

Implementation report format

The format below follows the structure of the *CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2020* and aims to collect information to enable the Strategic Vision indicators to be implemented.

CITES vision statement

Conserve biodiversity and contribute to its sustainable use by ensuring that no species of wild fauna or flora becomes or remains subject to unsustainable exploitation through international trade, thereby contributing to the significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss and making a significant contribution towards achieving the relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets.

Article VIII, paragraph 7 (b), of the Convention requires each Party to submit to the CITES Secretariat a report on legislative, regulatory and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of the Convention.

The report format allows Parties to present information in a standard manner, so that it can be easily collated, with three main objectives:

- i) To enable monitoring of the implementation and effectiveness of the Convention;
- ii) To facilitate the identification of major achievements, significant developments, or trends, gaps or problems and possible solutions; and
- iii) Provide a basis for substantive and procedural decision-making by the Conference of the Parties and various subsidiary bodies.

Information on the nature and extent of CITES trade should be incorporated into the annual report [Article VIII paragraph 7 (a)], whereas the report provided under Article VIII paragraph 7 (b) should focus on measures taken to implement the Convention.

The report should cover the period indicated in [Resolution Conf. 11.17 \(Rev. CoP16\)](#) which urges that the report should be submitted to the Secretariat one year before each meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP). The reason for setting the report to be due a year in advance of the following CoP is to allow information to be collated so it can be considered by the Standing Committee in advance of CoP, and enable publication of the Strategic Vision indicators in advance of CoP.

Reports should be prepared in one of the three working languages of the Convention (English, French, Spanish).

Parties are *strongly* encouraged to prepare and submit their reports in electronic form. This will facilitate timely integration of information from Parties into publication of the Strategic Vision Indicators. If reports are only provided in hard copy, resources will be needed at the Secretariat to make an electronic copy, and this is not good use of Secretariat resources.

The completed report should be sent to:

CITES Secretariat
International Environment House
Chemin des Anémones 11-13
CH-1219 Châtelaine-Geneva
Switzerland

Email: info@cites.org
Tel: +41-(0)22-917-81-39/40
Fax: +41-(0)22-797-34-17

If a Party requires further guidance on completing their report, please contact the CITES Secretariat at the address above.

Party	SAMOA
Period covered in this report	1 January 2015 – 31 December 2017
Department or agency preparing this report	Ministry of Natural Resources & Environment (MNRE)
Contributing departments, agencies and organizations	Ministry of Foreign Affairs & Trade (MFAT) Ministry of Agriculture & Fisheries (MAF) Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP).

GOAL 1 ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH AND IMPLEMENTATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF THE CONVENTION

Objective 1.1 Parties comply with their obligations under the Convention through appropriate policies, legislation and procedures.
All Aichi Targets relevant to CITES, particularly Aichi Target 2, Target 6, Target 9, Target 12, Target 17 and Target 18.

Indicator 1.1.1: The number of Parties that are in category 1 under the national legislation project.

1.1.1a	Have any CITES relevant policies or legislation been developed during the period covered in this report? Yes ☒ No ☐ If 'Yes', have you shared information with the Secretariat? Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐ If 'No', please provide details to the Secretariat with this report:
1.1.1b	Does your legislation or legislative process allow easy amendment of your national law(s) to reflect changes in the CITES Appendices (e.g. to meet the 90 day implementation guidelines)? Yes ☒ No ☐ If 'No', please provide details of the constraints faced:

Objective 1.2 Parties have in place administrative procedures that are transparent, practical, coherent and user-friendly, and reduce unnecessary administrative burdens.
Aichi Target 3.

Indicator 1.2.1: The number of Parties that have adopted standard transparent procedures for the timely issuance of permits in accordance with Article VI of the Convention.

		Yes	No	No information
1.2.1a	Do you have standard operating procedures for application for and issuance of permits?	☒	☐	☐
	Are the procedures publicly available?	☐	☒	☐
1.2.1b	Do you have:			
	Electronic data management and a paper-based permit issuance system?	☒	☐	☐
	Electronic permit information exchange between Management Authorities of some countries If 'Yes', please list countries	☐	☒	☐
	Electronic permit information exchange to Management Authorities of all countries?	☐	☒	☐
	Electronic permit data exchange between Management Authorities and customs?	☐	☒	☐

Electronic permit used to cross border with electronic validation by customs?	☐	☒	☐
If 'Yes' to any of the above, please provide information on challenges faced or issues overcome:			
If 'No', do you have any plans to move towards e-permitting ¹ ?	☐	☐	☒
If you are planning to move towards e-permitting, please explain what might help you to do so:			

Indicator 1.2.2: The number of Parties making use of the simplified procedures provided for in [Resolution Conf. 12.3 \(Rev. CoP16\)](#).

1.2.2a	Has your country developed simplified procedures for any of the following?	Tick all applicable		
		Yes	No	No information
	Where biological samples of the type and size specified in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP16) are urgently required.	☐	☒	☐
	For the issuance of pre-Convention certificates or equivalent documents in accordance with Article VII , paragraph 2.	☐	☒	☐
	For the issuance of certificates of captive breeding or artificial propagation in accordance with Article VII , paragraph 5.	☐	☒	☐
	For the issuance of export permits or re-export certificates in accordance with Article IV for specimens referred to in Article VII , paragraph 4.	☐	☒	☐
	Are there other cases judged by a Management Authority to merit the use of simplified procedures? If 'Yes', please provide details:	☐	☒	☐

Objective 1.3 Implementation of the Convention at the national level is consistent with decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties.
All Aichi targets relevant to CITES, particularly Target 9, Target 14 and Target 18.

