservation in Indonesia. (Presented by Niken Wuri Handayani, ecosystem specialist, Ministry of Environment and Forestry, Indonesia)**

Indonesia has the highest coral diversity in the world. Almost 600 species are identified. The status of coral reefs increased from year to year since 1993, except in 2016. Wild harvest needs to remain below determined national quota. The coral trading chain is long, several internal actors require specific permits (distributors, collectors, exporters, etc.). Coral harvest is the main income for 8000 people (2000 households), who make 150USD a month from it. Gender role: Women participate as algae cleaner. The reduction of harvest would reduce income. Most coral harvester would loose their livelihoods, and coral smuggling would increase. The Ministry promotes transplanted corals, audits are conducted every two years, and wild harvest decreases slowly every year. CITES regulation has a major influence on livelihoods. Lessons learnt: Political will is important, as well as community participation, capacity building, species management plans, and collaboration between local and central government and communities.

**Livelihood impacts of international trade in Nile crocodiles in the communities of Tana river county, Kenia. (Presented by Fridah Dermilla Obare, Kenyan Wildlife Service, Kenya)**

Population status: The population is healthy in protected areas, but in open areas, the population is decreasing. We do not have an updated information (last census in 1990s), a new census coming soon. The Tana area is located in coastal Kenya. There exist conflicts between farming and pastoralists in the area. It is a poor area in which most households have many members. Thus, mitigating resource-use conflicts requires alternative livelihood options. Three companies are in the crocodile business, mainly to export crocodile skin. They employ local communities due to their knowledge of the Tana river area and of crocodile biology. Each company exploits eggs along specific zones of the river in specific harvest periods. Eggs are collected by men. The communities collect eggs, companies breed them and release 4% of the hatch (if not harvested, survival probability of the hatch is only 1%). Collectors are paid by egg and egg quality; a hatch success translates into additional bonus.

Benefits comprise a variety of infrastructure, technology and social support projects through the three companies. Community involvement: CITES helps the protection, the local framework is adapted to human-crocodile conflict, data collection serves as monitoring, and community involvement helps conservation. Challenging is that much of the processing facilities and companies are not located locally, which decreases benefits, while the human wildlife-conflict remains in the area.

**CITES implementation and fishery-based livelihoods in Sabah, Malaysia. (presented by Lawrence Kissol Jr., Director, Department of Fisheries, Sabah, Malaysia)**

Many marine species are listed in CITES, mostly under zero quota pending NDF. Exploitation takes mostly place through artisanal fishing. The case study is about an area with multiple species - fishers do not know what gets into their nets. This is in contrast to hunters, who can see what species they are hunting. Sharks are CITES-listed since the CoP Bangkok, and more might be listed in Sri Lanka. Zero export quota is valid at the moment – use is mostly restricted to local consumption. Rays can make a good price – 100 USD per kg. Seahorses and giant clams are also under zero export quota. Livelihood benefits: Local people live on boats like gypsies, and marine resources main attraction for tourists. Aquaculture for export could improve benefits, as well as establishing marine parks to protect reefs – Sabah is surrounded by dead reefs. Reducing pressure from wild harvest, and habitat protection would also help, across species. Key factors: NDFs are essential for export quotas, aquaculture, enforcement and good governance are very important. Challenges: Pressure from tourism industry, transboundary issues, poverty, maintaining food security, and identification. Key lessons: If correctly implemented, CITES brings positive effect, but demand is too high. Holistic management is required.

**CITES and livelihoods case studies: Morelet's crocodile and Bighorn sheep in Mexico. (presented by Paola Mosig, Coordinator, CITES Scientific Authority, Mexico)**

Morelet's crocodile moved from severely endangered to no longer threatened, which resulted in a down-listing to App II with zero export quota for species from wild, a monitoring system in the whole country, and a legalization of commercial trade, accepted by consensus at CoP17. We now have 75.000 animals in the wild, with an upward trend. A ranching scheme was implemented, in which we collect 50% of the nests that we find in the wild and raise them in captivity. We have up to a 90% survival rate in captivity and sell the skins. In nature, only 1% would survive. This practice is supported by harvest plans and NDF's. Benefit sharing schemes and a traceability system are in place. Currently, two communities profit from the pilot project, comprising about 2000 people, 300 of them own land (22% of them women). 27 people are directly employed in the ranching project in one village, 14 in the other. 14.000ha have been set aside in a conservation scheme. This benefits also other species, since the areas are national priority habitats. The ranching protocol was published in 2017, and covers monitoring, harvest rate, collection methods, transport, incubation, and benefits to species and communities. More communities want to join. We will see what the results are from harvesting half of the eggs. Then we see whether we need to release some of the captive ranched specimen. currently, we do not. As opposed to Kenya, women manipulate the eggs, since they are more gentle. Communities have their own incubators, after which the newborns go to the farms. Human, financial, social, natural and physical capital (infrastructure) is created as benefits for livelihoods. Also, the perception of crocodiles has changed to the positive, communities take care of the species, participatory surveillance committees watch out for poachers, and poaching decreased. Lessons learnt: Multi-stakeholder and multi-sectorial coordination is key from the very beginning. A lot of challenges (see slides, no time was left to present them). Bighorn sheep case study: The species was extinguished from some local populations; only its Mexican populations are included in CITES, since it is more common in US and Canada. In the wild there currently are 3500 individuals. Only males older than six years can be hunted. A project aims at an aerial population survey in Baja California. Only local communities can permit hunting. They have field technicians and other personnel. They earn from 10.000-40.000 USD. One indigenous group makes auctions and gains up to 150.000 USD per trophy. Overall it is a good system, but some challenges remain, in particular to make free land available, and to combat poaching.

