



# **U.S. CITES SPECIAL SINGLE YEAR REPORT FOR 2004**

*PREPARED BY:*

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

*COMPLETED 20 DECEMBER 2005*

# U.S. CITES SPECIAL SINGLE YEAR REPORT FOR 2004

## *Table of Contents*

	<u>Page</u>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	4
<b>REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2004 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES</b>	5
A. General information	5
B. Legislative and regulatory measures	6
C. Compliance and enforcement measures	8
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	16
D6. Capacity building	19
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	21
D8. Areas for future work	24
E. General feedback	25
<b>ANNEX</b>	
<b>SUMMARIES OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2004 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES</b>	26
I. CITES IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION IN THE UNITED STATES	26
II. CoP13-RELATED ACTIVITIES	26
III. CITES PERMIT-RELATED ACTIVITIES	28

IV.	CITES STANDING COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	30
V.	CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	32
VI.	CITES PLANTS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	34
VII.	JOINT ANIMALS COMMITTEE – PLANTS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES	35
VIII.	ACTIVITIES RELATED TO CITES TIMBER ISSUES	36
IX.	CITES TRAINING AND ASSISTANCE	37
X.	LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES	38
XI.	PUBLIC EDUCATION EFFORTS	46
XII.	NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS	47
XIII.	CONSERVATION FUNDING	48
XIV.	OTHER CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES	48

## INTRODUCTION

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 1 December 2004, the United States submitted to the Secretariat its biennial report covering the two-year period 2002-2003.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13), amended by the Parties at the 13<sup>th</sup> regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP13), recommends that all Parties submit biennial reports for the same two-year periods beginning with the period 2003-2004. The United States has been submitting its biennial reports in an *even year – odd year* cycle, and has already submitted its 2002-2003 biennial report. In order to comply with the recommendation in Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) that Parties submit in an *odd year – even year* cycle beginning with 2003-2004, the United States is submitting a special single year report covering just the year 2004. The United States will change its submission schedule from an *even year – odd year* cycle to an *odd year – even year* cycle beginning with its 2005-2006 biennial report.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) also 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 – dated 6 July 2005). This is the first time that the Parties have adopted a format for the submission of biennial reports. Therefore, the United States submits this special single year report for 2004 in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format*, as provided in Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035.

The regulations implementing CITES in the United States were issued on February 22, 1977 (50 CFR Part 23). To date, there have been thirteen 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, and Bangkok). The United States has implemented new CITES Resolutions in the United States by modification of internal policy and administration, promulgation of special rules, and revision of specific regulations. A general revision of U.S. regulations implementing CITES is underway and will reflect measures adopted by the Parties at their regular meetings through CoP13 (Bangkok).

During 2004, the United States took many active 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 one year period. Attached as an Annex to the tabular report is a textual summary detailing some of the major measures that the United States took during 2004.

# REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2004 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES

## A. General information

Party	United States of America
Period covered in this report:	1 January 2004 to 31 December 2004
Details of agency preparing this report	<p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service          Division of Management Authority          4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 700          Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247          United States of America          Tel: +1 (703) 3582095          Fax: +1 (703) 3582280          Email: <a href="mailto:managementauthority@fws.gov">managementauthority@fws.gov</a>          Web: <a href="http://www.gov/international">http://www.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 750          Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247          United States of America          Tel: +1 (703) 3581708          Fax: +1 (703) 3582276          Email: <a href="mailto:scientificauthority@fws.gov">scientificauthority@fws.gov</a>          Web: <a href="http://www.gov/international">http://www.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) 3581949          Fax: +1 (703) 3582271          Email: <a href="mailto:lawenforcement@fws.gov">lawenforcement@fws.gov</a>          Web: <a href="http://www.le.fws.gov">http://www.le.fws.gov</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 Wild Bird Conservation Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection 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: During 2004, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service continued the process of preparing a new proposed rule to update the U.S. CITES implementing regulations. It was from this process that we were able to assess the effectiveness of CITES legislation in the United States with regard to the above items.					
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: During the process of preparing a new proposed rule to update the U.S. CITES implementing regulations during 2004, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed U.S. legislation on each of the above subjects related to CITES implementation.					
9	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Section I of the Annex for summaries of some of the major legislative and regulatory measures taken by the United States during 2004.				

### C. Compliance and enforcement measures

		Yes	No	No information
1	Have any of the following compliance monitoring operations been undertaken?			
	Review of reports and other information provided by traders and producers:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Inspections of traders, producers, markets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Border controls	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Have any administrative measures (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related violations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<p>If Yes, please indicate how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details.</p> <p>NOTE: The total instances of CITES-related violations for which the United States took administrative measures during 2004 are too numerous to list and summarize here. However, see Section X of the Annex for summaries of some of the major CITES violation-related measures taken by the United States during 2004.</p>			
4	Have any significant seizures, confiscations and forfeitures of CITES specimens been made?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	<p>If information available:</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Significant seizures/confiscations</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;"><input type="checkbox"/> Total seizures/confiscations</p> <p>If possible, please specify per group of species or attach details.</p> <p>NOTE: The total U.S. CITES-related seizures/confiscations during 2004 are too numerous to list and summarize here. However, see Section X of the Annex for summaries of some of the major seizures/confiscations by the United States during 2004.</p>	Number		
6	Have there been any criminal prosecutions of significant CITES-related violations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	<p>If Yes, how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details as Annex.</p> <p>NOTE: See Section X of the Annex for summaries of some of the major criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations by the United States during 2004.</p>			
8	Have there been any other court actions of CITES-related violations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9	If Yes, what were the violations involved and what were the results? Please attach details as Annex.			