Indicator 1.3.1: The number of Parties that have implemented relevant reporting under Resolutions and Decisions of the Conference of the Parties and/or Standing Committee recommendations.

1.3.1a	Has your country responded to all relevant special reporting requirements that are active during the period covered in this report, including those in the Resolutions and Decisions of the Conference of the Parties, Standing Committee recommendations, and Notifications issued by the Secretariat (see link to location on the CITES website where the reporting requirements are listed)? Responses provided to ALL relevant reporting requirements ☐ Responses provided to SOME of the relevant reporting requirements ☒ Responses provided to NONE of the relevant reporting requirements ☐ No special reporting requirements applicable ☐
1.3.1b	Were any difficulties encountered during the period covered in this report in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties? Yes ☐ No ☒ If 'Yes', please provide details of which Resolution(s) or Decision(s), and, for each, what difficulties were / are being encountered?

¹ e-permitting refers to the electronic (paperless) management of the permit business process, including permit application, Management Authority – Scientific Authority consultations, permit issuance, notification to customs and reporting.

Objective 1.4 The Appendices correctly reflect the conservation needs of species.

Aichi Target 1, Target 12, Target 14 and Target 19.

1.4.1: The number and proportion of species that have been found to meet the criteria contained in Resolution Conf. 9.24 or its successors. This includes both the periodic review and amendment proposals.

1.4.1a	Have you undertaken any reviews of whether species would benefit from listing on the CITES Appendices? Yes ☒ No ☐ If 'Yes', please provide a summary here, or a link to the report of the work (or a copy of that report to the Secretariat if the work is not available online): Review of Proposals for listing of: 1) Silky shark (<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>) by Maldives 2) Mobula rays (<i>Mobula</i> sp.) by Fiji 3) Thresher shark (<i>Alopias</i> sp.) by Sri Lanka
--------	---

Objective 1.5 Best available scientific information is the basis for non-detriment findings.

Aichi Target 2, Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 9, Target 12 and Target 14.

Indicator 1.5.1: The number of surveys, studies or other analyses undertaken by exporting countries based on the sources of information cited in Resolution Conf. 16.7 on Non-detriment findings related to:

- a) the population status of Appendix-II species;
- b) the trends and impact of trade upon Appendix-II species; and
- c) the status of and trend in naturally-occurring Appendix I species and the impact of any recovery plans.

1.5.1a	Have any surveys, studies or other analyses been undertaken <u>in your country</u> in relation to:	Yes	No	Not Applicable	If Yes, How many?
	- the population status of Appendix II species?	☐	☒	☐	☐
	- the trends and impact of trade on Appendix II species?	☐	☒	☐	☐
	- the status of and trend in naturally-occurring Appendix I species?	☒	☐	☐	3
	- the impact of any recovery plans on Appendix I species?	☐	☒	☐	☐
	Have the surveys, studies or analyses integrated relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities?	☒	☐	☐	☐

	If there are such studies that you are willing to share, please provide: Species name (scientific) A brief summary of the results of the survey, study or other analysis (e.g. population status, decline / stable / increase, off-take levels etc), or provide links to published reference material.																					
1.5.1b	How are the results of such surveys, studies or other analyses used in making non-detriment findings (NDFs)? Please tick all that apply Revised harvest or export quotas ☐ Banning export ☐ Stricter domestic measures ☐ Changed management of the species ☐ Discussion with Management Authorities ☐ Discussion with other stakeholders? ☐ Other (please provide a short summary):																					
1.5.1c	Do you have specific conservation measures or recovery plans for naturally occurring Appendix-I listed species? Yes ☒ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐ No information ☐ If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary, including, if possible, an evaluation of their impact: Conservation measures are included in our National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP) 2015 – 2020 and National Environment Sector Plan 2017 – 2021 (NESP)																					
1.5.1d	Have you published any non-detriment findings that can be shared? Yes ☐ No ☒ If 'Yes', please provide links or examples to the Secretariat within this report:																					
1.5.1e	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th>Which of the following (A to F of paragraph a) x) of Resolution Conf. 16.7 do you use in making non-detriment findings?</th> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A. relevant scientific literature concerning species biology, life history, distribution and population trends.</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B. details of any ecological risk assessments conducted.</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest locations and at sites protected from harvest and other impacts.</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D. relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities.</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>E. consultations with relevant local, regional and international experts.</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F. national and international trade information such as that available via the CITES trade database maintained by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), publications on trade, local knowledge on trade and investigations of sales at markets or through the Internet for example.</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Which of the following (A to F of paragraph a) x) of Resolution Conf. 16.7 do you use in making non-detriment findings?	Yes	No	A. relevant scientific literature concerning species biology, life history, distribution and population trends.	☐	☐	B. details of any ecological risk assessments conducted.	☐	☐	C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest locations and at sites protected from harvest and other impacts.	☐	☐	D. relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities.	☐	☐	E. consultations with relevant local, regional and international experts.	☐	☐	F. national and international trade information such as that available via the CITES trade database maintained by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), publications on trade, local knowledge on trade and investigations of sales at markets or through the Internet for example.	☐	☐
Which of the following (A to F of paragraph a) x) of Resolution Conf. 16.7 do you use in making non-detriment findings?	Yes	No																				
A. relevant scientific literature concerning species biology, life history, distribution and population trends.	☐	☐																				
B. details of any ecological risk assessments conducted.	☐	☐																				
C. scientific surveys conducted at harvest locations and at sites protected from harvest and other impacts.	☐	☐																				
D. relevant knowledge and expertise of local and indigenous communities.	☐	☐																				
E. consultations with relevant local, regional and international experts.	☐	☐																				
F. national and international trade information such as that available via the CITES trade database maintained by UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), publications on trade, local knowledge on trade and investigations of sales at markets or through the Internet for example.	☐	☐																				

Indicator 1.5.2: The number of Parties that have adopted standard procedures for making non-detriment findings.