**Community management of wild animals and plants in the CITES process (*Podocnemis unifilis* – yellow-spotted river turtle and orchids). (presented by Jessica-Maria Galvez Durand Besnard, Director, Directorate of Sustainable Management, of the Wildlife Heritage, Peru)**

12 turtle species are listed in App II. They are a protein resource for local communities, as well as a cultural, medicinal and income-related resource. Species management started in the nineties, with involvement of local communities. The state engages in a monitoring and management plan. Artificial beaches are constructed, and efforts are taken to deter predators. Community members take care of the beach. 50% of offspring are released in the wild, which is the rate of survival. The rest are up for sale through CITES export permits. The population is currently growing. Communities receive technical assistance to ensure species management. In 2017, 700.000 specimen were exported. Social (community empowerment, positive attitudes to conservation through participation in release and care of turtles) and natural capital is created (protected beaches, reduced wildlife

trafficking), and the population is increasing. Successes are the achieved through community organization and training – many people know how to manage species better than us academics. *Phragmipedium kovachii* is a cold weather cloud forest orchid, which is critically endangered. All members of community are involved in care and propagation of the orchids, which is propagated in nurseries. Livelihood benefits are human capital (they know how to grow orchids, but learn legal acquisition and trade), and financial capital. Stronger governance is another success, though support from government and NGO`s. Challenges remain a strengthened local organization and market access.

**Coral, orchid, and turtle, and livelihoods in the Solomon Islands. (prepared by Rose Babaua, chief conservation officer, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology, Solomon Islands)**

IUCN Boa and Python specialist group presented on behalf of Ms. Babaua. The Solomon Islands consist of 992 Islands of which 147 are inhabited. Many people depend on natural resources for livelihoods. They are a member to CITES since 2007. Orchids are locally propagated surrounding homes, mostly for domestic trade. Turtles are used for meat, ceremonial, medicinal purposes. Staghorn coral is used to make lime powder. Various challenges remain, including mining. Added comments by IUCN: For many people in this part of the world, there is no distinction between domestic and international trade. Sale is so important from a livelihoods perspective. You need this cash for medicinal purposes, because people can otherwise not buy essential things for their lives. It's also about tradition, about culture. What about conservation of cultural diversity? Not only biodiversity. Help them to meet both goals!

**How regulated trade in CITES-listed medicinal plant *Aloe ferox* contributes to the livelihoods of rural communities. (presented by Olga Kumalo, Director, Threatened or Protected Species and CITES, Department of Environmental Affairs, South Africa)**

This is a proposed case study to be completed in the future. Our case study will analyse how CITES affects the use of *A. ferox*, which is found in four provinces. It is still rather common in many different habitats, and amongst the most used and traded species in South Africa. It is not endangered, and the population did not decline in the last ten years. NDF shows low to moderate risk. They are also regulated under access and benefit sharing regulations, since they are used for medicinal purpose: the bitter (medical) substance comes from the plants yellow part, and the interior parts of the skin, and the hard parts. The green epidermis, yellow bitter juice, and the inner gel-like flesh are also used for cosmetic purposes. Benefits can be monetary or other. Funding has been cleared for community deposits of *A. ferox*. Main importers are Germany, Austria, Switzerland. No challenges yet, since case study is not yet there, neither the lessons learnt.

