



# **U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2009-2010**

*PREPARED BY:*

**DIVISION OF MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

*COMPLETED 26 OCTOBER 2011*

# U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2009-2010

## *Table of Contents*

	<u>Page</u>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	2
<b>REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2009-2010 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES</b>	3
A. General information	3
B. Legislative and regulatory measures	4
C. Compliance and enforcement measures	6
D. Administrative measures	10
D1. Management Authority (MA)	10
D2. Scientific Authority (SA)	11
D3. Enforcement Authorities	13
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	13
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	17
D6. Capacity building	20
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	23
D8. Areas for future work	27
E. General feedback	28
<b>ANNEX 1 – HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION B OF THIS REPORT</b>	29
<b>ANNEX 2 – HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION C OF THIS REPORT</b>	31
<b>ANNEX 3 – HIGHLIGHTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT</b>	39
D1 and D2. Management Authority (MA) and Scientific Authority (SA)	39
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	45
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	45
D6. Capacity building	47
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	51

## INTRODUCTION

Article VIII of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) prescribes that each Party shall prepare periodic reports on its implementation of CITES and shall transmit to the Secretariat, in addition to an annual report, a biennial report on legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of CITES. This U.S. biennial report covers the interval 2009-2010.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14) recommends that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at the Thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP13) and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submits this 2009-2010 report in accordance with the recommended format.

The original regulations implementing CITES in the United States were issued on 22 February 1977 (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23). To date, there have been fifteen regular meetings of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (Berne, San Jose, New Delhi, Gaborone, Buenos Aires, Ottawa, Lausanne, Kyoto, Fort Lauderdale, Harare, Gigiri, Santiago, Bangkok, The Hague, and Doha). From 1977 through 2006, the United States implemented new CITES resolutions in the United States by modification of internal policy and administration, promulgation of special rules, and revision of specific regulations. On 23 August 2007, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a final rule in the *Federal Register* substantially updating the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. These updates reflect measures adopted by the Parties at their regular meetings through CoP13. Also, in 2008, the USFWS published revisions to the regulations to include provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14.

During 2009-2010, the United States took many legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures in its implementation of the Convention. On the following pages, using the tabular *Biennial Report Format*, the United States reports on the major measures taken during this biennial period. Attached to the tabular report are three Annexes providing narrative highlights of some of the major measures that the United States took during 2009-2010, with respect to Sections B, C, and D of the tabular report.

# REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2009-2010 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES

## A. General information

Party	United States of America
Period covered in this report:	1 January 2009 to 31 December 2010
Details of agency preparing this report	<p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Division of Management Authority          4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 212          Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247          United States of America          Tel: + 1 (703) 358 2095          Fax: + 1 (703) 358 2280          Email: <a href="mailto:managementauthority@fws.gov">managementauthority@fws.gov</a>          Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/international">http://www.fws.gov/international</a></p>
Contributing agencies, organizations or individuals	<p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Division of Scientific Authority          4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 110          Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247          United States of America          Tel: + 1 (703) 358 1708          Fax: + 1 (703) 358 2276          Email: <a href="mailto:scientificauthority@fws.gov">scientificauthority@fws.gov</a>          Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/international">http://www.fws.gov/international</a></p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Office of Law Enforcement          4401 North Fairfax Drive          MS-LE-3000          Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247          United States of America          Tel: + 1 (703) 358 1949          Fax: + 1 (703) 358 2271          Email: <a href="mailto:lawenforcement@fws.gov">lawenforcement@fws.gov</a>          Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/le">http://www.fws.gov/le</a></p>

### B. Legislative and regulatory measures

1	Has information on CITES-relevant legislation already been provided under the CITES National Legislation Project? If yes, ignore questions 2, 3 and 4.	Yes (fully) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (partly) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information/unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If any CITES-relevant legislation has been planned, drafted or enacted, please provide the following details: <hr/> Title and date: _____ Status: _____ <hr/> Brief description of contents: _____	
3	Is enacted legislation available in one of the working languages of the Convention?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If yes, please attach a copy of the full legislative text or key legislative provisions that were gazetted.	legislation attached <input type="checkbox"/> provided previously <input type="checkbox"/> not available, will send later <input type="checkbox"/>
5	Which of the following issues are addressed by any stricter domestic measures adopted for CITES-listed species (in accordance with Article XIV of the Convention)?	Tick all applicable
	The conditions for:	The complete prohibition of:
Issue	Yes      No      No information	Yes      No      No information
Trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Taking	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Possession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Transport	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Additional comments:  Major stricter domestic measures in the United States that in many instances affect CITES-listed species include the Endangered Species Act, the Lacey Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, and State natural resource and wildlife laws and regulations.		

6	What were the results of any review or assessment of the effectiveness of CITES legislation, with regard to the following items?	Tick all applicable			
	Item	Adequate	Partially Inadequate	Inadequate	No information
	Powers of CITES authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Clarity of legal obligations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Control over CITES trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Consistency with existing policy on wildlife management and use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Coverage of law for all types of offences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Coverage of law for all types of penalties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Implementing regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Coherence within legislation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please provide details if available:					
<p>During previous and current efforts to revise the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, the USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation on each of the above items related to the effectiveness of CITES implementation.</p> <p>The USFWS has drafted a proposed rule to incorporate into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23) relevant provisions from resolutions adopted by the Parties at CoP14 and CoP15, and anticipates publication of this proposed rule in late 2011.</p>					
7	If no review or assessment has taken place, is one planned for the next reporting period?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		No	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Please provide details if available:					
8	Has there been any review of legislation on the following subjects in relation to implementation of the Convention?	Tick all applicable			
	Subject	Yes	No	No information	
	Access to or ownership of natural resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Harvesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Transporting of live specimens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Handling and housing of live specimens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please provide details if available:					
<p>During previous and current efforts to revise the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, the USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation on each of the above subjects related to CITES implementation.</p>					

9	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 1 for highlights of some of the major legislative and regulatory measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010.</i></p>
---	--

### C. Compliance and enforcement measures

		Yes	No	No information
1	<p>Have any of the following compliance monitoring operations been undertaken?</p> <p>Review of reports and other information provided by traders and producers: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information</p> <p>Inspections of traders, producers, markets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information</p> <p>Border controls <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information</p> <p>Other (specify): USFWS wildlife inspectors and special agents have also conducted random or intelligence-based intensified inspection "blitzes" to check cargo, mail shipments, passengers, and vehicles at the border. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information</p> <p>USFWS has also undertaken increased monitoring of key internet sites utilized by those engaged in wildlife trade.</p>			
2	<p>Have any administrative measures (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related violations? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information</p>			
3	<p>If Yes, please indicate how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details.</p> <p>Fines were assessed and collected for CITES-related violations on numerous occasions. However, the structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES-related violations under different statutes make it impossible to compile totals for the "number and type of violations" for which the United States took administrative measures.</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for a representative sampling of instances involving the imposition of administrative measures for CITES violations during 2009 and 2010.</i></p>			
4	<p>Have any significant seizures, confiscations and forfeitures of CITES specimens been made? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information</p>			
5	<p>If information available:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Significant seizures/confiscations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Total seizures/confiscations</p> <p>If possible, please specify per group of species or attach details.</p> <p>Please note that seizure totals at right address the number or weight of CITES specimens seized, not the</p>	<p>Number</p> <p>In 2009, the USFWS seized 208,393 CITES specimens (including live wildlife, parts, and products) as well as 78,480 kilograms of "commodities" representing CITES species.</p>		

	<p>number of shipments seized for CITES violations. Some specimens included in this total may have been seized for violations of U.S. wildlife laws and regulations other than CITES. Each year, the United States submits detailed data on seizures as part of its CITES Annual Report.</p>	<p>In 2010, the USFWS seized 154,488 CITES specimens and 242,959 kilograms of CITES "commodities."</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2 under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for details on representative seizures.</i></p>
6	<p>Have there been any criminal prosecutions of significant CITES-related violations?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
7	<p>If Yes, how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details as Annex.</p> <p>USFWS inspections and investigations resulted in multiple criminal prosecutions involving the smuggling of CITES-listed species and other significant violations. However, the structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES violations under other U.S. laws (laws that often authorize higher penalties) make it impossible to compile totals for the "numbers and types of CITES violations" that resulted in criminal prosecution.</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for summaries of some of the major criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations in the United States during 2009 and 2010.</i></p>	
8	<p>Have there been any other court actions of CITES-related violations?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>
9	<p>If Yes, what were the violations involved and what were the results? Please attach details as Annex.</p>	
10	<p>How were the confiscated specimens usually disposed of?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Return to country of export</li> <li>- Public zoos or botanical gardens</li> <li>- Designated rescue centres</li> <li>- Approved, private facilities</li> <li>- Euthanasia</li> <li>- Other (specify)</li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p> <p>Some confiscated specimens were also donated to educational facilities for use in conservation education to improve public understanding of wildlife conservation and trade issues. A backlog of CITES Appendix-II products and other non-CITES wildlife property forfeited or abandoned to the USFWS was auctioned off, and proceeds will be used for conservation education and enforcement activities.</p>	<p>Tick if applicable</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>



11	Has detailed information been provided to the Secretariat on significant cases of illegal trade (e.g. through an ECOMESSAGE or other means), or information on convicted illegal traders and persistent offenders?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:		
12	Have there been any cooperative enforcement activities with other countries (e.g. exchange of intelligence, technical support, investigative assistance, joint operation, etc.)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
13	<p>If Yes, please give a brief description:</p> <p>The USFWS routinely shared law enforcement intelligence on potential CITES violations with the CITES Secretariat, appropriate enforcement authorities in other CITES Party nations, and Interpol.</p> <p>USFWS cooperative enforcement efforts during the reporting period included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hosting the second meeting of the CITES Law Enforcement Experts Group;</li> <li>• Participating in the Secretariat’s CITES Workshop on Internet trade in Canada;</li> <li>• Continuing an ongoing on-the-ground enforcement partnership with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations-Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN);</li> <li>• Increasing USFWS engagement with the U.S. National Central Bureau of Interpol and Interpol’s Wildlife Crimes program;</li> <li>• Developing a checklist of interview questions for wildlife smugglers for Interpol distribution to its 187 member nations worldwide;</li> <li>• Participating in Operation Ramp (an Interpol-organized multi-nation effort to intercept illegal reptile shipments);</li> <li>• Working with the Haitian Management Authority to address compliance problems involving U.S.-bound shipments of CITES live rock, coral, and other CITES species;</li> <li>• Helping the St. Kitts Management Authority bring its CITES permit forms into compliance with treaty requirements;</li> <li>• Conducting cooperative inspection blitzes with Canadian wildlife and customs authorities at various ports of entry along the U.S.-Canada land border; and</li> <li>• Participating in an International Wildlife Enforcement Conference in Saskatchewan, Canada, to increase intelligence sharing on cross-border wildlife trafficking.</li> </ul> <p>USFWS enforcement staff also provided support and assistance to a number of global investigations and worked with international partners to document wildlife trafficking in this country. Such cooperation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Resulted in a prison sentence for an Internet ivory trafficker based in the United Kingdom;</li> <li>• Launched a Dutch investigation of a facility that was unlawfully importing live bobcats from the United States;</li> <li>• Helped the government of Cameroon investigate and arrest a wildlife dealer who was using forged CITES documents to sell monkey skulls to customers in the United States;</li> <li>• Yielded a USFWS-Thai Royal Police investigation that secured indictments and</li> </ul>	

	<p>arrests of elephant ivory traffickers in both countries;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Led to a joint U.S.-Canada investigation that resulted in the seizure of over 200 CITES-listed reptiles that had been smuggled across the St. Lawrence River to Canada;</li> <li>• Helped Environment Canada document illegal CITES feather trade and trafficking by a Saskatchewan resident;</li> <li>• Facilitated a U.S.-Canada coral trade investigation in Michigan;</li> <li>• Secured the conviction of a Florida businessman for ivory trafficking that involved illegal purchases from the United Kingdom;</li> <li>• Secured assistance from the Limpopo provincial government in South Africa that helped the USFWS arrest and charge a South African national for smuggling leopard trophies into the United States; and</li> <li>• Resulted in critical court testimony from a South African wildlife officer that allowed the USFWS to secure the court conviction of a U.S. big game hunter involved in a scheme to launder illegally taken leopard trophies through Zimbabwe.</li> </ul>
14	<p>Have any incentives been offered to local communities to assist in the enforcement of CITES legislation, e.g. leading to the arrest and conviction of offenders?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
15	<p>If Yes, please describe:</p> <p>The Endangered Species Act (which implements CITES in the United States) and other U.S. wildlife laws that regulate international trade (such as the Lacey Act, African Elephant Conservation Act, and Wild Bird Conservation Act) authorize the use of fine money to pay rewards to individuals who provide information that leads to the arrest and conviction of offenders.</p>
16	<p>Has there been any review or assessment of CITES-related enforcement?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
17	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p>The USFWS worked proactively to improve CITES compliance by maintaining and improving communication with the U.S. wildlife import/export community and working directly with key groups and individual companies involved in wildlife trade. Specific compliance assistance “measures” in 2009 and 2010 included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilization of web and port-posted public bulletins to inform the import/export community about changes in CITES requirements and U.S. wildlife trade rules;</li> <li>• Regular meetings and liaison with such groups as the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, the Port Authority of New York, the Los Angeles Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders Association, and the New York City and Boston Custom House Brokers Associations;</li> <li>• Presentations and training on CITES and U.S. wildlife import/export requirements for brokers associations at ports of entry throughout the United States;</li> <li>• Outreach booths at the 2009 and 2010 Safari Club International conventions in Nevada and the 2010 Safari Club Convention in Houston, Texas;</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compliance meetings and contacts with FedEx, DHL, UPS and the Express Carriers Association;</li> <li>• Outreach to the commercial import/export community, including such companies as WalMart, Hermes of Paris, and Monsoon, Inc.;</li> <li>• Outreach presentations on CITES import/export requirements for the Chinese Herb Trade Association, the Maryland Orchid Society, the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), the Kentucky Herpetological Society, and scientists at the Los Angeles Zoo and American Museum of Natural History in New York;</li> <li>• One-on-one CITES compliance guidance to company representatives and individuals engaged in wildlife trade;</li> <li>• Operation of an e-mail-based "contact" service to answer specific questions on wildlife import/export requirements and other enforcement issue;</li> <li>• Presentations on CITES and humane transport requirements at a meeting of the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) in 2009 and at the 2010 international conference of the Animal Transport Association (ATA); and</li> <li>• Working with wildlife inspectors at the port of Miami, Florida, to assess problems with certain International Air Transport Association (IATA) Live Animal Regulations (LAR) and ways to improve them.</li> </ul>
--	---

**D. Administrative measures**

***D1 Management Authority (MA)***

1	Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the MA(s) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here.	
3	If there is more than one MA in your country, has a lead MA been designated?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If Yes, please name that MA and indicate whether it is identified as the lead MA in the CITES Directory.	
5	How many staff work in each MA?  The USFWS Division of Management Authority is the only CITES Management Authority in the United States. Currently, 30 staff work in the Division of Management Authority.	