1.5.2a	Do you have standard procedures for making non-detriment findings in line with Resolution Conf. 16.7? Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐ If 'Yes', please briefly describe your procedures for making non-detriment findings, or attach as an annex to this report, or provide a link to where the information can be found on the internet:
1.5.2b	When establishing non-detriment findings, have any of the following guidance been used? Please tick all that apply Virtual College ☐ IUCN Checklist ☐ Resolution Conf. 16.7 ☐ 2008 NDF workshop ☐ Species specific guidance ☐ Other ☐ If 'Other' or 'Species specific guidance', please specify details:
1.5.2c	How often do you review and/or change your non-detriment findings? Case by case ☐ Annually ☐ Every two years ☐ Less frequently ☐ A mix of the above ☐ Please describe the circumstances under which non-detriment findings would be changed:

Indicator 1.5.3: The number and proportion of annual export quotas based on population surveys.

1.5.3a	Do you set annual export quotas? Yes ☐ No ☒ If 'Yes', do you set quotas based on population survey, or by other means? Please specify, for each species, how quotas are set: Species Name (scientific) Population Survey? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Other, please specify
1.5.3b	Have annual export quotas been set at levels which will ensure sustainable production and consumption? Yes ☐ No ☐ If 'Yes', please describe how this fits into your non-detriment finding process:

Objective 1.6 Parties cooperate in managing shared wildlife resources.
Aichi Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 10, Target 12 and Target 19.

Indicator 1.6.1: The number of bilateral and multilateral agreements that specifically provide for co-management of shared CITES listed species by range States.

1.6.1a	Is your country a signatory to any bilateral and/or multilateral agreements for co-management of shared species? Yes ☐ No ☒ If 'Yes', please provide brief details, including the names of the agreements, and which other countries are involved:
--------	---

Indicator 1.6.2: The number of cooperative management plans, including recovery plans, in place for shared populations of CITES-listed species.

1.6.2a	Do you have any cooperative management plans, including recovery plans, in place for shared populations of CITES-listed species? Yes ☒ No ☐ If 'Yes', please list the species for which these plans are in place and provide a link or reference to a published plan for each species. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 30%;">Species Name (scientific)</th> <th>Link or reference to a published plan</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Chelonia mydas</i></td> <td>https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i></td> <td>https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Dermochelys coriacea</i></td> <td>https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Physeter macrocephalus</i></td> <td>https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i></td> <td>https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Species Name (scientific)	Link or reference to a published plan	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf	<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf	<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf	<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf	<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf
Species Name (scientific)	Link or reference to a published plan													
<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf													
<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf													
<i>Dermochelys coriacea</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf													
<i>Physeter macrocephalus</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf													
<i>Megaptera novaeangliae</i>	https://www.sprep.org/attachments/Publications/Marine_Species_Programme_2013-2017.pdf													

Indicator 1.6.3: The number of workshops and other capacity-building activities that bring range States together to address the conservation and management needs of shared, CITES listed, species.

1.6.3a	Have the CITES authorities <i>received or benefited</i> from any of the following capacity-building activities provided by external sources? Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity. <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 35%;">Target group</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Oral or written advice/guidance</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Technical assistance</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Financial assistance</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Training</th> <th style="width: 10%;">Other (specify)</th> <th rowspan="2">What were the external sources¹?</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Staff of Management Authority</td> <td>☒</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> <td>SPREP,</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>						Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	What were the external sources ¹ ?	Staff of Management Authority	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	SPREP,
Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	What were the external sources ¹ ?														
Staff of Management Authority	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐		SPREP,													

¹ Please provide the names of Parties, and any non-Parties, involved.

	Staff of Scientific Authority	☒	☒	☒	☒	☐	SPREP, IUCN, NZ – DOC, Pew Charitable Trust, Paul G. Allen Philanthropies and the Global FinPrint Project, Australia Institute of Marine Science (AIMS), Commonwealth Australia
	Staff of enforcement authorities	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐	IUCN
	Traders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	NGOs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	SPREP, Samoa Conservation Society (SCS), Conservation International (CI),
	Public	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	SPREP and Pew Charitable Trust
	Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
1.6.3b	Have the CITES authorities been the <i>providers</i> of any of the following capacity-building activities to other range States?						
	Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity.						
	Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	Details
	Staff of Management Authority	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Staff of Scientific Authority	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Staff of enforcement authorities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Traders	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	NGOs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Public	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Other Parties/International meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Other (please specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
1.6.3c	In what ways do you collaborate with other CITES Parties?						
		Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Very Often	Always	Further detail / examples
	Information exchange	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
	Monitoring / survey	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Habitat management	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Species management	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
	Law enforcement	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
	Capacity building	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	
	Other (please provide details)						

Objective 1.7 Parties are enforcing the Convention to reduce illegal wildlife trade.
[Aichi Target 4](#), [Target 5](#), [Target 6](#), [Target 7](#), [Target 9](#), [Target 10](#), [Target 12](#) and [Target 19](#).

- Indicator 1.7.1: The number of Parties that have, are covered by, or engaged with:
- an international enforcement strategy and/or action plan;
 - formal international cooperation, such as an international enforcement network;
 - a national enforcement strategy and/or action plan; and
 - formal national interagency cooperation, such as a national interagency enforcement committee.