**Community-based wildlife conservation and use, practices and lessons learnt in Tajikistan during 10 years of work with communities. (presented by Khalil Karimov, Tajikistan, Institute of Zoology and Parasitology, of the Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan, Chair of IUCN SULi, for Central Asia)**

Challenges of trophy hunting are a lack of transparency, corruption, benefit that reach only few, connected people. The population status of mountain goats are varying, since they comprise several species. Historically, there was a significant decline of populations, due to poaching and for being competitors to livestock. The red list inclusions were not helpful, and even damaged a lot. It prevented trophy hunting, since no legal trade was allowed. In effect, the population did poorly, and is close to extinction. Around 2005 the population crashed, which was a big disaster. From then onwards we monitored and understood that we did wrong management, since we did not empower local communities and key stakeholders/hunters. In result, we decided on a complete change of approach. Now, monitoring is conducted by independent experts and through user monitoring, based on approved guidelines and established methodologies. Our sustainable hunting quota is 1-2% of population, with a minimum population size, and not more than 20% of older males. Populations surged twofold since 2010, now comprising 2000 specimen. In 2018, the hunting generated 1.5mio USD income. 50% of net benefits remain with communities, the rest goes directly to 1000 families. We cannot create the same from tourism, not even 10%. Community based management provides real benefits for nature and for our country. Assignment of long term rights, and support to local hunters through legal entities is crucial. The number of equitable users must be appropriate to area and population size. Adequate benefit sharing needs to be established. Farms are dangerous for conservation, since prices will go down, prevent hunting in natural environment, and thus reduce populations. Additionally, there might be poaching of wild animals for farms.

**How well-managed trade in African cherry (*Prunus Africana*) for medicinal products supports livelihoods of rural communities. (presented by George Owoyesigire, Deputy Director of Community Conservation, Uganda)**

*Prunus Africana* is classified as vulnerable and listed in App II. It grows in moist tropical rainforest and is used medicinally. There is a high export demand, which threatens survival. 23.000 mature trees were left in 2008 in eight districts. In 2015 there were 50.000 mature trees overall. Since 2006, 400.000 seedlings were planted, of which 75% survived. The seedlings are provided by pharmaceutical company. Today, 5.400 farmers are involved in harvesting and trade, some of the forests are protected, nurseries were established, and sustainable utilization was introduced. Only two opposite quarters of the bark are harvested, the rest remains on the trunk. Full recovery from this kind of harvest takes 4-5 years. Ladders are used to reach recommended harvest heights, up to first lateral branch. Each tree produces about 6kg of raw bark. Dried, it reduces to about 3kg, which are packaged for export. Export quotas were increased from 10.000 to 253.000kg. In total, Uganda has exported 1.5mio kg since 2006. Contribution to livelihoods: Sales have translated into 3mio USD in 11 years. Direct payments are made to farmers of *P. africana* to support their families and to invest in forest protection. Conclusions: the harvest addresses rural poverty, motivates and encourages communities for protection, minimizes deforestation (the forest coverage in Uganda went down from 30% to 9% since 1990), reduces vulnerability to climate change, builds capacity and access to local markets.

### **BioTrade experiences with CITES listed species. (presented by Lika Sasaki, BioTrade Initiative Team, UNCTAD)**

BioTrade is working in 46 countries with a variety of species. Example one: Two Ecuadorian frogs are propagated in labs for ex-situ breeding. In-situ breeding is done through ponds. Less than ten people are employees / direct beneficiaries. Scholarships are provided to communities. However, there are also multiplier effects – transportation, food, etc. Security is a concern in-situ sites (there was a bomb). There is little experience with the species, it takes long to get CITES permits, and it is hard to get loans. The project will do an encyclopedia on frogs. Example two: *Zamia incognita*, Colombia. Target beneficiaries are 20 families. Research is done on conservation status and potential for commercial use. Interviews are conducted on propagation and collection options. Market study was also undertaken. Discussions with stakeholders are ongoing on production, marketing and trade options of a potential pilot project. Next steps are to include more species, receive use permits, define a business plan, and start the pilot project. Expected outcomes are a diversification of income, since *Zamia* is not a traditionally used plant, and maintenance of forests for ecosystem services. Challenges are the financing, and to guarantee that local communities receive an important share of benefits. Example three: Weleda case study with *Arnica montana* (Romania): 460 collectors, local processors and exporters are involved. Weleda transforms the plants into extracts. Univ. Cluj Napoca monitors regeneration rates and the use of species. The government delivers permits based on that information. Success factors are strong leadership on the ground, which involves all stakeholders. SEE SLIDES!