6	<p>Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters?</p> <p>If yes, please give estimation: About 75 percent.</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
7	<p>What are the skills/expertise of staff within the MA(s)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Administration</li> <li>- Biology</li> <li>- Economics/trade</li> <li>- Law/policy</li> <li>- Other (specify)</li> <li>- No information</li> </ul>	<p>Tick if applicable</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
8	<p>Have the MA(s) undertaken or supported any research activities in relation to CITES species or technical issues (e.g. labelling, tagging, species identification) not covered in D2(8) and D2(9)?</p>	<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>	
9	<p>If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.</p>		
10	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.</i></p>		

**D2 Scientific Authority (SA)**

1	Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the SA(s) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory?	Yes No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here.		
3	Is the designated Scientific Authority independent from the Management Authority?	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4	What is the structure of the SA(s)?	Tick if applicable	
	- Government institution		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Academic or research institution		<input type="checkbox"/>
	- Permanent committee		<input type="checkbox"/>
	- Pool of individuals with certain expertise		<input type="checkbox"/>
	- Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>
5	How many staff work in each SA on CITES issues?  The USFWS Division of Scientific Authority is the only CITES Scientific Authority in the United States. Currently, eight staff in the Division of Scientific Authority work on CITES issues.		
6	Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters If yes, please give estimation: About 80 percent.	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the SA(s)?	Tick if applicable	
	- Botany		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Ecology		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Fisheries		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Forestry		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Welfare		<input type="checkbox"/>
	- Zoology		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>
	- No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Have any research activities been undertaken by the SA(s) in relation to CITES species?	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

9	If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.						
	Species name	Populations	Distribution	Off take	Legal trade	Illegal trade	Other (specify)
	<i>Panax quinquefolius</i>	United States	United States and Canada	ca. 37,000 kg. annually	ca. 37,000 kg. wild roots exported annually; also export ca. 231,000 kg. of artificially propagated roots annually	Not quantified	Research conducted on status (abundance, distribution) and genetic variation of the species (2009-2010).
	<i>Sclerocactus</i> spp.	United States and Mexico	United States and Mexico			Not quantified	A taxonomic and conservation status review of the genus
	<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	Mississippi River	United States				Status and regulation of trade in the Mississippi River
LYNX a) <i>Lynx rufus</i>  b) <i>Lynx</i> spp.	North America	United States and Canada  North America and Eurasia				Facilitate population survey  Pelt identification guide	
					No information	<input type="checkbox"/>	
10	Have any project proposals for scientific research been submitted to the Secretariat under Resolution Conf. 12.2?					Yes No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:  <i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.</i>						

**D3 Enforcement Authorities**

1	Has the Secretariat been informed of any enforcement authorities that have been designated for the receipt of confidential enforcement information related to CITES?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If No, please designate them here (with address, phone, fax and email).	
3	Is there a specialized unit responsible for CITES-related enforcement (e.g. within the wildlife department, Customs, the police, public prosecutor's office)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Under consideration <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If Yes, please state which is the lead agency for enforcement:  U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement 4401 North Fairfax Drive MS-LE-3000 Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247 United States of America Tel: + 1 (703) 3581949 Fax: + 1 (703) 3582271 Email: lawenforcement@fws.gov Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/le">http://www.fws.gov/le</a>	
5	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:  <i>See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for summaries of CITES enforcement activities, including criminal prosecutions, seizures, and administrative penalties.</i>	

**D4 Communication, information management and exchange**

1	To what extent is CITES information computerized?	Tick if applicable
	- Monitoring and reporting of data on legal trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Monitoring and reporting of data on illegal trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Permit issuance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>
	- Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

2	Do the following authorities have access to the Internet?	Tick if applicable																												
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="244 745 499 869">Authority</th> <th data-bbox="499 745 595 869">Yes, continuous and unrestricted</th> <th data-bbox="595 745 715 869">Yes, but only through a dial-up connection</th> <th data-bbox="715 745 834 869">Yes, but only through a different office</th> <th data-bbox="834 745 914 869">Some offices only</th> <th data-bbox="914 745 1010 869">Not at all</th> <th data-bbox="1010 745 1161 869">Please provide details where appropriate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="244 869 499 925">Management Authority</td> <td data-bbox="499 869 595 925"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="595 869 715 925"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="715 869 834 925"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="834 869 914 925"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="914 869 1010 925"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1010 869 1161 925"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="244 925 499 981">Scientific Authority</td> <td data-bbox="499 925 595 981"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="595 925 715 981"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="715 925 834 981"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="834 925 914 981"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="914 925 1010 981"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1010 925 1161 981"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="244 981 499 1037">Enforcement Authority</td> <td data-bbox="499 981 595 1037"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="595 981 715 1037"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="715 981 834 1037"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="834 981 914 1037"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="914 981 1010 1037"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1010 981 1161 1037"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Authority	Yes, continuous and unrestricted	Yes, but only through a dial-up connection	Yes, but only through a different office	Some offices only	Not at all	Please provide details where appropriate	Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Scientific Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Enforcement Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Authority	Yes, continuous and unrestricted	Yes, but only through a dial-up connection	Yes, but only through a different office	Some offices only	Not at all	Please provide details where appropriate																								
Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																									
Scientific Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																									
Enforcement Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																									
3	Is there an electronic information system providing information on CITES species?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>																												
4	If Yes, does it provide information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Legislation (national, regional or international)?</li> <li>- Conservation status (national, regional, international)?</li> <li>- Other (please specify)? The U.S. Combined Species database provides the CITES listing status of CITES-listed species, as well as their protected status under U.S. stricter domestic measures, such as the Endangered Species Act, Wild Bird Conservation Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Marine Mammal Protection Act.</li> </ul>	Tick if applicable <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/></li> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> </ul>																												
5	Is it available through the Internet: <i>Note:</i> The USFWS is currently working on reprogramming the U.S. Combined Species database to make it available via the Internet.  Please provide URL:	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>																												



6	Do the authorities indicated have access to the following publications?			Tick if applicable
	Publication	Management Authority	Scientific Authority	Enforcement Authority
	<i>2005 Checklist of CITES Species</i> (book)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>2008 Checklist of CITES Species and Annotated Appendices</i> (CD-ROM)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Identification Manual</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>CITES Handbook</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7	If not, what problems have been encountered to access this information?			
8	Have enforcement authorities reported to the Management Authority on:			Tick if applicable
	– Mortality in transport?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Seizures and confiscations?			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Discrepancies in number of items in permits and number of items actually traded?			<input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments:			
9	Is there a government website with information on CITES and its requirements?		Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			No	<input type="checkbox"/>
			No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
	If Yes, please give the URL: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/international">http://www.fws.gov/international</a> ; <a href="http://www.fws.gov/le">http://www.fws.gov/le</a> ; and <a href="http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/cites_endangered_plants.shtml">http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/cites_endangered_plants.shtml</a>			

10	<p>Have CITES authorities been involved in any of the following activities to bring about better accessibility to and understanding of the Convention’s requirements to the wider public?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Press releases/conferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Newspaper articles, radio/television appearances <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Brochures, leaflets <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Presentations <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Displays <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Information at border crossing points <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Telephone hotline <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> <p>Please attach copies of any items.</p> <p><i>Note:</i> These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.</p>	Tick if applicable
11	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USFWS Law Enforcement and Management Authority representatives staffed a compliance outreach booth at the national convention of the Safari Club International in Reno, Nevada, in both 2009 and 2010. USFWS participation in this yearly event raises hunter awareness about CITES import/export permit requirements and helps improve treaty compliance by global big game hunters.</li> <li>• Outreach activities explaining the USFWS role in policing global trade and enforcing U.S. wildlife laws and treaties included exhibits at such venues as the Kentucky and Florida State Fairs; the National Boy Scout Jamboree; Red River Valley Trade Show in Fargo, North Dakota; Environmental Week at California State University in Long Beach; Outdoors Week in Anchorage, Alaska; the Wildlife Conservation Network Expo in San Francisco, California; the Hawaii Conservation Conference in Honolulu; the Safari Club International convention in Houston, Texas; and Earth Day celebrations in California, Georgia, Washington, and other States. Materials distributed included the USFWS “Buyer Beware” brochure, which cautions U.S. travellers about buying and importing souvenirs made from protected species.</li> <li>• USFWS Law Enforcement staff contributed to print and broadcast news reports, web publications, and magazine articles focused on illegal wildlife trafficking. Major media outlets included National Geographic, National Public Radio, Nightline (ABC), and the Los Angeles Times.</li> </ul> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section “D4,” for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010, with respect to communication, information management, and information exchange.</i></p>	

**D5 Permitting and registration procedures**

1	Have any changes in permit format or the designation and signatures of officials empowered to sign CITES permits/certificates been reported previously to the Secretariat?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		No	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	If no, please provide details of any:			
	Changes in permit format:			
	Changes in designation or signatures of relevant officials:			
2	To date, has your country developed written permit procedures for any of the following?	Tick if applicable		
		Yes	No	No information
	Permit issuance/acceptance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Registration of traders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Registration of producers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

3 Please indicate how many CITES documents were issued and denied in the two year period? (Note that actual trade is reported in the Annual Report by some Parties. This question refers to issued documents).

Year 1 (2009)	Import or introduction from the sea	Export	Re-export	Other	Comments
How many documents were issued?	795	2,959	12,742	6,949	A total of 23,445 CITES documents were issued during 2009. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 6,949 "other" documents, 451 were for either export or re-export, 118 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificates of ownership, etc.), and 99 were for the import of specimens both listed under CITES and protected under a stricter domestic measure (i.e., the Endangered Species Act). The rest of the "other" documents were CITES "clones" of master file permits issued mainly for exports of captive-bred wildlife and artificially propagated plants.
How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	-	-	-	-	A total of 198 applications were denied or abandoned during 2009. Due to the manner in which our permit computer system is programmed, a breakdown of this number by import, export, re-export, and other is not available.

<p>Year 2 (2010)</p> <p>How many documents were issued?</p>	753	3,819	9,690	5,520	<p>A total of 19,782 CITES documents were issued during 2010. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 5,520 "other" documents, 659 were for either export or re-export, 56 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificate of ownership, etc.), and 90 were for the import of specimens both listed under CITES and protected under a stricter domestic measure (i.e., the Endangered Species Act).</p> <p>The rest of the "other" documents were CITES "clones" of master file permits issued mainly for exports of captive-bred wildlife and artificially propagated plants.</p>
<p>How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?</p>	-	-	-	-	<p>A total of 62 applications were denied or abandoned during 2010. Due to the manner in which our permit computer system is programmed, a breakdown of this number by import, export, re-export, and other is not available.</p>
4	<p>Were any CITES documents that were issued later cancelled and replaced because of serious omissions or misinformation?</p>				<p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
5	<p>If Yes, please give the reasons for this.</p>				
6	<p>Please give the reasons for rejection of CITES documents from other countries.</p>				<p>Tick if applicable</p>
<p>Reason</p>					<p>Yes    No    No information</p>
<p>Technical violations</p>					<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Suspected fraud</p>					<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Insufficient basis for finding of non-detriment</p>					<p><input type="checkbox"/>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Insufficient basis for finding of legal acquisition</p>					<p><input type="checkbox"/>    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Other (specify)</p>					<p><input type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/>    <input type="checkbox"/></p>
7	<p>Are harvest and/or export quotas used as a management tool in the procedure for issuance of permits?</p>				<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Comments</p>					

8	<p>How many times has the Scientific Authority been requested to provide opinions?</p> <p>During 2009-2010, the U.S. Scientific Authority was asked to provide opinions on more than 430 specific findings. Additionally, the Scientific Authority has produced a number of non-detriment findings (i.e., "general advices") that are used when a particular application meets certain established criteria. For example, for applications requesting the exports of pet birds of commonly bred species, the Scientific Authority has made a non-detriment finding that can be used provided that the applicant meets certain requirements.</p>
9	<p>Has the MA charged fees for permit issuance, registration or related CITES activities? <span style="float: right;">Tick if applicable</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Issuance of CITES documents: <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species: <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Harvesting of CITES-listed species : <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Use of CITES-listed species: <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species: <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Importing of CITES-listed species: <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Other (specify): <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> </ul>
10	<p>If Yes, please provide the amounts of such fees.</p> <p>U.S. permit fees vary depending on the activity requested. The fees are listed in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 13, Section 13.11.</p>
11	<p>Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation? <span style="float: right;">Tick if applicable</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Entirely: <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Partly: <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Not at all: <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>- Not relevant: <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>
12	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D5," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010, with respect to permitting and registration procedures.</i></p>

**D6 Capacity building**

1	<p>Have any of the following activities been undertaken to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level? <span style="float: right;">Tick if applicable</span></p>
	<p>Increased budget for activities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Improvement of national networks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>Hiring of more staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Purchase of technical equipment for <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

Development of implementation tools	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	monitoring/enforcement Computerization	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	-------------------------------------

- Other (specify)

The USFWS is participating in the development of the Automated Customs Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS) – a U.S. Government-wide project to centralize the policing and processing of all international trade entering or exiting the United States. The system, which is being designed and deployed over a multi-year period, will improve U.S. CITES enforcement and USFWS efforts to detect and interdict illegal wildlife trade by providing access to integrated trade and law enforcement intelligence information, as well as selectivity and targeting mechanisms.