1.7.1a	Do you have, are you engaged in, or covered by:	Yes	No	No Information
	– an international enforcement strategy and/or action plan?	☐	☒	☐
	– formal international cooperation, such as an international enforcement network?	☐	☒	☐
	– a national enforcement strategy and/or action plan?	☐	☒	☐
	– formal national interagency cooperation, such as a national interagency enforcement committee?	☐	☒	☐
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please specify the level of engagement and provide additional details:			

- Indicator 1.7.2: The number of Parties with a process or mechanism for reviewing their enforcement strategies, and the activities taken to implement their strategies.

1.7.2a	Do you have a process or mechanism for reviewing your enforcement strategy(ies) and the activities taken to implement your strategy(ies)?	Yes	☐
		No, but review is under consideration	☐
		No	☒
		No information	☐
	If 'Yes', what do you do?		
	If 'Yes' or 'No, but review is under consideration', which tools do you find of value?		
1.7.2b	Have you used the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC) Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit, or equivalent tools?	Yes	☐
		No, but toolkit use is under consideration	☐
		No	☐
		No information	☒
	If 'Yes', please provide feedback on the parts of the toolkit used and how useful the toolkit or equivalent tools have been. Please specify improvements that could be made:		
	If 'No', please provide feedback on why not or what is needed to make the toolkit or equivalent tools useful to you:		

- Indicator 1.7.3: The number of Parties that have criminal (penal) law and procedures, capacity to use forensic technology, and capacity to use specialized investigation techniques, for investigating, prosecuting, and penalizing CITES offences..

1.7.3a	Do you have law and procedures in place for investigating, prosecuting, and penalizing CITES offences as a crime?	Yes	☐
		No	☒
		No information	☐
	If 'Yes', please provide the title of the legislation and a summary of the penalties available		
1.7.3b	Are criminal offences such as poaching and wildlife trafficking recognized as serious crime ¹ in your country?	Yes	☐
		No	☒

¹ The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines serious crime as conduct constituting an offence punishable by imprisonment for at least four years or a more serious penalty.

	No information ☐				
	If 'Yes', please explain what criteria must be met for poaching or wildlife trafficking offences to be treated as serious crimes:				
1.7.3c	Do you have capacity to use forensic technology ¹ to support the investigation of CITES offences?	Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐			
	If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary of any samples from CITES-listed species that were collected and submitted to an appropriate forensic analysis facility (located in your country and/or another country) during the period covered in this report: If 'Yes', and your country has an appropriate forensic analysis facility for CITES-listed species, please indicate which species it applies to:				
1.7.3d	Did your authorities participate in or initiate any multi-disciplinary ² law enforcement operation(s) targeting CITES-listed species during the period covered in this report?	Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐			
	If 'Yes', please provide a brief summary, including any lessons learned which might be helpful for other Parties:				
1.7.3e	Do you have a standard operating procedure among relevant agencies for submitting information related to CITES offences to INTERPOL and/or the World Customs Organization?	Yes ☐ No ☐ No information ☒			
1.7.3f	Do you have legislative provisions for any of the following that can be applied to the investigation, prosecution and/or sentencing of CITES offences as appropriate?	Yes	No	No information	If yes, how many times was this used during the period covered by this report?
	General crime ³	☐	☒	☐	
	Predicate offences ⁴	☐	☒	☐	
	Asset forfeiture ⁵	☐	☒	☐	
	Corruption ⁶	☐	☒	☐	
	International cooperation in criminal matters ⁷	☐	☒	☐	
	Organized crime ⁸	☐	☒	☐	
	Specialized investigation techniques ⁹	☐	☒	☐	
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please explain how each is used for CITES offences? Please provide a				

¹ Capacity to use forensic technology means the ability to collect, handle and submit samples from crime scenes involving CITES-listed species to an appropriate forensic analysis facility, located either in your country or in another country(ies).

² A multi-disciplinary law enforcement operation is one that involves officers from all relevant enforcement disciplines as appropriate, for example officers from Police, Customs and the wildlife regulatory authority. It could be either sub-national, national or international in scope.

³ General crime laws relate to offences such as fraud, conspiracy, possession of weapons, and other matters as set out in the national criminal code.

⁴ Article 2, paragraph (h) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines a predicate offence as an offence whose proceeds may become the subject of any of the money-laundering offences established under the Convention.

⁵ Asset forfeiture is the seizure and confiscation of assets obtained from criminal activities to ensure that criminals do not benefit from the proceeds of their crimes.

⁶ Provisions against corruption include national laws to implement the United Nations Convention against Corruption covering offences such as bribery of officials, embezzlement or misappropriation of public funds, trading in influence and abuse of functions by public officials.

⁷ International cooperation in criminal matters includes legislation through which a formal request for mutual legal assistance and/or extradition of a person for criminal prosecution can be forwarded to another country.

⁸ Article 2, paragraph (a) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime defines an organized criminal group as a structured group of three or more persons, existing for a period of time and acting in concert with the aim of committing one or more serious crimes or offences established in accordance with the Convention, in order to obtain, directly or indirectly, a financial or other material benefit.

⁹ Specialized investigation techniques are techniques that are deployed against serious and/or organized crime when conventional law enforcement techniques fail to adequately address the activities of crime groups. Examples include controlled deliveries and covert operations.

brief summary, including any lessons learned which might be helpful for other Parties:	
1.7.3g	Do you have institutional capacity to implement the legislative provisions listed in question 1.7.3f against CITES offences? Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐ If 'No', please provide a brief summary of your major capacity-building needs: Capacity building on the convention itself for law enforcer and compliance officers

Indicator 1.7.4: The number of Parties using risk assessment and intelligence to combat illegal trade in CITES-listed species.