### **CITES and livelihoods: Lessons learnt from Crocodilians. (presented by Grahame Webb, chair, IUCN Crocodile Specialist group)**

I am working in the Australian Northwestern Territories on Saltwater crocodiles. This area is inhabited by only 25.000 people on 1.3mio km<sup>2</sup>, but many of them are indigenous hunters, living a traditional life style. The problem is to make people get along with them – they are big and dangerous! They are used since antiquity for food, medicine, skins, and cultural purposes, even for crocodile-skin armor. In the 1970's, there was a severe depletion, and a CITES listing followed 1975. Since 1980's, trade under CITES increased, often for high-fashion products that people pay a high price for. Originally, resources came from the wild. The model for sustainable management came from Louisiana. They did a large effort to reinstate trade. Swamp owners make more money from crocodiles than they would from converting the land (which is what happened when conservators tried to stop all trade). We saw full recovery of the populations right after protection, since crocs stay in the same place and we also counted the young. If we had only seen adults (like for many migratory animals like turtles), it would have taken long to see a change in adults. Over time, with more large crocs, the conservation problem turned into management problems. Indigenous people have a history of harvesting eggs for food. One nest is worth 1000+USD, which is considerable in areas without other sources of income. But it requires investment, and the problem is that most people want to invest close to cities. Currently, the croc industry is worth 106mio USD a year. Egg ranching has not broken the recovery trend in crocodiles, it was easily compensated. But many people are killed, especially in Timor (two a day). Those crocs in Timor come from US, they move. That is a serious problem, since those get eaten that can afford it least. How will they put up with it? Indonesia, there is lots of harvest on farms. In New Guinea there is a sustainable harvest system since the 60's, which in many areas is the only source of income. China is a big importer of skins. Lessons learnt: Extinguishing crocs is not easy – we could not do it in Java. The worst conservation threat is poverty, since governments care more about species that bring income. Human wildlife conflict remains a problem, but financial incentives convince people. Crocs are tenacious – they have made it hundreds of millions of years, they will outlive us, I suspect. Populations can be very dynamic! Satellite farming spreads benefits to more people, but is hard under CITES. Brands play an important role in croc conservation. Attacks on brands undermine conservation. Species without commercial value are most difficult to conserve. Bottom up approaches work so much better. Benefits that are driving conservation, and conservation

success stories are poorly understood by consumers. CITES was not designed to govern sustainable management, of which people and livelihoods are the most critical elements. Legal trade in crocs has obliterated illegal trade. Conclusions: Crocs are an important case history in CITES. There have been some failures. Madagascar has been a failure in crocodiles, as it has been in everything else. But mostly it has been a success story. Crocs are FAR more abundant now than in the 1940's.

#### **Livelihood implications of global trade in reptiles. (presented by Daniel Natusch, IUCN Boa and Python Specialist group)**

Wildlife trade is about people, not wildlife! A vast majority of reptiles are still taken from the wild. The face of illicit wildlife trade is that of a small boy who collects species because he wants to do his part to generate an income for his family. Increasingly we see captive production. China are world leaders in novel forms of agriculture when it comes to reptiles. In Indonesia, 150.000 people are involved in trade with one or the other species of pythons. Half its populations live on 80 USD a month, a single snake is worth half of that. Indonesia trades 2.6mio reptiles annually. Many single animals can be worth 2-5.000 Euros. The industry is becoming aware of the link between sustainable use & livelihoods. If python trade was banned, many people would consider hunting other species illegally, since a legal alternative has been removed. You need to create LEGAL ALTERNATIVES to illegal hunting that is of much greater conservation concern! Python trade is far more sustainable than other industries, since it relies on a renewable resource, and since the animal contributes to its ecosystem. There is also illegal trade in reptiles, whose drivers are not intuitive. Hearing local voices and communities is essential for informed decisions and interventions that benefit wildlife conservation. Often illegal trade is stimulated by inappropriate regulations. Would it not be wonderful to have a mechanism for not regulating species in isolation, without consideration of context? How do we define success when it comes to wildlife trade? There needs to be a benefit. There are millions of people depending on trade in reptiles, creating massive benefits!

#### **Succeeding with CITES: new projects in Nepal and Vietnam promote sustainable trade in medicinal plants that benefit rural communities. (presented by Anastasiya Timoshyna, TRAFFIC program leader medicinal plants, co-chair IUCN / SSC Medicinal Plant Specialist Group)**

Medicinal plants are important, often harvested from wild, some are threatened. There is a high demand, high trade, and complex trade networks. Legality of medicinal plants harvest is complex to establish (property rights etc). Several opportunities for livelihood improvements, including a growing awareness of sustainability markets, an availability of best practices, some policy and legislative frameworks are in place, and there are potential linkages to landscape-level conservation. Fairwild contains strong fairtrade component. It has been implemented many times around the world. Case studies from Vietnam, Nepal, India and China were presented. Enabling circumstances: Wild resource availability and established value of wild and sustainable quality. Clear and fair community benefits. Best practice reliance and rigor of adherence and monitoring. Transparent / clear use, access and tenure situations. Enabling policies, laws, including customary habits. Multi-stakeholder engagement and co-responsibility. Market access.