2	Have the CITES authorities received or benefited from any of the following capacity building activities provided by external sources?						
Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity.		Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	What were the external sources?
Target group							
Staff of Management Authority		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other U.S. Government agencies, traders, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), scientific experts, and the public.
Staff of Scientific Authority		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Staff of enforcement authorities		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

<p>3</p> <p>Have the CITES authorities been the <i>providers</i> of any of the following capacity building activities?</p> <p>Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="247 224 726 504"></th> <th data-bbox="726 224 821 504">Oral or written advice/guidance</th> <th data-bbox="821 224 917 504">Technical assistance</th> <th data-bbox="917 224 1013 504">Financial assistance</th> <th data-bbox="1013 224 1109 504">Training</th> <th data-bbox="1109 224 1204 504">Other (specify)</th> <th data-bbox="1204 224 1449 504">Details</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 504 726 548">Target group</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 548 726 593">Staff of Management Authority</td> <td data-bbox="726 548 821 593"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 548 917 593"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 548 1013 593"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 548 1109 593"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 548 1204 593"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 548 1449 593"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 593 726 638">Staff of Scientific Authority</td> <td data-bbox="726 593 821 638"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 593 917 638"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 593 1013 638"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 593 1109 638"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 593 1204 638"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 593 1449 638"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 638 726 683">Staff of enforcement authorities</td> <td data-bbox="726 638 821 683"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 638 917 683"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 638 1013 683"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 638 1109 683"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 638 1204 683"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 638 1449 683"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 683 726 728">Traders</td> <td data-bbox="726 683 821 728"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 683 917 728"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 683 1013 728"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 683 1109 728"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 683 1204 728"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 683 1449 728"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 728 726 772">NGOs</td> <td data-bbox="726 728 821 772"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 728 917 772"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 728 1013 772"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 728 1109 772"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 728 1204 772"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 728 1449 772"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 772 726 817">Public</td> <td data-bbox="726 772 821 817"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 772 917 817"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 772 1013 817"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 772 1109 817"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 772 1204 817"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 772 1449 817"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 817 726 862">Other parties/International meetings</td> <td data-bbox="726 817 821 862"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 817 917 862"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 817 1013 862"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 817 1109 862"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 817 1204 862"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 817 1449 862"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="247 862 726 929">Other (specify)</td> <td data-bbox="726 862 821 929"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="821 862 917 929"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="917 862 1013 929"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1013 862 1109 929"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1109 862 1204 929"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td data-bbox="1204 862 1449 929"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	Details	Target group							Staff of Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Staff of Scientific Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Staff of enforcement authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Traders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		NGOs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Public	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Other parties/International meetings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	Details																																																																	
Target group																																																																							
Staff of Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
Staff of Scientific Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
Staff of enforcement authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
Traders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
NGOs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
Public	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
Other parties/International meetings	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>																																																																		
<p>4</p>	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement extended the reach of U.S. CITES enforcement by providing “cross training” on treaty requirements to other Federal officers that police trade at U.S. ports of entry. More than 1,000 new U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) inspectors were trained each year as well as several hundred new CBP agriculture specialists and military customs clearance agents.</li> <li>• USFWS wildlife inspectors nationwide conducted wildlife import/export training sessions for CBP enforcement officers already in place at U.S. ports of entry and border crossings.</li> <li>• USFWS Office of Law Enforcement established and staffed a Digital Evidence Recovery and Technical Support Unit to provide computer forensics and high-tech investigative support to officers in the field.</li> </ul> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section “D6,” for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010, with respect to capacity building.</i></p>																																																																						



**D7 Collaboration/co-operative initiatives**

1	Is there an interagency or inter-sectoral committee on CITES?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
2	<p>If Yes, which agencies are represented and how often does it meet?</p> <p>The U.S. interagency CITES Coordination Committee (CCC) meets 5-8 times a year. The following agencies are represented in the CCC:</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior          U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Division of Management Authority</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior          U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Division of Scientific Authority</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior          U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Office of Law Enforcement</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior          Office of the Solicitor</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior          International Technical Assistance Program</p> <p>National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration          National Marine Fisheries Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture          Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture          Forest Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture          Foreign Agriculture Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Justice</p> <p>U.S. Department of State</p> <p>Office of the U.S. Trade Representative</p> <p>U.S. Department of Commerce</p> <p>U.S. Agency for International Development</p>	

	Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies							
	U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection							
3	If No, please indicate the frequency of meetings or consultancies used by the Management Authority to ensure co-ordination among CITES authorities (e.g. other MAs, SAs, Customs, police, others):							
		Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Annually	None	No information	Other (specify)
	Meetings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Consultations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
4	At the national level have there been any efforts to collaborate with:					Tick if applicable		Details if available
	Agencies for development and trade					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Provincial, state or territorial authorities					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Local authorities or communities					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Indigenous peoples					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Trade or other private sector associations					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	NGOs					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Other (specify)					<input type="checkbox"/>		
5	To date, have any Memoranda of Understanding or other formal arrangements for institutional cooperation related to CITES been agreed between the Management Authority and the following agencies?					Tick if applicable		
	Scientific Authority					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Customs					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Police					<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Other border authorities (specify): USFWS Law Enforcement; U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Other government agencies					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Private sector bodies					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	NGOs					<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Other (specify)					<input type="checkbox"/>		
6	Have Government staff participated in any regional activities related to CITES?					Tick if applicable		
	Workshops					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Meetings					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Other (specify)					<input type="checkbox"/>		

7	Has there been any effort to encourage any non-Party to accede to the Convention?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
8	If Yes, which one(s) and in what way? - Bahrain: Under the auspices of the U.S. Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI), U.S. Government officials encouraged Bahrain to accede to CITES. However, to date, Bahrain has not yet acceded.	
9	Has technical or financial assistance been provided to another country in relation to CITES?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
10	If Yes, which country(ies) and what kind of assistance was provided?  USFWS enforcement personnel conducted the following international training programs in 2009: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A USFWS special agent completed a multi-month assignment as an on-site technical advisor to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations-Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN) in Bangkok, Thailand. Efforts included investigative consultation and intelligence liaison, as well as the presentation of multiple in-country formal and on-the-job training programs.</li> <li>• USFWS enforcement officers presented a two-week course on investigating wildlife crime as part of the core curriculum at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Gabarone, Botswana. The course, which has been conducted yearly as part of the core curriculum at the Academy since 2002, focuses on skills that enforcement personnel need to combat the illegal take and trafficking of wildlife in sub-Saharan Africa. Participants this year included 30 officers from seven countries. The training covered endangered species laws and CITES, intelligence gathering, crime scene processing, surveillance, undercover operations, interviewing and raid planning, and preparing cases for court, and featured both classroom presentations and field exercises.</li> <li>• A USFWS special agent provided presentations on U.S. wildlife enforcement and investigative approaches to Russian government officials and NGO representatives as part of an official delegation to discuss drafting and enforcement of a Russian law similar to the U.S. Lacey Act.</li> <li>• A USFWS wildlife inspector provided CITES training at a Humane Society International conference in San Jose, Costa Rica. Representatives from Costa Rica, El Salvador, Dominican Republic, Nicaragua, and Guatemala participated in the program, which focused on the safe transport of CITES-listed live wildlife.</li> <li>• A USFWS special agent and two U.S. National Park Service rangers provided resource protection training to 43 ranger supervisors in Georgia; the training covered risk management, wildlife protection techniques, interviewing, rural surveillance, and intelligence collection and analysis.</li> </ul> USFWS provided the following training and technical assistance in 2010:	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A USFWS special agent completed a multi-month assignment as an on-site technical advisor to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations-Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN) in Bangkok, Thailand. Efforts included investigative consultation and intelligence liaison, as well as the presentation of multiple in-country formal and on-the-job training programs.</li> <li>• The USFWS again presented a two-week wildlife crime investigations course at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Gaborone, Botswana. Participants included 30 officers from eight countries.</li> <li>• A USFWS special agent completed a three-week assignment in Tanzania where he trained village game scouts who are responsible for wildlife enforcement on Wildlife Management areas connected to the Ugalla Game Reserve.</li> <li>• A USFWS special agent presented wildlife enforcement training at a Peru-Forest Sector Initiative training program sponsored by the U.S. Forest Service in Iquitos, Peru; attendees included top Peruvian officials and 50 Peruvian National Police officers.</li> </ul>		
11	Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>	
12	If Yes, please give a brief description.		
13	Have measures been taken to achieve co-ordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national authorities for CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the biodiversity-related Conventions)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>	
14	If Yes, please give a brief description.  <i>For an example, see ANNEX 3, Section "D7," under "Expanded cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)."</i>		
15	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:  <i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D7," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010, with respect to collaboration and cooperative initiatives.</i>		

**D8 Areas for future work**

1	Are any of the following activities needed to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level and what is the respective level of priority?			
	Activity	High	Medium	Low
	Increased budget for activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Hiring of more staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development of implementation tools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Improvement of national networks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Purchase of new technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Computerization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2	Were any difficulties encountered in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>	
3	If Yes, which one(s) and what is the main difficulty?			
4	Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>	
5	If Yes, please describe the constraint and the type of attention or assistance that is required.			
6	Have any measures, procedures or mechanisms been identified within the Convention that would benefit from review and/or simplification?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7	If Yes, please give a brief description.			
8	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:			

### E. General feedback

Please provide any additional comments you would like to make, including comments on this format.

Thank you for completing the form. Please remember to include relevant attachments, referred to in the report. For convenience these are listed again below:

Question	Item		
B4	Copy of full text of CITES-relevant legislation <i>NOTE: Already provided.</i>	Enclosed	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C3	Details of violations and administrative measures imposed <i>NOTE: See attached ANNEX 2.</i>	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
C5	Details of specimens seized, confiscated or forfeited <i>NOTE: See ANNEX 2.</i>	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
C7	Details of violations and results of prosecutions <i>NOTE: See ANNEX 2.</i>	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
C9	Details of violations and results of court actions <i>NOTE: See ANNEX 2.</i>	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
D4(10)	Details of nationally produced brochures or leaflets on CITES produced for educational or public awareness purposes  <i>NOTE: These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.</i>	Enclosed	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Comments		

## HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION B OF THIS REPORT

### *CITES-RELATED REGULATORY MEASURES*

Revision to U.S. regulations implementing CITES: The USFWS published revised CITES-implementing regulations (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23) on 23 August 2007. The new regulations, which became effective on 24 September 2007, incorporate provisions from appropriate resolutions adopted by the Parties through CoP13. In 2008, the USFWS published revisions to the regulations to include provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14. During 2009-2010, the USFWS drafted a proposed rule to incorporate into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations other relevant provisions from resolutions adopted by the Parties at CoP14 and CoP15, and anticipates publication of this proposed rule in late 2011.

U.S. proposed regulation to list hellbender in Appendix III: On 8 September 2010, the USFWS published a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* (75 FR 54579) to list the hellbender (*Cryptobranchus alleganiensis*), a large aquatic salamander, in Appendix III of CITES. The proposed listing includes live and dead whole specimens, and all readily recognizable parts, products, and derivatives of the species. Listing the hellbender in Appendix III is necessary to allow the United States to adequately monitor international trade in the species and to determine whether further measures are required to conserve it. [Note: The notice announcing the final decision by the United States to take this action was subsequently published in the *Federal Register* on 6 October 2011 (76 FR 61978). Prior to its publication, the USFWS notified the Secretariat about this Appendix-III listing and that the effective date of the listing is 3 April 2012.]