1.7.4a	Do you use risk assessment to target CITES enforcement effort?	Always ☐ Very often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never ☒ No information ☐
1.7.4b	Do you have capacity to analyse information gathered on illegal trade in CITES-listed species?	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
1.7.4c	Do you use criminal intelligence ¹ to inform investigations into illegal trade in CITES-listed species?	Always ☐ Very often ☐ Sometimes ☐ Rarely ☐ Never ☒ No information ☐
1.7.4d	Have you implemented any supply-side activities to address illegal trade in CITES-listed species during the period covered in this report?	Yes ☐ No, but activities are under development ☐ No ☒ No information ☐
1.7.4e	Have you implemented any demand-side activities to address illegal trade in CITES-listed species during the period covered in this report?	Yes ☐ No, but activities are under development ☐ No ☒ No information ☐

¹ Criminal intelligence is information that is compiled, analyzed and disseminated in an effort to anticipate, prevent and/or monitor criminal activity. Examples include information on potential suspects held in a secure database and inferences about the methods, capabilities and intentions of specific criminal networks or individuals that are used to support effective law enforcement action.

Indicator 1.7.5: The number of administrative measures, criminal prosecutions and other court actions for CITES-related offences.

During the period covered in this report:		Yes	No	No Information
1.7.5a	Have any administrative measures (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related offences? If 'Yes', please indicate how many and for what types of offences. If available, please attach details:	☐	☒	☐
1.7.5b	Have there been any criminal prosecutions of CITES-related offences? If 'Yes', how many and for what types of offences? If available, please attach details:	☐	☒	☐
1.7.5c	Have there been any other court actions against CITES-related offences? If 'Yes', what were the offences involved and what were the results? Please attach details:	☐	☒	☐
1.7.5d	How were any confiscated specimens disposed of? ☐ Return to country of export ☐ Public zoos or botanical gardens ☐ Designated rescue centres ☐ Approved private facilities ☐ Euthanasia ☐ Other (please specify): Have you encountered any challenges in disposing of confiscated specimens? Do you have good practice that you would like to share with other Parties?	Tick all that apply		

Objective 1.8 Parties and the Secretariat have adequate capacity-building programmes in place.
Aichi Target 1, Target 12 and Target 19.

Indicator 1.8.1: The number of Parties with national and regional training programmes and information resources in place to implement CITES including the making of non-detriment findings, issuance of permits and enforcement.

1.8.1a	Do you have information resources or training in place to support: YesNo The making of non-detriment findings? ☐ ☒ Permit officers? ☒ ☐ Enforcement officers? ☒ ☐		
1.8.1b	Is the CITES Virtual College used as part of your capacity building work? What improvements could be made in using the Virtual College for capacity building?	Yes No No information	☐ ☒ ☐
1.8.1c	Is the ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Toolkit used in the development of capacity-building programmes, or does it form part of the curriculum of such programmes? What improvements could be made in using the ICCWC Toolkit for capacity building?	Yes No No information	☐ ☐ ☒

GOAL 2 SECURE THE NECESSARY FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND MEANS FOR THE OPERATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION

Objective 2.1 Financial resources are sufficient to ensure operation of the Convention.

Information to be provided through records held by the Secretariat on financial management of the Convention.

Objective 2.2 Sufficient resources are secured at the national and international levels to ensure compliance with and implementation and enforcement of the Convention.
[Aichi Target 1](#), [Target 2](#), [Target 3](#), [Target 12](#), [Target 19](#) and [Target 20](#).

Indicator 2.2.1: The number of Parties with dedicated staff and funding for Management Authorities, Scientific Authorities and wildlife trade enforcement agencies.

2.2.1a	Do you have an approved service standard(s)¹ for your Management Authority(ies)? If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d. If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards? If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards²? If 'Yes', what are your performance targets? Do you publish your performance against service standard targets? If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report: If you did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall a result of: – availability of funding? – number of staff? – a shortage of skills? If 'Yes' to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of?	Yes ☐ No ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐
2.2.1b	Do you have an approved service standard(s)⁴⁷ for your Scientific Authority(ies)? If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d. If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards? If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards⁴⁸? If 'Yes', what are your performance targets? If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report: If you did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall a result of: – availability of funding? – number of staff? – a shortage of skills? If 'Yes' to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of?	Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐
2.2.1c	Do you have an approved service standard(s)⁴⁷ for your enforcement authority(ies)? If 'No', please go to Question 2.2.1d. If 'Yes', for which services are there standards, and what are those standards?	Yes ☐ No ☐

¹ For example, a time frame in which you are required to provide a response on a decision to issue or not issue a permit, certificate, or re-export certificate.

² For example, 85% of all decisions will take place within the service standard.

	If 'Yes', do you have performance targets for these standards⁴⁸? Yes ☐ If 'Yes', what are your performance targets? No ☐ If possible, please provide your performance against service standards during the period covered in this report: If you did not meet your performance targets then was this shortfall a result of: <table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Yes</td> <td>No</td> </tr> <tr> <td>– availability of funding?</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>– number of staff?</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> <tr> <td>– a shortage of skills?</td> <td>☐</td> <td>☐</td> </tr> </table> If 'Yes' to a shortage of skills, which skills do you need more of?		Yes	No	– availability of funding?	☐	☐	– number of staff?	☐	☐	– a shortage of skills?	☐	☐				
	Yes	No															
– availability of funding?	☐	☐															
– number of staff?	☐	☐															
– a shortage of skills?	☐	☐															
2.2.1d	Please only complete this question if you answered 'No' to the first part of question 2.2.1a, 2.2.1b, or 2.2.1c, relating to the existence of approved service standards for your authorities: Do you have sufficient of the following for your authorities to function effectively? <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Management Authority(ies)</th> <th>Scientific Authority(ies)</th> <th>Enforcement Authority(ies)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Funding?</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Staff?</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Skills?</td> <td>Yes ☒ No ☐</td> <td>Yes ☒ No ☐</td> <td>Yes ☐ No ☒</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		Management Authority(ies)	Scientific Authority(ies)	Enforcement Authority(ies)	Funding?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒	Staff?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒	Skills?	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☒
	Management Authority(ies)	Scientific Authority(ies)	Enforcement Authority(ies)														
Funding?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒														
Staff?	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒	Yes ☐ No ☒														
Skills?	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☒ No ☐	Yes ☐ No ☒														

Indicator 2.2.2: The number of Parties that have undertaken one or more of the following activities:

- changed the budget for activities;
- hired more staff;
- developed implementation tools;
- purchased technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement.