#### **4. Best practices and lessons learnt from case studies**

Ms Rosie Cooney, chair of IUCN SuLi wrapped up main insights from the case studies, as following:

- Livelihood benefits (direct and indirect) from trade can be very significant
- Legal, well managed and sustainable trade can support conservation
- Trade regulation decisions that do not carefully consider how those decisions affect incentives can have unintended negative conservation consequences

Further insights were summarized as:

- Hunting and harvest are often deeply entrenched in cultures
- Communities often hold important local knowledge
- Harvesters often gain low proportions of market value
- CITES listing can support livelihoods
- Regulations can have negative consequences
- Ex-situ production can boost income, but may remove income from local people, lead to loss of habitat or poorer management
- Markets often do not recognize the full value of these products

Best practices were summarized as:

- Inclusion of communities
- Rights and responsibilities
- Traditional knowledge
- Coordination
- Standards for harvest, certification
- Making regulations more simple
- Avoiding pressures to close markets for products
- Careful use of artificial propagation

This wrap up was followed by some general discussions.

## **5. Enabling environment**

The following presentations took place on Day 3 under enabling environment for successful CITES and livelihoods experiences.

### **FairWild Standard and certification of products from rural communities in the CITES context. (presented by Anastasia Timoshyna, TRAFFIC)**

FairWild was invented for enhancing consumer awareness and consumer recognition. It can be regulated in many different ways (by a government, company...). FairWild is available in 18 languages. Its principle areas: Wild collection and conservation, legal and ethical requirements, social and fair trade, management, traceability and business. Annual audits required to certify compliance with the standard. Implementation takes five years. FairWild addresses many of the UN sustainability goals: It provides practical measures to reduce poverty, builds capacity, prevents discrimination, reinforces respect to customary rights and knowledge, supports fair and equitable employment opportunities, invests premium funds into community development, ensures transparent and democratic decision making, empowers harvesters and workers, encourages responsible sourcing practices, supports implementation of sustainable harvest policies, inter alia. Currently there are 20+ certified species, producing 400t of herbal ingredients a year. More than 20 companies have certified more than 50 products. 42 out of 800 CITES-listed medicinal and aromatic species are traded from the wild, with a total annual amount 25mio kg. These trade networks are very complex and long. Can certification schemes support CITES processes and CITES agencies? The certification scheme brings in traceability for legal acquisition findings. It provides relevant field-based resource assessment and monitoring information for NDF's. Field audits help to confirm NDF's or provide additional information. Detailed, robust species and area management plans may prevent trade restrictions and have a positive influence on industry. Third-party audits are appealing to importing country businesses. Add-ons to CITES are benefit sharing, customary rights and local knowledge. TRAFFIC referred to an online questionnaire, and a workshop in January 2019.

### **Medicinal plant species: A strategy to foster future livelihood case studies. (presented by Martin Hitziger, CITES Secretariat)**

The Secretariat presented medicinal plants as a cross-cutting topic that was the subject of many of the discussed case studies and has particular links to livelihoods. A string of documents on this topic were submitted, and side events were held at PC23 and 24, and SC70. Pertinent background research led to the development of key objectives and actions, that would help to strengthen synergies between the conservation of medicinal plant species, and livelihoods, as well as the incorporation of traditional knowledge of medicinal plant species into NDF's, monitoring and management approaches. This strategy was profited from strong input of many Parties, experts and stakeholders. It is evolving and further input is welcome. It will be proposed to CoP18 for discussion. Its latest version is entailed in document [SC70 Inf. 36](#). The Secretariat welcomes any input and requests for collaboration, since it regards this topic and the proposed avenues for improving CITES implementation for medicinal plants ads crucial to better ascertain the sustainability of this quickly emerging, large and complex trade.

### **The BioTrade Initiative, and how it relates to the CITES and livelihoods program. (presented by Lorena Jaramillo, Economic Affairs officer, UNCTAD)**

BioTrade relates to both biodiversity and trade. We work in 46 countries, in a variety of industries. CITES and UNCTAD are partners since 2010. The framework of BioTrade promote sustainable trade in biodiversity products. It is aligned with the SGDs, Aichi targets and multilateral conventions. It comprises four important components: Value chain, sustainable livelihoods, an ecosystem approach, and adaptive management. Examples: Candelilla wax, and Star Anise. What is the future of Biotrade? Natural products are a real trend. BioTrade still a niche



market. We want to use experiences of the past 20 to upscale BioTrade. Just a few months ago, a new BioTrade program was launched, funded by Switzerland. If interested in collaborating, please come talk to us.