### *STRICTER DOMESTIC LEGISLATIVE MEASURES*

Amendments to the U.S. Lacey Act regarding plants: The Lacey Act, first enacted in 1900, is the United States' oldest wildlife protection statute. It makes it illegal to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce any wildlife specimen taken or traded in violation of U.S. or foreign law. However, with regard to plants, until 2008 the Act only applied to plants that were U.S. native species and its application to those plants was limited. In 2008, the U.S. Congress adopted significant amendments to the Lacey Act expanding its protection to a broader range of plants, including foreign plant and timber species. Now, in addition to its application to wildlife, the Act makes it unlawful to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce any plant specimen (with some limited exceptions) taken or traded in violation of foreign law or the laws or regulations of a U.S. State. The Act also now makes it unlawful to submit any false record of any covered plant and to import any covered plant or plant product without a declaration indicating the genus and species, quantity, value, and country of origin of the covered plant material. During the reporting period, the U.S. Government took a number of steps toward fully implementing the new Lacey Act amendments, including establishing a phased-in approach to the declaration requirement, proposing in the *Federal Register* definitions of the terms "common cultivar" and "common food crop," as they apply in the Lacey Act, and providing additional national and international outreach.

### *STRICTER DOMESTIC REGULATORY MEASURES*

Black-breasted puffleg: On 27 July 2010, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the black-breasted puffleg (*Eriocnemis nigrivestis*) as “Endangered” under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This bird species is also listed in CITES Appendix II.

Humboldt penguin: On 3 August 2010, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the Humboldt penguin (*Spheniscus humboldti*) as “Threatened” under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This bird species is also listed in CITES Appendix I.

Chilean woodstar and Andean flamingo: On 17 August 2010, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the Chilean woodstar (*Eulidia yarrellii*) and the Andean flamingo (*Phoenicoparrus andinus*) as “Endangered” under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. These two bird species are also listed in CITES Appendix II.

Shovelnose sturgeon: On 1 September 2010, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the shovelnose sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus platyrhynchus*) as “Threatened” under the U.S. Endangered Species Act due to its similarity of appearance to the Endangered pallid sturgeon (*Scaphirhynchus albus*). The shovelnose sturgeon and the pallid sturgeon are also listed in CITES Appendix II.

Jackass penguin: On 28 September 2010, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the jackass penguin (*Spheniscus demersus*) as “Endangered” under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This bird species is also listed in CITES Appendix II.

Margaretta’s hermit: On 28 December 2010, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing Margaretta’s hermit (*Phaethornis malaris*) as “Endangered” under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This bird species is also listed in CITES Appendix II.



## HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT

### *CITES COMPLIANCE MEASURES*

U.S. efforts related to Peruvian mahogany: During the reporting period, the USFWS continued to work closely with Peru regarding Peru's implementation of the Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*). For 2009, Peru established a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota of 5,043.7345 cubic meters of wood. For 2010, this quota was 3,565.547 cubic meters of wood, and the 2010 quota remained valid until 22 July 2011. The USFWS closely monitored the volume of bigleaf mahogany imported into the United States from Peru during the reporting period and provided Peru with periodic reports on those imports, which totalled 1,303 cubic meters of wood in 2009 and 1,253 cubic meters of wood in 2010. The USFWS continues to monitor the volume of bigleaf mahogany imported into the United States from Peru and provides this information to Peru, as well as the CITES Secretariat and other major mahogany importing countries, on a regular basis to assist Peru in monitoring its exports of mahogany to the United States and in managing its export quota.

United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement: In 2008, the United States and Peru concluded the Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA). The PTPA commits both Parties to effectively enforce their domestic environmental laws and adopt, maintain, and implement laws, regulations, and all other measures to fulfill obligations under seven Multilateral Environmental Agreements, one of which is CITES. The Environment Chapter of the PTPA includes an Annex on Forest Sector Governance, which seeks to address the environmental and economic consequences of illegal logging and associated trade. The PTPA was ratified by both Peru and the United States and entered into force on 1 February 2009. During the reporting period, the United States worked very closely with Peru under the terms of the agreement.

Ramin implementation activities: During the reporting period, the USFWS continued to work with its partners in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to ensure that the United States is fully implementing the ramin (*Gonystylus* spp.) Appendix-II listing. The CITES Management Authority in Sarawak, Malaysia, continued its process of notifying the USFWS whenever it issues a CITES export permit for a shipment of ramin from Sarawak destined for the United States. The USFWS distributes this information to the appropriate agencies in the United States to ensure that those ramin shipments are properly inspected and cleared upon arrival at U.S. ports of entry.

## *CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES*

Administrative measures for CITES violations: U.S. CITES enforcement resulted in the imposition of administrative measures (specifically, monetary assessments called “civil penalties”) on numerous occasions in 2009 and 2010. The work of USFWS wildlife inspectors, for example, secured the following penalty assessments:

- A major importer of live primates for medical research forfeited 25,050 USD for violating CITES and U.S. humane transport requirements when importing a shipment of live crab-eating macaques from Mauritius to Chicago, Illinois.
- An importer in Houston, Texas, paid an 8,025 USD penalty and forfeited a shipment from Peru that contained unlawfully imported black coral specimens and products, vicuna wool garments from unapproved sources, sea turtle jewelry, 42 elephant ivory carvings, and decorative items made from other CITES-listed corals.
- In Newark, New Jersey, a company that imported 995 pounds more Appendix-II queen conch meat from Honduras than was authorized by its CITES permit paid 6,000 USD in civil penalties.
- Inspectors in Anchorage, Alaska, assessed a 4,975 USD penalty for the illegal commercial importation of 178 caiman skin pieces from Hong Kong that arrived without a valid CITES permit.
- Other penalties in Anchorage, Alaska, included 1,475 USD for a shipment of 51 watchbands made from CITES species; 1,050 USD for two importations of macaque primate blood sera; and 525 USD for the import of 2-plus kilograms of pink coral beads.
- Two women in Minnesota forfeited 7,000 USD for their involvement in smuggling furs from endangered leopards.
- A U.S. resident who was caught smuggling CITES-listed Asian arowanas and a Fly River turtle into the country from Canada paid penalties totaling 3,500 USD.
- A Michigan resident forfeited 3,385 USD for trying to smuggle African elephant ivory out of the United States; the large pieces had been sold to a buyer in Singapore.
- An import/export business paid 2,775 USD in penalties for trying to smuggle a sea turtle into the United States via Detroit Metro Airport.
- A Tennessee businessman paid 2,675 USD in penalties for unlawfully importing six pool cues made from elephant ivory.
- A New York collector who tried to smuggle 11 Appendix-II Reeves turtles from China forfeited the wildlife and paid a 1,800 USD penalty.
- An Atlanta, Georgia, area fish store owner forfeited 1,600 USD for illegally importing live beluga sturgeon and Asian arowanas.
- An antiques dealer in Charleston, South Carolina, paid a 1,350 USD penalty for unlawfully importing CITES Appendix-I sea turtle and ivory products.
- A Michigan businessman forfeited 1,375 USD after trying to smuggle CITES-listed coral from Canada into the United States.
- The owner of an acupuncture center that sells medicinals paid 500 USD for CITES violations in connection with the smuggling of 570 pills made from Saiga antelope; he was caught by the USFWS at Detroit Metro Airport as he returned from a trip to China.
- Three individuals caught smuggling live parrots across the Mexican border into the United States each paid 1,000 USD in penalties.
- A Miami, Florida, importer paid a 1,000 USD penalty for illegally importing 1,227 live *Tridacna* clams from the Marshall Islands without a CITES permit.

Seizures, confiscations, and forfeitures of CITES specimens: The USFWS wildlife inspection program provides front-line enforcement of the CITES treaty at U.S. ports of entry. Selected seizures of unlawfully imported CITES specimens for 2009 and 2010 are provided below:

- USFWS wildlife inspectors in Miami, Florida, seized more than 100 pieces of CITES Appendix-II stony coral hidden in a 21-box shipment of live tropical fish imported from the Philippines and stopped an export shipment containing CITES-listed live rock.
- In another coral interception in Miami, Florida, USFWS staff seized two shipments containing 8,000 USD worth of live corals imported from Indonesia for CITES violations.
- USFWS staff in Miami, Florida, seized four reptilian leather handbags valued at 12,000 USD that were imported from Italy without valid permits.
- Live reptile interceptions in Miami, Florida, included an unlawfully imported shipments of 741 lizards from Mali; a shipment of CITES reptiles from Madagascar that contained some 700 live specimens; and 150 CITES Appendix-II live tortoises taken from the wild in Argentina.
- In another live reptile case in Miami, Florida, inspectors intercepted two commercial shipments containing 40 Appendix-II chameleons from Tanzania; CITES quotas only authorized the yearly export of 18 live captive-raised specimens from this country.
- A reptile importer in Miami, Florida, abandoned an 18,000 USD shipment of live specimens after inspectors documented humane transport and other CITES violations.
- Other CITES seizures in Miami, Florida, included a shipment of over 22,000 pounds of queen conch meat imported without a CITES permit from Belize; sea turtle eggs from both Peru and Nicaragua; a 45,000 USD shipment of live snakes imported from Honduras in violation of CITES requirements for humane transport; and a mail shipment from Peru containing an ocelot skin, 19 other spotted cat skins, jaguar teeth bracelets, and other items made from cat teeth.
- After inspecting two large shipments of non-living coral imported from the Solomon Islands, USFWS staff in Tampa, Florida, seized the equivalent of a container-load of the material because of irregularities in the CITES permits.
- Inspectors in Tampa, Florida, also seized over 7,500 pieces of coral that were not properly identified on the CITES permit for a commercial shipment from the Solomon Islands.
- The USFWS seized a container shipment from Belgium that contained sea turtle shells, elephant ivory, and other CITES wildlife products destined for a Florida business.
- A proactive inspection of an export shipment declared as captive-bred live tropical fish being shipped from Orlando, Florida, uncovered 12 live CITES Appendix-II salamanders and undeclared crustaceans, molluscs, and amphibians.
- A passenger arriving in Atlanta, Georgia, from Peru was caught with 70 sea turtle eggs in her baggage.
- Seizures at the DHL express mail hub in Louisville, Kentucky, included a commercial shipment containing 42 pieces of CITES-listed coral; sperm whale teeth; a shipment containing 103 pangolin scales; 104 carved pieces of hippopotamus ivory; and multiple shipments of python skin shoes imported without CITES permits.
- In Newark, New Jersey, inspectors intercepted and seized two shipments of Russian medicinals containing over 5,000 products made from bear and other CITES species.
- Newark, New Jersey, staff discovered two boxes of primate bushmeat (including chimpanzee meat) in an ocean cargo container that was being shipped to an African arts store in Chicago, Illinois.
- Officers in Boston, Massachusetts, discovered raw elephant ivory being smuggled into the United States in a shipment of wooden statues from the Democratic Republic of Congo. The shipment was tracked to its final destination in the Bronx, New York; all of the ivory (100 pieces) was recovered when the recipient's premises were searched under warrant.

- USFWS staff in upstate New York seized over 200 CITES-listed live reptiles from an individual who was attempting to smuggle them into Canada.
- Inspectors at John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFK) in New York City discovered CITES protected wildlife items (including leopard and primate skins) in a shipment from the Democratic Republic of the Congo that had been declared as non-wildlife African handicrafts.
- A New York inspector seized two international mail parcels shipped from Indonesia that contained raw CITES bird and primate skins imported without CITES permits.
- An inspection blitz at the JFK mail facility resulted in the seizure of commercial shipments containing dried sea horses; tiger medicinals; CITES reptilian leather products; and iguana meat.
- Inspection operations at Chicago's O'Hare International Airport resulted in the seizures of a commercial shipment containing 100 live sea horses; pangolin and monitor lizard meat; a 56,000 USD shipment of caiman shoes from Brazil; a 21-piece shipment of African elephant ivory; and 42 dried shark fins from Hong Kong that were destined for a local restaurant.
- Inspectors in Houston, Texas, seized 16 ivory items falsely imported as antiques and a massive stony coral statue weighing some 1,200 pounds that had been unlawfully imported from Vietnam.
- Staff in Houston, Texas, also seized two leopard hunting trophies whose tag numbers failed to match the information recorded on the CITES export permit.
- Inspectors in Dallas, Texas, seized multiple imports of Asian medicinals, including 1,970 items containing bear bile from members of a family that owns medicinal stores in Dallas and Orlando, Florida.
- Another large-scale medicinal shipment intercepted in Dallas, Texas, contained 3,120 products made from pangolin; 420 medicinals containing walrus; 600 products made from musk deer; and four vials of bear bile. Other medicinal seizures at this port included another 2,040 pangolin products, 480 musk deer products, and 420 seahorse products.
- An El Paso, Texas, inspector's apprehension of a man smuggling CITES leather products from Mexico resulted in the seizure of some 9,000 USD worth of contraband wildlife goods.
- USFWS officers at the international mail facility in San Francisco, California, intercepted a package from the Republic of Korea containing concealed bear bile; the package was destined for a medicinal store in Chicago, Illinois.
- Other medicinal seizures at this port included a shipment of products labelled as containing tiger and monkey parts and a second bear bile shipment – this one destined for a distributor in Los Angeles, California.
- Inspectors at Los Angeles International Airport intercepted two U.S. citizens returning from Peru with smuggled wildlife; the contraband included live Appendix-II snakes and Appendix-I macaw feathers.
- In other Los Angeles, California, smuggling incidents, the USFWS intercepted a mail package from Germany containing 41 Appendix-II tarantulas; a shipment of live Peruvian aplomado falcons that arrived without a valid CITES permit; and multiple shipments of coral jewelry destined for a Las Vegas, Nevada, trade show.
- In Anchorage, Alaska, inspectors seized a commercial quantity of medicinal products made from CITES-listed wildlife from a Chinese citizen returning to the United States from that country.
- Other Anchorage, Alaska, seizures included a 2,993 USD shipment of reptile skin jewelry; a commercial shipment of Appendix-III red coral jewelry valued at 1,250 USD; two shipments of CITES coral from China; a shipment of two sperm whale teeth necklaces valued at over 12,000 USD; and an export shipment of 55 monitor lizard skins bound for China without a CITES permit.