2.2.2a	Have any of the following activities been undertaken during the period covered in this report to enhance the effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level? Hiring of more staff Tick if applicable ☐ Development of implementation tools ☐ Purchase of technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement ☐ Other (please specify):			
2.2.2b	During the period covered in this report, was the budget for your:	Increased	Stable	Decreased
	Management Authority(ies)	☐	☒	☐
	Scientific Authority(ies)	☐	☒	☐
	Enforcement authorities	☐	☒	☐
2.2.2c	Have you been able to use international development funding assistance to increase the level of implementation of your	Yes	No	Not applicable
	Management Authority(ies)?	☐	☒	☐
	Scientific Authority(ies)?	☐	☒	☐
	Enforcement authorities?	☐	☒	☐

2.2.2d	What is the respective level of priority for enhancing the effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level through the following activities?				
	Activity	High	Medium	Low	Not a Priority
	Hiring of more staff	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Development of implementation tools	☐	☒	☐	☐
	Purchase of new technical equipment for implementation, monitoring or enforcement	☐	☐	☒	☐
	e-permitting	☐	☐	☒	☐
	Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐
2.2.2e	Do you have a operational system (e.g. electronic database) for managing		Yes	Under development	No
	Species information		☐	☐	☒
	Trade information		☒	☐	☐
	Non-detriment findings		☐	☐	☒

Indicator 2.2.3: The number of Parties raising funds for CITES implementation through user fees or other mechanisms.

2.2.3a	Does the Management Authority charge fees for:	Tick all that are applicable	
	– Administrative procedures	☒	
	– Issuance of CITES documents (e.g. for import, exports, re-export, or introduction from the sea)	☐	
	– Shipment clearance (e.g. for the import, export, re-export, or introduction from the sea of CITES-listed species)	☐	
	– Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species	☐	
	– Harvesting of CITES-listed species	☐	
	– Use of CITES-listed species	☐	
	– Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species	☐	
	– Other (please specify): Research permit for any species including CITES listed species	☒	
2.2.3b	Is a fee schedule publicly available?	Yes ☐	No ☒
	If 'Yes', please provide an internet link, or a copy of the schedule to the Secretariat:		
2.2.3c	Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation?	Entirely ☐	
		Partly ☐	
		Not at all ☒	
		Not relevant ☐	
2.2.3d	Do you raise funds for CITES management through charging user fees?	Yes ☐	No ☒
	Do your fees recover the full economic cost of issuing permits?	☐	☒
	Do you have case studies on charging or using fees?	☐	☒
	If 'Yes' to any of the above, please provide brief details:		
	Do you use innovative financial mechanisms to raise funds for CITES implementation?	☐	☒
	If 'Yes', please provide brief details:		

Indicator 2.2.4: The number of Parties using incentive measures as part of their implementation of the Convention.

2.2.4a	Do you use incentive measures¹ such as those described in CoP14 Doc 14.32 to implement the Convention? <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th><th>Yes</th><th>No</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Due diligence</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> <tr> <td>Compensatory mechanisms</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> <tr> <td>Certification</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> <tr> <td>Communal property rights</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> <tr> <td>Auctioning of quotas</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> <tr> <td>Cost recovery or environmental charges</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> <tr> <td>Enforcement incentives</td><td>☐</td><td>☒</td></tr> </tbody> </table> If 'Yes' to any of the above, or if you use other measures, please provide a summary or link to further information:		Yes	No	Due diligence	☐	☒	Compensatory mechanisms	☐	☒	Certification	☐	☒	Communal property rights	☐	☒	Auctioning of quotas	☐	☒	Cost recovery or environmental charges	☐	☒	Enforcement incentives	☐	☒
	Yes	No																							
Due diligence	☐	☒																							
Compensatory mechanisms	☐	☒																							
Certification	☐	☒																							
Communal property rights	☐	☒																							
Auctioning of quotas	☐	☒																							
Cost recovery or environmental charges	☐	☒																							
Enforcement incentives	☐	☒																							
2.2.4b	Have incentives harmful to biodiversity been eliminated? Not at all ☐ Very little ☐ Somewhat ☐ Completely ☐																								

¹ Defined as 'Social and economic incentives that promote and regulate sustainable management of and responsible trade in, wild flora and fauna and promote effective enforcement of the Convention'. The intent of such measures is not to promote wildlife trade as such, but rather to ensure that any wildlife trade undertaken is conducted in a sustainable manner.

Objective 2.3 Sufficient resources are secured at the national and international levels to implement capacity-building programmes.
Aichi Target 12, Target 19 and Target 20.

Indicator 2.3.1: The number of capacity building activities mandated by Resolutions and Decisions that are fully funded.