**Wild lives, wild livelihoods: Engaging rural communities in wildlife management. (presented by Bianca Notarbartolo di Sciara, UNEP)**

The mandate of the report on engaging rural communities in wildlife management was to analyse international best practice to encourage sustainable use and reduce unsustainable use. The report draws on decades of experience and was presented at CITES SC69. Main messages: Best practices have long been known. Many are well reflected in government policies. With few exceptions, there has been a consistent failure to implement them. Militarization of enforcement risks to undermine human rights and effectiveness. There is a need to build trust slowly, respect traditional knowledge, rights and authorities. Effective enforcement needs community support. Elite capture remains a constant threat. Challenges are particularly high on high value land and nomads. Land and use rights are crucial. Corruption hampers, but complexity often leads to inaction. Thinking needs to be global, but acting needs to be local. Communities need a greater voice in decision making and development of policies. The UN Env. Assembly has power. To all participants of the workshop: Speak to your representative at UNEP government council, we are willing to take this forward.

**The SULi specialist group and the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management: Current initiatives and linkages with CITES processes. (presented by Rosie Cooney, IUCN-SULi, also on behalf of Kristina Rodina of UN Food and Agriculture Organization)**

IUCN has in the last year produced lots of relevant documents on sustainable livelihood topics. Focus of some was on the potential negative impacts of poorly designed policies. What species are good for sustainable management? Which ones are not suitable for sustainable use approaches? What is the theory of change how community-based intervention reduce poaching and international wildlife trade? There is a need to increase incentives for stewardship, strengthen disincentives for illegal behavior, to decrease costs of living with wildlife, and to support non-wildlife-based livelihoods. Example actions: Communities as first line of defense project (FLoD). We launched the Website 'people, not poaching' - A communities and International wildlife trade learning platform. We want to include information and case studies from this workshop here, including videos, and any other resource. We are in the process of developing a SULi capacity in Latin America. The wildlife forum will be a special session at CBD CoP, to develop a vision for humans and wildlife in 2050.

**Alternative livelihoods versus CITES. Rosie Cooney, IUCN-SULi**

Alternative livelihoods are a popular approach for addressing poaching and illegal wildlife trade. Does it work? Rosie Cooney highlighted the results of an evidence-based systematic review by IIED (Roe et al 2015). Of the 106 published studies, only 22 monitored delivered positive impacts, more were negative or neutral than positive. We know it can work, but it can often go badly wrong. Most alternative livelihoods interventions switch livelihoods away from wildlife. That is a problem, since benefits from alternative livelihoods are not dependent on conservation. There is no incentive to continue to conserve nature. New alternative livelihoods just add to income, they do not substitute the income from unsustainable activity. Economics is often not integrated in project planning.

**6. Communications about CITES and livelihoods and showcasing of case studies**

The last agenda item of the workshop was about how to best communicate about the livelihoods in the CITES context. Mr Liu Yuan, as the programme officer responsible for livelihoods and the communications officer of the CITES Secretariat, made a presentation on this topic.

He said that for the celebration of the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the CITES in 2013, the CITES Secretariat produced a brochure which, among other things, contains 12 milestone stories using 12 species of CITES-listed animal and plant species to represent the success stories in CITES. When looking back, it is clear that most of these 12 success stories have strong links with livelihoods. In these cases, the species has not been protected, but also brought back from the brink of extinction and the populations in the wild have considerably increased. CITES is a powerful conservation tool when used wisely and it must be presented as such. He also spoke about the importance of highlighting the role of women in CITES and livelihoods as shown in many case studies.

He stressed that while the CITES Secretariat can use its various platforms, including its website, social media channels, exhibitions during the CoP, World Wildlife Day etc to raise awareness and profile of the livelihoods issue, Parties should make their best efforts too.

He said that decision-makers and the general public should be among the key audiences in our communications strategy. This should be taken into account when considering the style and format of outreach materials.

The presentation resonated well with the participants some of who considered communication one of the most important item on the agenda.

## **7. Draft decisions for CITES CoP18**

There was a considerable discussion around draft decisions, and their consideration of recommendations from the previous livelihoods workshop in South Africa. The group agreed to a set of draft decisions, as detailed in the pertinent draft CoP document. Yet, the Parties that co-chair the CITES livelihoods working group might want to submit a document based on recommendations from the previous workshop. That would be separate from draft decisions presented by the Secretariat.

Participants to the workshop agreed that the following draft decision should be submitted by the co-chairs of the SC Working Group on Livelihoods for consideration at CoP18.