Seizures of CITES plant parts and products in 2009 and 2010: During 2009 and 2010, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized the following specimens of CITES-listed non-living plant parts and products upon import into the United States:

2009

- 1 shipment of *Dalbergia nigra*, imported from Brazil, containing 0.19 cubic meters of veneer.
- 1 shipment of *Pericopsis elata*, imported from the Democratic Republic of Congo, containing 30 cubic meters of veneer.
- 1 shipment of *Pterocarpus santalinus*, imported from the Republic of Korea, containing 58 kilograms of timber.
- 1 shipment of *Prunus africana*, from an unknown country of origin, imported from Canada, containing 22,320 numbers of extracts.
- 1 shipment of *Aquilaria* spp., imported from China, containing 38 kilograms of wood chips.
- 3 shipments of *Hoodia gordonii*: all from unknown countries of origin; 2 shipments imported from Canada, containing 4 kilograms of extract; and 1 shipment imported from China, containing 725 kilograms of extract.
- 2 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*: 1 shipment imported from China, containing 225 kilograms of root; and 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Canada, containing 516 kilograms of root.
- 3 shipments of *Panax ginseng*: 2 shipments imported from Viet Nam, 1 containing 2 roots and 1 containing 1 kilogram of root; and 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Kenya, containing 12 grams of root.
- 8 shipments of *Saussurea costus*: 6 shipments imported from China, containing 4,233 kilograms of extract and 790 kilograms of medicinal products; 1 shipment imported from the Republic of Korea, containing an unknown quantity of medicinal products; and 1 shipment imported from Taiwan, containing 12 kilograms of extract.
- 2 shipments of *Aloe ferox*, imported from South Africa, containing 1,911 stems.
- 3 shipments of *Aloe* spp.: 2 shipments imported from South Africa, containing 800 kilograms of powder and an additional 40 units of powder; and 1 shipment imported from the Republic of Korea, containing an unknown quantity of derivatives.
- 5 shipments of *Cibotium barometz*: 3 shipments imported from China, containing 140 kilograms of extract; and 2 shipments imported from Taiwan, containing 17 kilograms of extract.
- 4 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*: 2 shipments imported from China, containing 18 kilograms of extract and 1,134 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Picrorhiza kurrooa*, imported from India, containing 150 kilograms of powder.
- 1 shipment of *Adonis vernalis*, from an unknown country of origin, imported from Canada, containing 9 kilograms of dried plants.
- 4 shipments of *Gastrodia elata* orchid specimens: 3 shipments imported from the Republic of Korea, containing 13,002 kilograms of extract; and 1 shipment imported from an unknown country, containing 15 grams of extract.
- 26 shipments of other orchid specimens containing 25 kilograms of derivatives, 180 grams of dried plants, 102 kilograms of extract, 194 kilograms of medicinal products and an additional 134 units of medicinal products, 1,990 kilograms of powder, 73 kilograms of root, and 24 kilograms of stems.

## 2010

- 4 shipments of *Swietenia macrophylla*: 1 shipment imported from Belize, containing 1 cubic meter of sawn wood; 2 shipments imported from Honduras, containing 155 cubic centimeters of veneer and an additional 5 kilograms of veneer; and 1 shipment imported from Nicaragua, containing 30 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 2 shipments of *Dalbergia nigra*: 1 shipment imported from Brazil, containing 310 cubic centimeters of veneer; and 1 shipment of Brazil origin, imported from Germany, containing 160,000 kilograms of wood products.
- 1 shipment of *Caesalpinia echinata* from Brazil origin, imported from Germany, containing 5 kilograms of sawn wood.
- 1 shipment of *Pericopsis elata*, imported from the Congo, containing 6 square meters of veneer.
- 1 shipment of *Gonystylus* spp., from an unknown country of origin, imported from Japan, containing an unknown number of wood products.
- 1 shipment of *Aquilaria agallocha*, imported from India, containing 9 kilograms of extract.
- 3 shipments of *Hoodia gordonii*: 2 shipments of South Africa origin, containing 142 grams of extract and 1 medicinal product; and 1 shipment imported from an unknown country, containing 21,600 units of extracts.
- 2 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*: 1 shipment imported from Canada, containing 3 kilograms of root; and 1 shipment imported from Hong Kong, containing 454 kilograms of root.
- 74 shipments of *Saussurea costus*: 64 shipments imported from China, containing 387 medicinal products and an additional 835 kilograms of medicinal products; 2 shipments from unknown countries of origin, imported from China, containing 15 medicinal products; 1 shipment imported from Canada, containing 1 medicinal product; 1 shipment of China origin, imported from Canada, containing 2 medicinal products; 1 shipment of Hong Kong origin, imported from Canada, containing 5 medicinal products; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Canada, containing 4 kilograms of root; 2 shipments of China origin, imported from Germany, containing 13 medicinal products; and 2 shipments imported from Taiwan, containing 1 medicinal products and 20 kilograms of powder.
- 2 shipments of *Aloe arborescens*: 1 shipment imported from Japan, containing 400 kilograms of extract; and 1 shipment imported from the Republic of Korea, containing 1,980 kilograms of extract.
- 2 shipments of *Cibotium barometz*: 1 shipment imported from Hong Kong, containing 570 kilograms of root; and 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Viet Nam, containing 80 medicinal products.
- 4 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*: 1 shipment imported from Hong Kong, containing 10 medicinal products; 2 shipments imported from Viet Nam, containing 1.070 kilograms of medicinal products; and 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Viet Nam, containing 2 medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Picrorhiza kurrooa*, imported from India, containing 8 kilograms of extract.
- 2 shipments of cacti, imported from Mexico, containing 3 dried plants and 1 rainstick.
- 13 shipments of *Gastrodia elata* orchid specimens: 4 shipments imported from China, containing 200 kilograms of extract, 48.290 kilograms of medicinal products, and 300 kilograms of powder; 4 shipments from an unknown country of origin, imported from China, containing 61 medicinal products; 2 shipments imported from the Republic of Korea, containing 1,166 kilograms of extract; 2 shipments imported from Viet Nam, containing 2

- kilograms of medicinal products; and 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Viet Nam, containing 80 medicinal products.
- 42 shipments of other orchid specimens containing 23 kilograms and 200 milliliters of extract, 82.12 kilograms of medicinal products, 87 kilograms of powder, 2,600 roots and an additional 2 kilograms of root, 62.2 kilograms of stems, and 1 unit of trim.

Criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations: USFWS investigations of CITES violations resulted in criminal prosecutions for illegal trafficking in CITES-listed species. Key cases from 2009 and 2010 are summarized below:

- Two Taiwanese individuals were sentenced to terms of 30 and 20 months in prison and fined 12,500 USD each after pleading guilty to conspiracy and other charges in connection with the smuggling of more than 194,000 USD worth of CITES-listed black coral from China through Hong Kong and on to the U.S. Virgin Islands.
- A German national who runs an aquatic supply business in Taiwan was ordered to pay over 35,000 USD in fines and restitution for smuggling over 40 tons of coral into the United States from the Philippines.
- A Cayman Islands corporation that pleaded guilty to illegally importing some 29 items made from protected species (including elephant ivory and leopard, tiger, and jaguar skins) was ordered to pay a 50,000 USD fine and 100,000 USD in restitution.
- A defendant who was found guilty of smuggling elephant ivory into the United States was sentenced to serve 33 months in prison and pay a 25,000 USD fine. USFWS investigators showed that the defendant imported two air cargo shipments containing 71 concealed elephant ivory carvings from Nigeria and Uganda.
- The owner of a Florida company that manufactures pool cues pleaded guilty to wildlife charges after USFWS special agents documented his shipping of elephant ivory to an undercover operative of the London Metropolitan Police.
- An Atlanta, Georgia, piano company pleaded guilty to one felony count of smuggling elephant ivory into the United States in a case where keys had been removed from multiple instruments and concealed in shipping crates.
- A Massachusetts scrimshaw artist was convicted of smuggling sperm whale teeth and elephant ivory into the United States after a four-day jury trial in Boston, Massachusetts. A USFWS/National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) joint investigation exposed the smuggling of hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of whale and elephant ivory from the United Kingdom and Ukraine to multiple U.S. buyers.
- A Russian immigrant living in Minnesota and his import/export business were sentenced for their role in aiding and abetting the smuggling of CITES caviar from the former Soviet Union; together they paid fines totalling 30,000 USD.
- A business in southern California admitted smuggling 350 CITES-listed orchids into the United States; the business was ordered to pay a 25,000 USD fine and 5,424 USD in restitution.
- Two defendants pleaded guilty to Federal charges in a USFWS investigation involving the illegal importation of CITES Appendix-I Brazilian rosewood.
- A Federal jury convicted a South Dakota man on smuggling and wildlife charges in a USFWS case that exposed illegal hunting in South Africa and the “laundering” of smuggled leopard trophies through Zimbabwe and then on to the United States. This individual was fined 20,000 USD and lost his hunting privileges worldwide for three years. The investigation previously secured guilty pleas from two South African outfitters, a Denver, Colorado, taxidermist, and four other U.S. hunters. One of these hunters was fined 20,000 USD and another was ordered to pay 10,000 USD in fines and restitution during the reporting period.

- A Honduran national pleaded guilty to a felony conspiracy charge stemming from his role in a large-scale queen conch meat trafficking operation; the man admitted harvesting some 115,000 pounds of queen conch for eventual export to the United States, circumventing a CITES embargo that was then in place.
- A Michigan man pleaded guilty to CITES violations for buying thousands of CITES-listed butterflies after being warned that his transactions were illegal. He forfeited some 18,000 USD worth of specimens and was ordered to pay a 15,000 USD fine and 5,000 USD in restitution.
- A mother and daughter from Saint Paul, Minnesota, were sentenced to home confinement, a 9,000 USD fine, and 70 hours of community service for smuggling and selling protected wildlife items at that city's International Marketplace.
- A Minnesota woman, who claimed to be a Hmong healer, pleaded guilty to one felony smuggling count after the USFWS twice caught her trying to smuggle CITES-listed wildlife (including elephant skin and primate parts) into the United States from Laos. She was sentenced to three years probation and 300 hours of community service.
- A North Carolina fish importer who pleaded guilty to smuggling Appendix-I Asian arowanas was fined 25,000 USD.
- A San Francisco, California, resident was sentenced to one year in prison and fined 3,000 USD after pleading guilty to smuggling 26 Asian arowanas into the United States from China. Another California man, who smuggled six of these fish from Indonesia, was fined 7,500 USD.
- A defendant in New York State pleaded guilty to smuggling 20 Asian arowanas into the United States via JFK International Airport. In another New York arowana case, a Brooklyn man was fined 2,000 USD after conspiring with Canadian residents to smuggle eight Asian arowanas into the United States.
- Two women in Washington State who conspired to smuggle a rhesus macaque monkey into the United States from Thailand were sentenced to 60 days in prison and ordered to pay 4,507 USD in restitution.
- A California man was sentenced to three years probation, six months home detention, and a 2,000 USD fine in connection with his conviction for engaging in an international conspiracy to smuggle more than 35 protected tortoises.
- A Virginia resident investigated for the unlawful importation of live CITES-listed snakes from Brazil pleaded guilty and was fined 2,100 USD.
- A Texas man caught smuggling skins from CITES-listed reptiles from Mexico to the United States was sentenced to three months in prison and three years of supervised release; USFWS special agents also seized 48,000 USD worth of wildlife leather products from the defendant.



## HIGHLIGHTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT

### D1 and D2. Management Authority (MA) and Scientific Authority (SA)

#### *COP-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

Public participation in U.S. preparations for CoP15: CoP15 was held 13-25 March 2010 in Doha, Qatar. In 2009 and 2010 leading up to CoP15, the USFWS published three notices in the U.S. *Federal Register* as part of the process designed to allow NGOs and the public to participate in the preparations of the U.S. Government for CoP15. The first notice, published on 13 July 2009, described the species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items that the United States was at that time considering submitted for CoP15, and solicited public comment on these potential proposals. This notice also provided information on the process for participation of observers at CoP15. The second notice, published on 4 November 2009, announced the provisional agenda for CoP15, solicited public comment on the items on the agenda, and announced a public meeting held on 2 December 2009 to discuss the items on the provisional agenda. The third notice, published on 11 March 2010, announced the availability on the USFWS website of the tentative U.S. negotiating positions on the items on the CoP15 agenda.

U.S. SUBMISSIONS FOR CoP15: On 14 October 2009, the United States submitted eight species listing proposals (five animal proposals and three plant proposals) for consideration at CoP15. The United States also submitted eight discussion documents, including three proposed revisions of existing resolutions, and five proposed decisions.

U.S. approved 25 observers for CoP15: In accordance with CITES Article XI, paragraph 7, the USFWS approved 25 national NGOs to attend CoP15 as observers.

Results of CoP15: The United States participated fully in CoP15 in March 2010. Of the eight species listing proposals submitted by the United States at CoP15, three were adopted. The eight discussion documents submitted by the United States for consideration at CoP15 resulted in the adoption by the Parties of one revised resolution and six new decisions. The Parties from North America selected the United States as the North American Regional Representative on the Standing Committee for the intersessional period between CoP15 and CoP16. In addition, Dr. Rosemarie Gnam, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, was selected to continue as the alternate North American Regional Representative on the CITES Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP15 and CoP16.