2.3.1a	How many training and capacity building activities ¹ have you run during the period covered in this report?	Without assistance from the Secretariat	Conducted or assisted by the Secretariat
	None	☐	☐
	1	☐	☐
	2-5	☐	☐
	6-10	☒	☐
	11-20	☐	☐
	More than 20	☐	☐
	Please list the Resolutions or Decisions involved:		
2.3.1b	What sorts of capacity building activities have taken place? Community consultations, Public awareness, institutional presentations		
2.3.1c	What capacity building needs do you have?		
	Please tick all boxes which apply to indicate which target group and which activity.		
	Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance
		Financial assistance	Training
		Other (specify)	Details
	Staff of Management Authority	☒	☒
	Staff of Scientific Authority	☒	☒
	Staff of enforcement authorities	☐	☒
	Traders / other user groups	☐	☐
	NGOs	☐	☒
	Public	☐	☐
	Other (please specify)	☐	☐

¹ An activity might be a single day training e.g. for a group of staff from the Management Authority, or a longer course / project undertaken by an individual.

GOAL 3 CONTRIBUTE TO SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCING THE RATE OF BIODIVERSITY LOSS AND TO ACHIEVING RELEVANT GLOBALLY-AGREED GOALS AND TARGETS BY ENSURING THAT CITES AND OTHER MULTILATERAL INSTRUMENTS AND PROCESSES ARE COHERENT AND MUTUALLY SUPPORTIVE

Objective 3.1 Cooperation between CITES and international financial mechanisms and other related institutions is enhanced in order to support CITES-related conservation and sustainable development projects, without diminishing funding for currently prioritized activities.

Aichi Target 2 and Target 20.

Indicator 3.1.1: The number of Parties funded by international financial mechanisms and other related institutions to develop activities that include CITES-related conservation and sustainable development elements.

3.1.1a	Has funding from international financial mechanisms and other related institutions been used to develop activities that include CITES-related conservation and sustainable development elements?	Yes	☒
		No	☐
		Not applicable	☐
		No information	☐
If 'Yes', please provide brief details: Funding assistance to implement educational and awareness, capacity building, surveys and research			
3.1.1b	During the period covered in this report, has funding for your country from international funding mechanisms and other related institutions:	Increased	☐
		Remained stable	☒
		Decreased	☐

Indicator 3.1.2: The number of countries and institutions that have provided additional funding from CITES Authorities to another country or activity for conservation and sustainable development projects in order to further the objectives of the Convention.

3.1.2a	Have you provided technical or financial assistance to another country or countries in relation to CITES?						Yes	☐
							No	☒
							No information	☐
	If 'Yes', please tick boxes to indicate type of assistance provided							
	Country(ies)	Species Management ¹	Habitat Management ²	Sustainable use	Law Enforcement	Livelihoods	Other (specify)	Details (provide more information in an Appendix if necessary)
		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
		☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

¹ Use species conservation column for work directly related to species – e.g. population surveys, education programmes, conflict resolution, etc.

² Use habitat conservation column for work that will indirectly support species conservation – e.g. habitat management, development of policy frameworks for how land is managed, etc.

Objective 3.2 Awareness of the role and purpose of CITES is increased globally.

Aichi Target 1, Target 4, Target 12 and Target 18.

Indicator 3.2.1: The number of Parties that have been involved in CITES awareness raising activities to bring about better awareness by the wider public and relevant user groups of the Convention requirements.

3.2.1a	Have CITES authorities been involved in any of the following activities to bring about better awareness of the Convention's requirements by the wider public and relevant user groups?	Wider public	Relevant User Groups
	– Press conferences	☐	☒
	– Press releases	☒	☐
	– Newspaper articles, brochures, leaflets	☒	☒
	– Television appearances	☐	☐
	– Radio appearances	☐	☐
	– Presentations	☒	☐
	– Public consultations / meetings	☒	☒
	– Market surveys	☐	☐
	– Displays	☒	☐
	– Information at border crossing points	☒	☒
	– Telephone hotline	☐	☐
	– Website(s) – if so please provide link(s)	☐	☐
	– Other (specify):	☐	☐
	Please attach copies of any items or describe examples:		

Indicator 3.2.2: The number of visits to the CITES website.

3.2.2a	How regularly do your Authorities consult the CITES website?					
	Please tick boxes to indicate the most frequent usage (decide on an average amongst staff if necessary).					
		Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Less frequently	Not known
	Target group					
	Staff of Management Authority	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
	Staff of Scientific Authority	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐
	Staff of enforcement authorities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒
3.2.2b	What has been your experience with using the CITES website?		Excellent	☐		
			Good	☒		
			Average	☐		
			Poor	☐		
			Very Poor	☐		
			No information	☐		
	Any further comments on the CITES Website? (e.g. useful aspects, any difficulties encountered, which authorities find which functions/tools most useful, what is missing, etc):					

Indicator 3.2.3: The number of Parties with web pages on CITES and its requirements.

A question relating to this indicator is within question 3.2.1a.

Objective 3.3 Cooperation with relevant international environmental, trade and development organizations is enhanced.

Indicator 3.3.1 The number of Parties which report that they have achieved synergies in their implementation of CITES, other biodiversity-related conventions and other relevant multilateral environmental, trade and development agreements.

3.3.1a	Have measures been taken to achieve coordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national CITES authorities and national focal points for other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the other biodiversity-related conventions: CBD, CMS, ITPGR, Ramsar, WHC) ¹ to which your country is party? If 'Yes', please give a brief description: mainstreaming of relevant Conventions into national sector plans and strategies	Yes	☒
		No	☐
		No information	☐

Indicator 3.3.2: The number of biodiversity conservation or sustainable use projects, trade and development goals, or scientific and technical programmes that integrate CITES requirements.