### ***Directed to the Standing Committee***

18.XX *The Standing Committee shall:*

- a) *re-establish the working group on CITES and Livelihoods, which will work in collaboration with the Secretariat to:*
  - i) *evaluate the possibility of using registered marks of certification, existing and new, for products of CITES-listed species produced by rural communities consistent with CITES provisions in order to enhance conservation and livelihood outcomes;*
  - ii) *analyse the need to draft a new Resolution, or amend an existing Resolution, on methods to avoid unintended negative conservation consequences of trade related measures that may result in livelihoods and incentive implications, and if deemed appropriate, draft such a Resolution or amendments to a resolution to be submitted to the Standing Committee for consideration at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties;*
  - iii) *explore the usefulness of developing an evaluation mechanism to consider the effects of CITES decisions on trade stakeholders, and the potential consequences of those decisions on the effective conservation of species and implementation of CITES;*
  - iv) *Provide feedback on the Guidance to be prepared by the consultant, under Decision 18.xx, on how to maximize the benefits of trade in CITES-listed species to rural communities and the conservation of the species.*
- b) *Review the Guidance developed by the consultant and submit it for consideration at the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties*

Participants to the workshop agreed that the following draft decisions, which were already reviewed by the Standing Committee at its 70<sup>th</sup> meeting, should be submitted by the CITES Secretariat for consideration at CoP18.

### ***Directed to the Parties***

18.BB Parties are invited to:

- a) conduct new case studies to identify how legal and sustainable trade in CITES-listed species contributes to the conservation of the species in the wild and the improvement of livelihoods of rural communities that live alongside the species and use the standard template when conducting such case studies.
- b) where appropriate, incorporate issues related to CITES and livelihoods into national wildlife conservation and socio-economic development plans, as well as in relevant projects being developed for external funding, including funding from the Global Environment Facility (GEF).

***Directed to the Secretariat***

18.CC Subject to the availability of external financial resources, the Secretariat shall:

- a) support the conduct of new case studies on CITES and livelihoods as described in Decision 18.BB a);
- b) facilitate the organization of workshops, including regional workshops, to review new case studies on CITES and livelihoods and best practices, build capacity in the use of the CITES and Livelihoods Handbook, and to facilitate the exchange of such experiences in collaboration with relevant Parties and relevant international and regional organizations;
- c) contract a consultant to review relevant case studies, both existing and new, in order to prepare a guidance on how to maximize the benefits of trade in CITES-listed species to rural communities, and to avoid unintended negative impacts of trade related measures on effective implementation of CITES and the conservation and sustainable use of the species.
- d) organize the production of outreach materials, including publications and short videos based on the case studies, to raise awareness of the best practices in CITES and livelihoods including its contribution to the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and to share such materials on the CITES website, social media channels and other appropriate platforms;
- e) make efforts to establish global partnerships for implementing the CITES and livelihoods program with relevant international and regional organizations, including conservation organizations, trade associations and development agencies;
- f) report to the Standing Committee and the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties on progress made with regard to the implementation of above decisions and Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) on CITES and livelihoods.

The workshop concluded with a clear vision for the future. It aims at supporting a robust analysis of the crucial factors that enable these success stories, strengthening the exchange of experiences between countries and across regions, mapping out guidelines to establish, promote and develop successful models for the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species. Results of the workshop will be highlighted at the upcoming World Wildlife Conference, CoP18 in May 2019 in Sri Lanka.

Annex:



**Provisional agenda**

**CITES and Livelihoods Workshop**

6 to 8 November 2018

Chimelong Hotel, Guangzhou, China

5 November 2018		
09:00 – 18:00	Registration	
6 November 2018, Day 1		
08:30 – 0850	Opening and welcome	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Host country</li> <li>- CITES Secretariat</li> </ul>
08:50 – 09:00	Round of introductions	All
09:00 – 09:20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An overview of CITES and livelihoods (background, achievement to date, relevant CITES mandates)</li> <li>- Purpose of the workshop</li> </ul>	LIU Yuan CITES Secretariat
09:20 – 10:15	<b>Presentation of case studies</b> <i>(15 minutes for each presentation, incl. 2 minutes for Q&amp;A)</i>	
	The contribution of the sustainable management of and international trade in wildlife to indigenous peoples – the cases of lagarto ( <i>Caiman yacare</i> ) and vicuña ( <i>Vicugna Vicugna</i> ) in the Plurinational State of Bolivia	María del Pilar Becerra Cardona Ministry of Environment and Water, Bolivia
	How trade in pirarucu ( <i>Arapaima gigas</i> ) benefits rural communities in the Amazonas State in Brazil and the conservation of this iconic freshwater fish species	Cristina Isis Buck Silva Institute of Environment and Renewable Natural Resources, Brazil
	Dendrobium officinale and livelihoods	Prof. LUO Yibo, Institute of Botany, Chinese Academy of Sciences, China
	Sensitization and supervision of local communities on the added value of the sustainable harvest and medicinal use of African cherry ( <i>Prunus Africana</i> ) bark in improving their livelihoods	Crispin Mahamba Kamate CITES Management Authority DR Congo
10:15 – 10:45	<b>Tea break &amp; group photo</b>	