U.S. provides financial support to the Secretariat: In 2010, the USFWS completed a grant to provide 320,000 USD in financial support to the CITES Secretariat to conduct certain activities stemming from CoP15. These activities include: a joint meeting of the Animals and Plants Committees; the snake trade and conservation management workshop; bilateral rhino enforcement exchanges; turtle report translation; Introduction from the Sea Working Group meetings; the Neotropical Timber Working Group meeting; and the Tiger Enforcement seminar.

## *STANDING COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

58<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent a 9-person delegation to the 58<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC58), which was held 6-10 July 2009, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, one from the Department of the Interior's Office of the Solicitor, two from the U.S. Department of State, and two from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The United States submitted three working documents for consideration at the meeting: one on inconsistent implementation of Appendix-III timber listings annotated to include only the national populations of the listing countries; one as the Chair of the working group to review the implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system and the trade in small crocodylian leather products; and one as the Chair of the working group to review the use of purpose-of-transaction codes by Parties.

59<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee: SC59 was held in Doha, Qatar, on 12 March 2010, immediately preceding CoP15. The United States participated fully in the meeting.

Introduction from the sea: At SC57 in 2008, in accordance with Decision 14.48, the Standing Committee established a working group on introduction from the sea to consider implementation and technical issues related to specimens taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State. The United States was an active participant in the September 2009 meeting of the working group in Geneva, Switzerland. Following CoP15, the working group elected a new Chair and Vice-Chair. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. CITES Management Authority, was elected Vice-Chair of the working group. The Chair and Vice-Chair met in December 2010 to begin development of a draft discussion document and revised resolution for consideration by the Standing Committee at SC62. The United States remains an active participant in the working group and Mr. Gabel continues to serve as its Vice-Chair. The United States strongly supports continuing efforts to achieve common understanding of the practical application of CITES introduction from the sea provisions.

Working group on review of the universal tagging system and trade in small crocodylian leather goods: Decision 14.62 directed the Standing Committee to establish a working group at SC57 to review the implementation and effectiveness of the CITES universal tagging system and the trade in small crocodylian leather goods. Decision 14.63 directed the Standing Committee to consider the report of this working group at SC58 and submit recommendations, as appropriate, at CoP15. The United States chaired the working group established at SC57, and prepared a document on behalf of the working group for CoP15 with recommended changes to Resolutions Conf. 11.12 (*Universal tagging system for the identification of crocodylian skins*) and Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP14) (*Permits and certificates*). These recommended changes were adopted at CoP15.

Working group on purpose codes: Decision 14.54 directed the Standing Committee to establish an intersessional working group to review the use of purpose-of-transaction codes by Parties on CITES permits. In accordance with the decision, the Standing Committee, at SC57, established a working group to carry out this review, report at SC58 on its progress and also on any potential recommendations for CoP15 for amendments to the purpose-of-transaction codes and their definitions in Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP14). The United States chaired this working group, and prepared a document on behalf of the working group for CoP15 reporting on the progress made by the working group and recommending that the working group be re-established at SC61 and carry on its work leading up to CoP16. This recommendation was adopted at CoP15.

Working group on review of resolutions: Decision 14.19 directed the Standing Committee to review any proposals from the Secretariat to correct non-substantive errors or minor editorial faults in current CITES resolutions and decide if they should be referred to the CoP. At SC57, the Standing Committee established an intersessional working group to review proposals, prepared by the Secretariat, for non-substantive revisions to the current resolutions and report back to SC58. During the reporting period, the United States, as an active participant in the working group, reviewed and commented on proposed revisions to a number of the resolutions that were subsequently adopted at CoP15.

USFWS participates in CITES E-commerce workshop: Representatives from the U.S. CITES Management Authority and USFWS Office of Law Enforcement (including a field investigator, forensics laboratory manager, and intelligence analyst) participated in the Workshop on E-commerce of CITES-listed Species held in Vancouver, Canada, in February 2009. The USFWS Intelligence Unit provided an overview of U.S. efforts to address internet wildlife trafficking, and USFWS representatives participated in workshop sessions that developed recommendations for presentation to the CITES Standing Committee at SC58.

### *CITES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

United States served as North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee until CoP15: At CoP14 in June 2007, the Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. Management Authority, to continue as the North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee for the intersessional period between CoP14 and CoP15 (March 2010).

18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a 6-person delegation to the 18<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC18), which was held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, 17-21 March 2009. The U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, one from APHIS, and one from the U.S. Forest Service. The United States prepared and submitted several documents for the meeting, regarding: problems associated with population-specific Appendix-III timber listings; clarification of the exemption for flaked seedlings of Appendix-I orchids; amendment of the Appendix-II orchid annotation to exempt seedpods; and the 2008 amendments to the Lacey Act. The following two documents on the results of two intersessional working groups were submitted by Robert Gabel of the United States, as the Regional Representative for North America: tree species annotations and trade in finished products. The U.S. delegation was active on numerous issues and participated in several working groups, including those for the Review of Significant Trade in Appendix-II plants, the Periodic Review of the Appendices, merging of cactus and orchid annotations, non-detriment findings, and nomenclature.

24<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent an 8-person delegation to the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Animals Committee (AC24), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 20-24 April 2009. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, four from NMFS, and one from U.S. Department of State. The United States submitted three documents for the meeting: a periodic review of Felidae - progress report; a report of the shark intersessional working group on the implementation of Decision 14.107; and an informational document on the international workshop on Coralliidae held in Hong Kong in March 2009. The United States also participated in a meeting convened by the Nomenclature Matters working group, and was a member of six working groups at AC24 pertaining to: the Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species; the periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices; assessment and monitoring methodologies used for shared stocks of Acipenseriformes species; the conservation and management of sharks and stingrays; sustainable use and management of sea cucumber fisheries; and international expert workshop on non-detriment findings.

Periodic review of Felidae: In the winter of 2009-2010, in collaboration with its U.S. State partners, the U.S. Scientific Authority produced an on-line *Lynx* spp. fur identification guide, in order to provide an improved tool to port authorities and law enforcement personnel for distinguishing bobcat pelts from those of other *Lynx* species. The on-line link to this identification guide was distributed for review to the other CITES Parties via an informational document at CoP15.

Review of the Appendices: The U. S. Scientific Authority (SA) is conducting a periodic review of the genus *Sclerocactus* (Cactaceae), including comprehensive taxonomic, distribution, and conservation status reviews of U.S. and Mexican taxa. [Note: an update and available preliminary results were provided at PC19 in Geneva in April 2011]. At CoP15 (Doha, 2010), the United States and Mexico jointly submitted a proposal to delist *Euphorbia misera* from Appendix II, which was adopted by consensus.

CITES Source Code 'R': The United States prepared a document for CoP14 on behalf of the Animals and Plants Committees proposing a decision that the technical committees review CITES trade data for species traded under Source Code 'R' and, based on this review, propose a definition of ranching and the use of Source Code 'R' for CITES purposes. As a result, the Parties adopted Decision 14.52, which directed the Animals and Plants Committees to review CITES trade data to determine which Parties utilize Source Code 'R,' and for which species, to evaluate whether the code was used consistently and properly. In addition, the decision directed the committees to determine what management programs are being used for the species to which Source Code 'R' is applied. The committees were then directed to review the literature on wildlife management for current information on management systems that would resemble ranching and identify common elements in these systems. Based on the review of CITES trade data, information obtained from Parties that use the code, and literature on management systems that would resemble ranching, the committees were to propose a definition for Source Code 'R' for CITES purposes at CoP15.

Documents PC17 Doc. 9 and AC23 Doc. 9 were submitted by the Secretariat for the PC17-AC23 joint meeting (April 2008), and included printouts from the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) CITES Annual Report database showing all exports of CITES listed animal and plant specimens with the source code declared as 'R,' for the years 1991-2005. The United States participated in a working group at this joint meeting, which compiled a list of countries to be contacted with regard to the management programs they are using for species to which they are applying the 'R' source code, and developed a questionnaire that was sent to those countries. The working group also reviewed literature on wildlife management for information on management systems for particular taxonomic groups that would resemble ranching and identify common elements in these systems. Based on the review of the information gathered, the working group proposed a definition for Source Code 'R' for CITES purposes that was adopted at CoP15.

Transport Working Group: The United States remains active on the Animals Committee Transport Working Group (TWG). A representative of the USFWS participated in the International Air Transport Association (IATA) Live Animal and Perishables Board (LAPB) meeting in Montreal, Canada, in October 2009, during which proposals to change manatee transport requirements and reorganize bird container requirements were presented. The USFWS also participated in the IATA-LAPB meeting in Houston, Texas, April 2010, during which various issues were discussed. In addition, a representative of the USFWS participated in meetings of the Association of Marine Mammal Parks and Aquariums (AMMPA) in April 2009 and April 2010, to discuss CITES-related issues that affect transport of marine mammals.

## OTHER CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES

U.S. submits its 2008 and 2009 CITES annual reports: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare annual reports on its trade in CITES-listed species. On 28 October 2009, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2008. The file (140,399 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2008. On 26 October 2010, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2009. The file (138,071 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2009. The data in these data files represent actual trade and not just numbers of CITES permits issued.

U.S. submits its 2007-2008 CITES Biennial Report: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare periodic reports on its implementation of CITES and shall transmit to the Secretariat, in addition to an annual report, a biennial report on legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of CITES. On 26 October 2009, the USFWS submitted to the CITES Secretariat its CITES biennial report for the years 2007 and 2008. This report summarized some of the major legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008 in its implementation and enforcement of CITES. Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14) recommends that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at CoP13 and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submitted its 2007-2008 biennial report in accordance with this new format. The USFWS has posted this report on its CITES website at [http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA\\_DSA/CITES/CITES\\_home.html](http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA_DSA/CITES/CITES_home.html).

Freshwater turtle workshop: The USFWS's International Wildlife Trade Program convened a freshwater turtle workshop in St. Louis, Missouri, in September 2010, to discuss the pressing management, regulatory, scientific, and enforcement needs associated with the harvest and trade of freshwater turtles in the United States. The USFWS was responding to a significant increase in the export of native turtles, particularly to Asia, and has been monitoring this situation closely. The USFWS invited all the U.S. States to this workshop, and provided funding for all State government participants. In addition, the USFWS funded the participation of a number of government, academic, and conservation group turtle researchers with specialized knowledge for this four-day meeting. The USFWS contracted with the IUCN Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group for technical advice prior to the meeting, and had the Specialist Group prepare draft revised assessments of native turtle species for the workshop participants to consider. Recommendations were adopted covering the areas of conservation biology, law enforcement, and management and the USFWS continues to work with the States and other cooperators to address those recommendations and raise awareness of the conservation implications of the turtle trade.

Meeting with States on Paddlefish Conservation and Management: The USFWS hosted a meeting on paddlefish conservation and management on 22 and 23 January 2009, in Memphis, Tennessee. The USFWS met with Fisheries Chiefs from the U.S. States that currently allow commercial harvest or a sport fishery of wild paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*). The group discussed the status of this species; management measures to ensure the sustainability of the species; domestic and international trade in the species; and future management and trade in the species. The outcomes of the meeting informed CITES non-detriment findings for the export of paddlefish and a report from the United States to the European Union's Scientific Review Group that informed their import finding for the species.

Red and pink corals (Coralliidae): The United States submitted a proposal at CoP14 to list red and pink corals in CITES Appendix II. The proposal was not adopted but following CoP14 NMFS convened a workshop to explore issues related to a possible CITES listing for this taxon. The International Workshop on *Corallium* Science, Management, and Trade, held in March 2009 in Hong Kong, China, was the first of two workshops convened to better understand the biological status of precious corals in the family Coralliidae, the adequacy of existing management measures, and the conservation benefits and limitations of a potential CITES Appendix-II listing for this taxon. A second workshop, the International Workshop on Red Coral Science, Management, and Trade: Lessons from the Mediterranean, was held in Naples, Italy, in September 2009. The workshop was organized by the Italian Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea in cooperation with the NOAA. The United States actively participated in both workshops.

Humphead wrasse: Indonesia submitted a document at CoP15 that highlighted the impacts of illegal, unregulated, and unreported fishing on the humphead wrasse (*Cheilinus undulatus*) and called on CITES Parties for assistance in controlling the international trade of this Appendix-II fish species. NMFS supported two workshops to enhance capacity to implement the CITES listing for humphead wrasse. NMFS and the IUCN Groupers and Wrasses Specialist Group sponsored the workshop on implementation of the CITES Appendix-II listing of the Napoleon fish with major exporting, importing, and transshipment countries, in June 2009, in Hong Kong, China. A second workshop was held in Bali, Indonesia in June 2010: the workshop on the Trade of *Cheilinus undulatus* (humphead wrasse/Napoleon wrasse) and CITES implementation. The report of the 2010 workshop was provided to the Standing Committee as an annex to Document SC61 Doc. 49.

NMFS also participated in a project titled, “Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Proactive Species Conservation: Assessment of Status and Habitat Specificity of *Cheilinus undulatus* and *Bolbometopon muricatum* in the Southern Islands of the CNMI.” The goals of the project were to produce a quantitative assessment of the abundance and distribution of *C. undulatus* and *B. muricatum* in CNMI, develop an effective habitat management strategy for these species, and to improve outreach and education by providing information to local government and nongovernmental organizations to improve ongoing programs.