3.3.2a	How many international projects which integrate CITES issues has your country contributed towards?	NA	
3.3.2b	In addition to 3.2.2a, how many national level projects has your country implemented which integrate CITES issues?	3 - 5	
3.3.2c	Have there been any efforts at a national scale for your CITES Management or Scientific Authorities to collaborate with:	Yes	No
	Agencies for development?	☐	☒
	Agencies for trade?	☐	☒
	Provincial, state or territorial authorities?	☐	☐
	Local authorities or communities?	☒	☐
	Indigenous or local peoples?	☒	☐
	Trade or other private sector associations?	☐	☒
	NGOs?	☒	☐
	Other (please specify)	☐	☐
3.3.2d	Are CITES requirements integrated into?	Yes	No
	National and local development strategies?	☒	☐
	National and local poverty reduction strategies?	☐	☒
	Planning processes?	☒	☐
	National accounting?	☒	☐

¹ CBD = Convention on Biological Diversity; CMS = Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, ITPGR = International Treaty on Plant Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture, Ramsar = The Convention on Wetlands of International Importance, WHC = World Heritage Convention.

Indicator 3.3.3: The number of Parties cooperating / collaborating with intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to participate in and/or fund CITES workshops and other training and capacity-building activities.

3.3.3a	Has funding been provided or received to facilitate CITES workshops, training or other capacity building activities to / from:	Tick if applicable	Which organizations?
	Inter-governmental organizations?	☒	SPREP, IUCN,
	Non-governmental organizations?	☒	Pew Charitable Trust, Paul G. Allen Philanthropies

Objective 3.4 The contribution of CITES to the relevant Millennium Development Goals, the sustainable development goals set at WSSD, the *Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020* and the relevant *Aichi Biodiversity Targets*, and the relevant outcomes of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development is strengthened by ensuring that international trade in wild fauna and flora is conducted at sustainable levels.

This objective may also be assessed by a variety of means beyond the reporting format, including action taken to implement many of the CITES resolutions and decisions.

[Aichi Target 1](#), [Target 2](#), [Target 3](#), [Target 4](#), [Target 5](#), [Target 6](#), [Target 7](#), [Target 12](#), [Target 14](#), [Target 17](#), [Target 18](#) and [Target 19](#).

Indicator 3.4.1: The conservation status of species listed on the CITES Appendices has stabilized or improved.

3.4.1a	Do you have data which shows that the conservation status of naturally occurring species in your country listed on the CITES Appendices has stabilized or improved?		
		Yes	No
	Appendix I	☐	☒
	Appendix II	☐	☒
	Appendix III	☐	☐
If there are such studies that you are willing to share, please provide:			Not Applicable
Species name (scientific) Link to the data, or a brief summary			
3.4.1b	Do you have examples of specific examples of success stories or emerging problems with any CITES listed species?		☐
			☒
			☐
			☐
If 'Yes', please provide details:			

Indicator 3.4.2: The number of Parties incorporating CITES into their National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP).

3.4.2a	Has CITES been incorporated into your country's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP)?	Yes	☒
		No	☐
		No information	☐
3.4.2b	Have you been able to obtain funds from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) or other sources to support CITES aspects of NBSAP implementation?	Yes	☒
		No	☐
		No information	☐

Objective 3.5 Parties and the Secretariat cooperate with other relevant international organizations and agreements dealing with natural resources, as appropriate, in order to achieve a coherent and collaborative approach to species which can be endangered by unsustainable trade, including those which are commercially exploited.
Aichi Target 2, Target 4, Target 5, Target 6, Target 7, Target 10, Target 12, Target 14 and Target 19.

Indicator 3.5.1: The number of cooperative actions taken under established bilateral or multilateral agreements to prevent species from being unsustainably exploited through international trade.

3.5.1a	Has your country taken action under established bilateral or multilateral agreements other than CITES to prevent species from being unsustainably exploited through international trade? If 'Yes', please provide details: Proposal for the inclusion of Blue shark <i>Prionace glauca</i> under CMS listing – fin trade	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
--------	---	---

Indicator 3.5.2: The number of times other relevant international organizations and agreements dealing with natural resources are consulted on issues relevant to species subject to unsustainable trade.

3.5.2a	Average number of times per year that international organizations or agreements have been consulted by CITES Authorities	Once	2-5 times	6-20 times	More than 20 times	No consultation	Optional comment about which organizations and issues consulted on
	Management Authority(ies)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
	Scientific Authority(ies)	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	
	Enforcement Authority(ies)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	

General feedback

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

Item		
Copy of full text of CITES-relevant legislation if changed	Enclosed	☐
Web link(s)	Not available	☐
	Previously provided	☒
Please list any materials annexed to the report, e.g. fee schedules, awareness raising materials, etc:		
1) Shark awareness community consultation report		
2) Information fact sheets translation in Samoan		
3) National Alo Paopao Festival side events to raise the awareness on sharks https://www.sprep.org/news/150-people-pledge-protect-sharks-alo-paopao-paddling-festival		
4) The Secretary General of the CITES John E. Scanlon, visit in Samoa. http://www.samoaoobserver.ws/en/09_04_2016/local/4720/Top-environment-official-visits.htm		
Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance?	Yes ☒ No ☐ No Information ☐	
If 'Yes', please describe the constraint and the type of attention or assistance that is required. Financial assistance and/or technical assistance for the draft national CITES Bill 2014 for review and consultations with key stakeholders as well as communities		
Are there examples of good practice you would like to share with other Parties?	Yes ☐ No ☒ No Information ☐	
If 'Yes' please provide details / links:		

How could this report format be improved?

Thank you for completing the report. Please remember to include relevant attachments referred to in the report when it is submitted to the Secretariat.