10:45 – 12:00	Trade in <i>Galanthus woronowii</i> , source of livelihood for rural communities in western Georgia	Teona Karchava Ministry of Environment Protection & Agriculture, Georgia
	Livelihoods associated with Kuth ( <i>Saussurea costus</i> ) in Indian Himalaya and future strategies	Dr Gopal Singh Rawat Dean, Wildlife Institute of India India
	The role of coral trade in sustainable livelihoods of coastal communities and species conservation in Indonesia	Niken Wuri Handayani Ecosystem specialist Ministry of Environment and Forestry Indonesia
	Livelihood Impact of international trade in Nile Crocodiles in the Communities of Tana River County, Kenya	Fridah Dermillah Obare Kenya Wildlife Service Kenya
	CITES implementation and fishery-based livelihoods in Sabah, Malaysia	Lawrence Kissol Jr. Assistant Director, Department of Fisheries Sabah, Malaysia
12:00 – 13:00	<b>Lunch</b>	
13:00 – 15:00	<b>Presentation of case studies (continued)</b>	
	CITES and Livelihoods case studies: Morelet's crocodile and Bighorn Sheep in Mexico	Paola Mosig Coordinator, CITES Scientific Authority Mexico
	Community management of wild animals and plants in the CITES process ( <i>Podocnemis unifilis</i> yellow-spotted river turtle and orchids)	Jessica María Gálvez-Durand Besnard Director, Directorate of Sustainable Management of the Wildlife Heritage Peru
	Coral, orchid and turtle and livelihoods in Solomon Islands	Rose Babau Chief Conservation Officer, Ministry of Environment, Climate Change, Disaster Management and Meteorology Solomon Islands
	How regulated trade in CITES-listed medicinal plant <i>Aloe ferox</i> contributes to the livelihoods of rural communities	Olga Kumalo Director, Threatened or Protected Species and CITES, Department of Environmental Affairs South Africa
	Community-based wildlife conservation and use - Practices and lessons learned in Tajikistan during 10 years of work with communities	Khalil Karimov Tajikistan Institute of Zoology and Parasitology of the Academy of Sciences of Tajikistan (Chair of IUCN SULi for Central Asia)
	How well-managed trade in African cherry ( <i>Prunus Africana</i> ) for medicinal supports livelihoods of rural communities	George Owoyesigire, Deputy Director of Community Conservation, Uganda
	Case studies of CITES-listed and other BioTrade related species of flora and fauna	Lorena Jaramillo Economic Affairs Officer

		United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
15:00 – 15:30	<b>Tea break</b>	
15:30 – 16:30	CITES and Livelihoods: Lessons Learned from Crocodilians	Grahame Webb, Chair, IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group
	Livelihood implications of the global trade in reptiles	Daniel Natusch IUCN-Boa and Python Specialist Group
	Sustainable and equitable trade in wild medicinal and aromatic plants for improved conservation and livelihood outcomes: case studies from China, Nepal, Viet Nam and India	Anastasiya Timoshyna TRAFFIC/IUCN SSC Medicinal Plant Specialist Group
	Trade in medicinal and aromatic plants and livelihoods	Martin Hitziger, CITES Secretariat
	Other case studies ( <i>when time allows</i> )	
16:30-16:50	Discussion	all
16:50-17:00	Summary of the day	Chair
18:30	Welcome dinner	Host country, all
<b>7 November 2018, Day 2</b>		
08:30 – 17:00	Field visit	Host country, all
<b>8 November 2018, Day 3</b>		
08:30 – 09:30	Best practices and lessons learned from the case studies	Moderator: Rosie Cooney, IUCN-SULi
09:30 – 10:00	<b>Enabling environment</b> ( <i>each presentation will be followed by discussions</i> )	
	FairWild Standard and certification of products from rural communities in the CITES context	TRAFFIC
10:00 – 10:20	<b>Tea break</b>	
10:20 – 12:00	<b>Enabling environment (continued)</b>	
	The BioTrade Initiative and how it relates to the CITES and livelihoods programme <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development of sustainable supply chains and rural communities</li> <li>• Access to markets and finance</li> <li>• Addressing consumer confidence</li> </ul>	Lika Sasaki BioTrade Initiative Team United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD)
	Wild life, wild livelihoods: Engaging rural communities in wildlife management	Bianca Notarbartolo, Wildlife Unit, Ecosystems Division, UN Environment (UNEP)
	IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group (IUCN-SULi) and the Collaborative Partnership on Sustainable Wildlife Management (CPW): Current initiatives and linkages with CITES processes	Rosie Cooney, Chair, IUCN Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group (IUCN-SULi), also on behalf of Kristina Rodina of UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
	Empowerment and benefit sharing	all
	Support from government and NGOs	all
	National, regional and international partners & funding needs	all