International Trade in Coral Reef Species: Impacts, Management and Policy Options: Two representatives each from the U.S. Scientific Authority and the U.S. Management Authority attended this workshop, which was held in Washington, D.C. 18-19 May 2009, and organized by the Environmental Defense Fund, the U.S. Agency for International Development, and Kingfisher Foundation. This workshop considered ecological and socioeconomic impacts of the coral reef species trade, and assessed the current levels of U.S. consumption and the U.S. role in the aquarium, curio, and jewelry trade. The workshop was part of the International Marine Conservation Congress.

8th International Symposium: Cephalopods - Present and Past: As part of a special session on the chambered nautilus at this cephalopod experts meeting held in Dijon, France, 30 August – 3 September 2010, the U.S. Scientific Authority presented the results of a status review on the extant cephalopod genera *Allonautilus* and *Nautilus*, entitled Nautilid Conservation and International Trade. The presentation summarized the process used by the USFWS to review taxa for listing consideration within the CITES Appendices, including a presentation of U.S. trade data in nautilus, the initial results of the USFWS’s review and the challenges to understanding the impact of international trade on these taxa, and activities being undertaken to continue gathering information and monitoring the taxa.

Friends of the Cephalopods meeting: The U.S. Scientific Authority presented the results of the USFWS’s assessment of *Nautilus* and *Allonautilus* species as part of this meeting held in Denver,

Colorado, on 2 November 2010. Attendees of this meeting represented mostly U.S.-based scientists and researchers involved in cephalopod studies. The meeting represented the ongoing efforts of the USFWS to address knowledge gaps regarding the status, conservation, and management of *Nautilus* and *Allonautilus* species in order to understand the impact of their international trade.

#### **D4. Communication, information management and exchange**

U.S. CITES website: The USFWS continues to review information on its international affairs website (<http://www.fws.gov/international>). The site contains a page summarizing the CITES treaty, and includes CITES Fact Sheets, copies of recent U.S. CITES biennial reports, copies of recent CITES Updates, and links to the CITES Secretariat's website. It also contains web pages on CITES timber, queen conch, American ginseng, and trade in Appendix-III species. Several Fact Sheets focused on CITES issues have been added including "Musical Instruments - Musicians and Manufacturers Information " (<http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/muscinstrmn.pdf>), and others have been updated. The USFWS is working on improving its U.S. permits website (<http://www.fws.gov/permits>), which includes information on permits issued under CITES and other U.S. domestic conservation laws. Additionally, a chart detailing U.S. regulation of crocodylians listed under CITES and the U.S. Endangered Species Act has been posted to the website.

Increased U.S. CITES presence using web-based and mobile platforms: In 2010, the USFWS launched a Facebook page, as well as a Flickr page, a You Tube channel, a Twitter feed, and creature feature text messages. Information about CITES and about CITES-listed animal and plant species of interest are relayed through these social media platforms.

U.S. hosts North American Regional CITES Meeting: In February 2010, the United States hosted a North American Regional meeting at the USFWS National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, to discuss issues on the agenda for CoP15. Delegations from Canada, Mexico, and the United States participated, discussed negotiating positions on CoP15 agenda items and established consensus regional positions where possible.

#### **D5. Permitting and registration procedures**

CITES permit applications handled during 2009 and 2010: The USFWS Division of Management Authority (the U.S. CITES Management Authority) is responsible for the review and arbitration of all permit applications involved in the international movement of CITES-listed species. Through the Division of Management Authority's Branch of Permits, along with some permitting responsibilities delegated to USFWS Law Enforcement regional offices and ports, over 23,600 CITES applications were received during 2009. Likewise, in 2010, over 19,800 CITES applications were received. In each year, over 26,000 telephone calls, e-mails, and faxes relating to CITES permitting questions were handled by the Division of Management Authority, along with countless calls and e-mails sent directly to Law Enforcement regional offices and ports. Along with work involving other permitting processes under additional domestic legislation, such as the U.S. Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Division of Management Authority is actively involved in disseminating outreach materials, producing fact sheets, holding public meetings, and fine-tuning the permitting process within the United States.

During the reporting period, the Division of Management Authority, in an effort to provide better customer service, continued to develop different applications specifically designed to address particular import/export activities. By establishing different applications, applicants respond to

specific questions related to the activities for which they are requesting authorization. The responses to these questions allow the Division of Management Authority and the Division of Scientific Authority (the U.S. CITES Scientific Authority) to make the required findings under the U.S. regulations that implement CITES. The establishment of these application types ensures that applicants respond to the proper questions and minimizes the need to go back to an applicant for additional information during the review process carried out by the Division of Management Authority.

A large portion of the applications received during the reporting period related to the export or re-export of commercially traded Appendix-II specimens. Since the United States is one of the largest wildlife-trading countries, with a large number of captive breeding facilities producing a vast number of birds, reptiles, and mammals, the Division of Management Authority must dedicate a large portion of its permitting staff to the processing of such applications. The bulk of CITES import permits issued by the Division of Management Authority are for the import of sport-hunted trophies from Southern Africa. However, the smaller number of Appendix-I import and export applications also capture a significant portion of the Division of Management Authority's time. Such applications require more in-depth analysis, consultation with foreign Management Authorities, and communication with both applicants and species experts. This is particularly true when these Appendix-I species are also covered by other U.S. domestic laws with their own issuance requirements. An excellent example of this is the giant panda (*Ailuropoda melanoleuca*). The need to make findings both under CITES and the U.S. Endangered Species Act increases the time and resources required.

International cooperation: In an effort to ensure that the United States is issuing permits and certificates under CITES in a consistent manner and fulfilling its permitting requirements, the Division of Management Authority works closely with other CITES Management Authorities. This close coordination, carried out through the Branch of Permits, allows the Division of Management Authority to identify concerns and problems before CITES documents are issued. Such coordination ranges from informing another Management Authority what documents the Division of Management Authority has issued, to discussions of how and when documents can be issued.

One example of this coordination is the work the Division of Management Authority carried out during 2009-2010, and continues to carry out, with the Japanese Management Authority. Under current Japanese regulations, a domestic import permit must be issued for all imports of wildlife, and confirmation that a valid CITES export permit was issued must be made prior to issuing the domestic import permit. In an effort to assist Japan, the Division of Management Authority provides the Japanese Management Authority with a monthly report of all wildlife export permits and certificates that the United States issued during that month that identify Japan as the country of import.

State coordination: During the reporting period, as part of the requirement to determine legal acquisition of specimens, the Division of Management Authority continued to consult with U.S. State wildlife management agencies regarding legal take of CITES-listed species. Such consultation also ensures that any permit issued will not conflict with State programs. For American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*), for example, the Division of Management Authority ensures that permit conditions on U.S. Federal permits comply with State regulations for take, introduction, transportation, and management. The Division of Management Authority's coordination with the States also extends to providing State wildlife agencies copies of permits that the Division of Management Authority has issued to their residents. This allows the State wildlife agencies to better understand what wildlife trade is occurring within their States. Both the Division of Management Authority and the State wildlife agencies benefit from the maintenance of strong communication channels.



## D6. Capacity building

United States participates in Masters Course module on plant trade: The United States continues to participate in the annual International University of Andalucia's Master's Course on "Management, Access, Conservation and Trade of Species: The International Framework." The USFWS provides instructors to participate in the modules on Introduction and implementation of CITES and the scientific aspects of CITES-related to plant species.

Free trade agreements: The United States continues to build capacity and strengthen efforts to implement CITES obligations through Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and other international partnership programs. The U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI), International Technical Assistance Program (ITAP), in consultation with the USFWS, currently operates CITES capacity-building and training programs for the signatory countries of the Central America-Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR) and for several countries in the Middle East and North Africa. Both programs are funded by the U.S. Department of State. A sample of recent, ongoing, and/or planned projects include:

### *Central America*

#### *Costa Rica*

- Assisted in updating CITES legal framework to conform with current resolutions.
- Provided computer and audiovisual equipment to the CITES authorities to strengthen management of their offices and to allow for a web-based system for CITES permit control and issuance on a national level.
- Provided resources for a national outreach campaign for wildlife protection, including displays at major airports, ports, and border crossings.

#### *Dominican Republic*

- In coordination with SEMARENA (the CITES Management and Scientific Authorities of the Dominican Republic), convened a CITES workshop for agricultural inspectors, CITES officials and SEMARENA regional directors on the operational and legal aspects of CITES. Also supported regional workshops for environmental police, public ministry and customs officials, agricultural inspectors, SEMARENA, and the public prosecutors' office.
- Supported the planning of a series of seizure operations by SEMARENA at points of sale for hawksbill turtle products; 4,300 products were seized and hundreds of stores were inspected.
- Supported and conducted a series of biological monitoring capacity-building activities for the Hispaniolian parrot (*Amazona ventralis*).

#### *El Salvador*

- In a partnership with El Salvador's Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of the Environment, and the CITES Secretariat, provided assistance to strengthen El Salvador's CITES legal framework, initiate a CITES Legislative Plan, and complete a review of wildlife trade sanctions and penalties. Numerous activities and steps in El Salvador were undertaken as part of this process, including drafting and publication of new CITES implementing regulations, development of a model municipal wildlife ordinance and an inter-office "Wildlife Seizure Coordination Agreement," and the institution of regular CITES coordination meetings.

- Supported a series of one-day workshops on the legal/technical aspects of CITES for key police, customs, forestry, and municipal environmental officials in each of El Salvador's 14 Departments, involving training for 400 officials.
- Provided technical and legal advice to national CITES authorities on the development of coordination mechanisms, training, technical guidelines for preparation of a species identification manual, and development of a plan of action covering marine turtle protection.
- Supported a study tour of Mexico's implementation of CITES by administrative, scientific and enforcement authorities of El Salvador, supported by regular follow-up meetings among the three groups of officials.
- In collaboration with the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), supported a participatory stakeholder process for the development of a Marine Turtle Action Plan with the inclusion of all three regions of the country.

#### *Guatemala*

- In collaboration with Guatemala's CITES Management Authority, supported the development of identification fact sheets for *Tillandsia* species.
- In collaboration with CONAP (the CITES Management and Scientific Authorities of Guatemala), developed species identification fact sheets distributed to customs officials at land and sea ports.
- Supported efforts by CONAP and the Ministry of Governance to organize national workshops for police officials on CITES legal and operational issues. A series of workshops directed at law enforcement officials, including customs, prosecutors, and judges were held, using the DOI-CITES Secretariat interactive CITES curriculum; all training was conducted by Guatemalan Management Authority officials.
- Supported the development of outreach and educational materials on Appendix-I *Tapirus* conservation.
- Purchased professional photography equipment for CITES authorities to enable the development of a photographic archive of national wildlife species.
- Support for the biological monitoring of bromeliads in the priority conservation regions of Guatemala in order to support management decisions on export to the United States.
- Supported the improved management and protection of the Maya Biosphere Reserve in collaboration with the Wildlife Conservation Society and Asociación Balam with a particular focus on jaguar protection.

#### *Honduras*

- Provided assistance in updating the 2004 CITES Ministerial Order and assisted in ensuring that the requirements conform with the Law on Forestry, Protected Areas, and Wildlife adopted in 2008.
- With respective CITES authorities, assisted in the design and implementation of Psittacidae species monitoring program in the Honduran Mosquitia Protected Area, based on a similar effort in Nicaragua.
- With the Honduran CITES authorities, organized a two-day workshop for national officials on implementation and enforcement of the Convention.
- Assisted in the design and implementation of an on-line system for improving the management of CITES permit applications.

#### *Nicaragua*

- Assisted in updating Nicaragua's 1998 CITES Executive Order to conform with current CITES resolutions.
- Advised on systems components and equipment purchase for an information management system for CITES document registration program.
- Provided technical assistance to the Nicaraguan CITES Management Authority to revise the existing database of records of import, export, and re-export of CITES-listed species for 1998-2010.
- Provided support to MARENA (the CITES Management and Scientific Authorities of Nicaragua) to implement a national plan to control illegal wildlife trade in Nicaragua, focused on areas with higher incidences of such activity.
- Provided support to MARENA and the Public Ministry to execute a national capacity-building workshop on the enforcement of environmental laws, including CITES.
- In collaboration with Nicaragua's CITES authorities and Humane Society International, supported CITES workshops on implementation, animal handling, and disposal and placement of confiscated wildlife.
- Provided resources and technical assistance to the Management Authority to improve an on-line CITES permits system to create and print documents.
- Supported a feasibility study on community-based poison arrow frog ranching project.

#### *Regional*

- Provided assistance to the CITES Secretariat in the development of an interactive electronic CITES curriculum and other tools specifically for CAFTA-DR countries' use.
- Provided support to the Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo (CCAD) to consolidate a list of CITES-listed fauna for the region and to ensure that Appendix-III species are listed in conformance with Resolution Conf. 9.25 (Rev. CoP15).
- Provided project assistance on the economic valuation of CITES trade in each CAFTA-DR country in order to justify increased spending for implementing offices.
- In partnership with academic institutions and nongovernmental organizations, undertook a regional assessment of the conservation status, exploitation, and trade in native iguana species (*Ctenosaura* and *Iguana* spp.) and produced a photographic identification guide for these species.
- In partnership with TRAFFIC and CCAD, assisted in the development of a Central America Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) in collaboration with the USFWS, U.S. Department of Justice, CITES Secretariat, and INTERPOL. The WEN, authorized in a September 2010 Memorandum of Understanding among the CAFTA-DR signatory States, will improve the coordination, cooperation, and enforcement capacity between agencies and countries.
- Strengthened the scientific implementation of CITES through non-detriment finding (NDF) workshops in collaboration with the USFWS, NMFS, and the CITES Secretariat. The first regional workshop for 40 participants was held in the Dominican Republic. Expert contributions were also provided by IUCN, CORALINA (Columbia), CONABIO (Mexico), TRAFFIC and CCAD. The workshop report can be found at <http://www.sica.int/ccad/DENP.aspx>.

#### *Bi-National*

- In cooperation with CCAD and the CITES Secretariat, provided assistance in updating the Costa Rica-Nicaragua bi-national CITES operations manual addressing legal and operational aspects of implementing and enforcing the Convention.
- In coordination with the CITES authorities of Costa Rica and Nicaragua, organized a capacity-building workshop in Nicaragua for national officials responsible for customs,

agricultural quarantine, and environmental management and protection in the border region. The workshop utilized an interactive CD curriculum developed by the CITES Secretariat to integrate procedures and regulations of each country.

- In cooperation with Zootropic and the Bay Islands Foundation, assisted the CITES authorities of Guatemala and Honduras in the preparation of the CITES Appendix-II listing proposal for four species of spiny-tailed iguanas (*Ctenosaura*) at CoP15. This effort included a training workshop and community outreach and stakeholder participation efforts.

#### *Middle East and North Africa*

- ITAP conducted a one-week workshop in Morocco for approximately 30 CITES Scientific Authority representatives from throughout the Middle East and North Africa. The training was delivered by the capacity-building unit of the CITES Secretariat and the USFWS Division of Scientific Authority. Workshop topics included: functions of the Scientific Authority; production systems; conducting non-detriment findings; setting quotas; significant trade review; and CITES listing criteria. Training materials were translated into Arabic and made widely available to Arabic speakers through the CITES Secretariat.
- ITAP hosted a Conservation Fellow from Oman to work on conservation of CITES-listed species and to learn about how the United States implements the Convention.

#### International capacity building on CITES non-detriment findings:

*African and Asia Regions* - A representative from the U.S. Scientific Authority participated in a four-day capacity building workshop for Scientific Authorities in the CITES regions of Africa and Asia. The workshop, funded by the U.S. Department of State and organized by DOI-ITAP, was led by the Chief of the Capacity Building Unit for the CITES Secretariat. The workshop was held 27-30 October 2009, in Rabat, Morocco, and included 23 participants representing 11 countries in the Middle East and North Africa. Participants heard presentations on and discussed the functions of CITES Scientific Authorities, including making non-detriment findings, setting trade quotas, species assessments for listing and de-listing, monitoring trade flow and data analysis, participating in CITES Plants and Animals Committees, and scientific collaboration on shared species.

*Central America and the Caribbean Region* - This non-detriment finding workshop was held in Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic, in November 2010, and focused on issues relevant to Central America and the Caribbean. The United States, represented by the Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, served as a member of the workshop's Steering Committee. A staff biologist from the U.S. Scientific Authority prepared and presented a talk on U.S. perspectives and procedures regarding the preparation of non-detriment findings. A total of 43 participants from 12 countries attended the 3-day workshop.

U.S. provides funding for and participates in ivory workshop: At CoP15, the United States, China, Thailand, and the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group discussed ways that CITES Parties might collaborate to reduce elephant poaching and illegal ivory trade. As a result of those discussions, in November 2010 China hosted the first Technical Exchange Meeting between Producing, Consuming and Transiting Nations to Reduce the Illegal Trade in African Elephant Ivory in Hangzhou. This meeting was primarily funded by the USFWS through a grant to the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group, and the USFWS participated in the meeting. Other participants included the Democratic Republic of Congo, Tanzania, Thailand, TRAFFIC, and CITES MIKE (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants). The meeting focused on activities related to outreach and education, and not on law enforcement-related work, as several other efforts were already

targeting enforcement-related activities. The participants identified a large suite of recommendations and specific actors to carry these recommendations out, including outreach and education efforts in producer, consumer, and transit countries.

Multinational Species Conservation Funds: The Multinational Species Conservation Funds consist of six programs created to fulfill direct congressional mandates to conserve populations of and habitats for neotropical migratory birds, African and Asian elephants, great apes, rhinoceroses, tigers, and marine turtles. Five of these programs involve CITES-listed species: the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1989, Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997, Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000, and Marine Turtles Conservation Act of 2004. These programs provide direct support to range countries through broad-based partnerships with national governments, NGOs, and other private entities for on-the-ground activities to conserve these species and their habitats. The USFWS administers the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. During the period from January 2009 through December 2010, the USFWS granted a total of 16,903,856 USD for various international projects focused on the conservation of African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, great apes, and marine turtles. Listed below is a breakdown of the funding by grant program:

African elephant:	61 projects totalling 4,526,961 USD in funding
Asian elephant:	42 projects totalling 2,030,574 USD in funding
Rhinoceros & tiger:	87 projects totalling 4,543,466 USD in funding
Great ape:	57 projects totalling 4,771,062 USD in funding
Marine turtles:	22 projects totalling 1,031,793 USD in funding

#### **D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives**

U.S. CITES Export Tagging Program: The United States cooperates with its States and Indian Tribes and Nations in utilizing a tagging program for the export of skins of the following Appendix-II species: bobcat (*Lynx rufus*); river otter (*Lontra canadensis*); Alaskan lynx (*Lynx canadensis*); Alaskan wolf (*Canis lupus*); Alaskan brown bear (*Ursus arctos*); and American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*). The USFWS initiated this program over 30 years ago to streamline the USFWS's CITES permit issuance process for the export of skins of these species. The USFWS currently cooperates with 47 States and 21 Indian Tribes/Nations that have instituted approved harvest programs. The USFWS approves a State or Indian Tribe/Nation for inclusion in the CITES Export Tagging Program when it can make the two CITES findings based on that State's or Tribe/Nation's harvest program and enforcement regime. Each approved State or Tribe/Nation applies CITES tags, provided by the USFWS, to new skins of approved species taken in that State or Tribe/Nation and intended for export from the United States. The tags serve as evidence that the skins were legally taken and that their export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species.

During 2009, the USFWS issued over 733,000 tags, and during 2010, the USFWS issued nearly 647,000 tags. During the reporting period, the USFWS approved into the program 10 Indian Tribe/Nations for exports of bobcat and river otter.

U.S. CITES American ginseng export program: In implementing the CITES Appendix-II listing of American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*), the USFWS works closely with other Federal agencies and the 25 States that have approved American ginseng export programs. The State natural resource and agricultural agencies are responsible for managing this species on State and private lands within their jurisdiction. The U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service manage the species on Federal lands. Subsequently, the USFWS relies on those State and Federal agencies to provide information on

legal and illegal harvest of American ginseng, the status of the species in the wild, and population trends. Using the information received annually from the States, the USFWS is able to make State-wide legal acquisition and non-detriment findings. This approach allows the USFWS to streamline its evaluation of CITES permit applications to export American ginseng roots from the United States. During the reporting period, the USFWS regularly communicated with the States on issues related to American ginseng, including revision of State ginseng management regulations and administrative changes to the State programs.

American ginseng meetings: From 24 February to 26 February 2009, the USFWS hosted a meeting with U.S. State ginseng program coordinators, other Federal agencies, ginseng researchers, industry representatives, and the general public. The first day of the meeting was open to the public and included a half-day symposium on recent research findings on American ginseng by Federal and academic researchers, and presentations by industry representatives. Following the presentations, the USFWS held a public meeting to hear from people involved in American ginseng harvest and trade, and to obtain current information on the status and conservation of American ginseng. The subsequent day-and-a-half was a closed meeting with State and Federal agency personnel. Presentations from the symposium are posted on the USFWS website at: [http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA\\_DSA/plants/ginseng.html](http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA_DSA/plants/ginseng.html).

CITES Plant Rescue Center Program: The USFWS established the CITES Plant Rescue Center Program in 1978 in response to the need to care for live CITES-listed plants legally abandoned (voluntary action by the importer) or forfeited (specimens taken from the U.S. importer after completion of judicial procedures) to the U.S. Government due to non-compliance with the import/export requirements of the Convention. The USFWS administers this program in cooperation with APHIS, the U.S. inspection agency for live CITES-listed plants entering the United States. Currently, 83 institutions cooperate as volunteer plant rescue centers. All of the cooperating rescue centers are public botanical gardens, arboreta, zoological parks, or research institutions, and are either government entities or governmentally or privately funded non-profit entities.

During 2009, APHIS confiscated 142 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 3,272 plants and 23 seeds, plus an additional gram of seeds. Of these 142 shipments, 137 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 2,132 orchids, 580 galanthus, 389 cacti, 93 euphorbias, 30 cyclamens, 18 aloes, and 14 plants of other taxa; plus 14 aloe seeds and an additional gram of aloe seeds.

During 2010, APHIS confiscated 89 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 7,554 plants and 3 grams of seeds. Of these 89 shipments, 87 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 4,908 carnivorous plants, 1,267 orchids, 695 aloes, 532 cacti, 133 euphorbias, and 15 cycads; plus 3 grams of cactus seeds.

Expanded cooperation between CITES and ITTO: The United States continued to provide support for effective implementation of CITES requirements for listed tree species through the ongoing ITTO-CITES Work Program. The Program supports work in all three tropical regions. The current work includes support to enhance CITES implementation for listed taxa, including *Gonystylus* spp., *Aquilaria* spp., *Pericopsis elata*, *Swietenia macrophylla*, and *Cedrela odorata*.

Medicinal Plant Working Group: The U.S. Scientific Authority remained chair of the Medicinal Plant Working Group (MPWG), a federal/non-federal collaboration that encourages the conservation and sustainable use of medicinal plants. In 2009 and 2010, the MPWG continued to work with national

and international organizations to provide outreach on CITES-listed medicinal plants. Botanists from the U.S. Scientific Authority co-authored “Medicinal Plants Discussed at the 15th Meeting of CITES,” published in the American Botanical Council’s peer-reviewed, quarterly journal *HerbalGram* 7(5) May 2010, to increase public awareness and professional knowledge about medicinal herbs and CITES.

The MPWG continued its collaboration with the U.S. Forest Service in a long-term inventory and monitoring project for the non-CITES medicinal plant black cohosh (*Actaea cimicifuga*), a species that is wild-harvested from public lands and traded internationally but for which there is insufficient information to indicate that such trade is a conservation concern. This scientist-led research uses citizen volunteers to collect field data that will assist in understanding the impact of harvest on this species. Information on these monitoring projects is available at: [www.nps.gov/plants/medicinal/projects/index.htm](http://www.nps.gov/plants/medicinal/projects/index.htm).

The MPWG Chair also attended the annual Appalachian Center for Ethnobotanical Studies Symposium (June 2009, Maryland), where the U.S. Forest Service science leader for the MPWG black cohosh field project gave a presentation.

USFWS pollinator work group: The U.S. Scientific Authority remained engaged in pollinator conservation through ongoing collaboration with the Pollinator Partnership (formerly the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign-NAPPC), an international consortium of individuals, government agencies, and organizations who work together to protect and promote pollinators in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. In addition to working internationally to promote pollinator awareness and conservation, the U.S. Scientific Authority worked with other USFWS programs to conduct and highlight activities that demonstrate the USFWS’s ongoing commitment to the conservation of pollinators, plants, and their habitat, including providing information on CITES-listed species featured in the 2009 Pollinator poster for the USFWS Pollinator web portal ([www.fws.gov/pollinators/PollinatorPages/poster\\_species.html](http://www.fws.gov/pollinators/PollinatorPages/poster_species.html)), as well as participation in a pollinator briefing for the USFWS’s newly appointed Science Advisor.

African Wildlife Consultative Forums: The U.S. Management and Scientific Authorities participated in the 8th African Wildlife Consultative Forum in Mangochi, Malawi, 15-20 November 2009, as well as the 9th Forum in Victoria Falls, Zimbabwe, 8-13 November 2010. The Forum, held annually in one of the southern African countries, is a venue for the Directors of various national wildlife agencies to gather to discuss wildlife issues of mutual interest and concern. The U.S. Management and Scientific Authorities gave presentations on USFWS policies and procedures that affect wildlife in southern Africa, particularly concerning imports of sport-hunted trophies of CITES-listed species.

Trilateral: The CITES Table did not participate in person in the 2009 or the 2010 annual meetings of the Canada/Mexico/U.S. Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management, held in Miami, Florida, and Halifax, Nova Scotia, respectively. At each of the meetings, a representative of the CITES Table presented the Table’s annual report to the Executive Table. Much of the work of the CITES Table focuses on regional coordination in preparation for CITES meetings.

Canada hosted a meeting of the CITES Table in Montreal, Canada, in November 2010. The participants discussed a number of shared issues, including CITES and marine issues and climate change. [Note: *The report of outcomes from this meeting was presented in the CITES Table’s report to the 2011 annual Trilateral Meeting, held in Oaxaca, Mexico, in May 2011.*]

U.S. CITES delegation visit to China: As part of the U.S.-China Nature Conservation protocol, the People's republic of China hosted a delegation of U.S. CITES officials in May 2009, and travelled with them to several cities to meet with the Chinese CITES Management and Scientific Authorities in Beijing, Kunming, Guangzhou, and with inspection station personnel in Mengla at the border with Laos. The official visit afforded an opportunity for the People's Republic of China to demonstrate its CITES inspection procedures and facilities, and discuss training in CITES implementation, inspection, enforcement, and capacity building with its U.S. counterparts.