	NOTE: See Section X of the Annex for summaries of some of the major U.S. court actions of CITES-related violations during 2004.		
10	How were the confiscated specimens usually disposed of?	Tick if applicable	
	– Return to country of export		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Public zoos or botanical gardens		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Designated rescue centres		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Approved, private facilities		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Euthanasia		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Comments: Some confiscated specimens were also donated to educational facilities.		
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	If Yes, please give a brief description: See Sections IX, X, and XIII of the Annex for summaries of some of the major cooperative enforcement activities with other countries taken by the United States during 2004.		
14	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?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
		No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
15	If Yes, please describe:		
16	Has there been any review or assessment of CITES-related enforcement?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
		No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments:		
17	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, III, VIII, IX, X, XI, XII, and XIII of the Annex for summaries of some of the major compliance and enforcement measures taken by the United States during 2004.		

## 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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority is the only CITES Management Authority in the United States. Thirty staff work in the Division of Management Authority.			
6	Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters? If yes, please give estimation: About 75 percent.	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the MA(s)?	Tick if applicable		
	– Administration		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Biology		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Economics/trade		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	– Law/policy		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>	
	– No information		<input type="checkbox"/>	
8	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)?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
9	If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.			
10	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.			

### **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 <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	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 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority is the only CITES Scientific Authority in the United States. Seven 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 60 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 checked="" 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. 30,000 kg. annually	ca. 30,000 kg. wild roots exported annually; also export ca. 200,000-240,000 kg. of artificially propagated roots annually	Not quantified	Research being conducted on status of the species (abundance, distribution), as well as impacts of harvest, sustainable harvest levels.
	<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	United States	United States		~4,000 kg. of caviar exported annually; also export about 1,100,000 live eggs annually	Not quantified	Stock assessment, sustainable harvest levels, management recommendations.
						No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
10	Have any project proposals for scientific research been submitted to the Secretariat under Resolution Conf. 12.2?					Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
						No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
						No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.						

**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: <a href="mailto:lawenforcement@fws.gov">lawenforcement@fws.gov</a> Web: <a href="http://www.le.fws.gov">http://www.le.fws.gov</a>	
5	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.	

**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			
	Authority	Yes, continuous and unrestricted access	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The central office of the Enforcement Authority has unrestricted access, but the field offices only have access through a dial-up connection.		
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:					Tick if applicable			
	– Legislation (national, regional or international)?					<input type="checkbox"/>			
	– Conservation status (national, regional, international)?					<input type="checkbox"/>			
	– Other (please specify)? The U.S. Combined Species database provides the CITES listing status of CITES-listed species, plus the status of such species 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.					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
5	Is it available through the Internet:					Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
	Please provide URL:								

6	Do the authorities indicated have access to the following publications? Tick if applicable			
	Publication	Management Authority	Scientific Authority	Enforcement Authority
	<i>2003 Checklist of CITES Species (book)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>2003 Checklist of CITES Species and Annotated Appendices (CD-ROM)</i>	<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/cites/cites.html">http://www.fws.gov/international/cites/cites.html</a>			

10	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?	Tick if applicable	
	– Press releases/conferences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Newspaper articles, radio/television appearances	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Brochures, leaflets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Presentations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Displays	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Information at border crossing points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	– Telephone hotline	<input type="checkbox"/>	
– Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Please attach copies of any items. NOTE: These items are too numerous to gather together all of them and attach them to this report.			
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.		

**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 (2004)	Import or introduction from the sea	Export	Re-export	Other	Comments
	How many documents were issued?	-	-	-	-	A total of 7,268 documents were issued during 2004. Due to the manner in which our permit computer system was programmed in 2004, a breakdown of this number by import, export, re-export, and other is not available. Our permit issuance program has now been modified so that these values can be broken down and will be provided for 2005 and subsequent years.
	How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	-	-	-	-	A total of 285 applications were denied or abandoned during 2004. Due to the manner in which our permit computer system was programmed in 2004, a breakdown of this number by import, export, re-export, and other is not available. Our permit issuance program has now been modified so that these values can be broken down and will be provided for 2005 and subsequent years.
	Year 2 How many documents were issued?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
	How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	
4	Were any CITES documents that were issued later cancelled and replaced because of serious omissions or misinformation?				Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>	
5	If Yes, please give the reasons for this.					

6	Please give the reasons for rejection of CITES documents from other countries.			Tick if applicable
	Reason	Yes	No	No information
	Technical violations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspected fraud	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient basis for finding of non-detriment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient basis for finding of legal acquisition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
7	Are harvest and/or export quotas as a management tool in the procedure for issuance of permits?		Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			No	<input type="checkbox"/>
			No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments			
8	How many times has the Scientific Authority been requested to provide opinions? During 2004, the U.S. Scientific Authority was asked to provide opinions in 145 specific cases. However, the Scientific Authority has produced a series of "general advices" that can be used when a particular application meets 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.			
9	Has the MA charged fees for permit issuance, registration or related CITES activities?			Tick if applicable
	– Issuance of CITES documents:			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species:			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Harvesting of CITES-listed species :			<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Use of CITES-listed species:			<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species:			<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Importing of CITES-listed species:			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify):			<input type="checkbox"/>
10	If Yes, please provide the amounts of such fees. U.S. permit fees vary depending on the activity being requested. The fees are listed in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 13, Section 11.			

11	Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation? – Entirely: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> – Partly: <input type="checkbox"/> – Not at all: <input type="checkbox"/> – Not relevant: <input type="checkbox"/> Comments:	Tick if applicable
12	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.	

**D6 Capacity building**

1	Have any of the following activities been undertaken to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level?	Tick if applicable
	Increased budget for activities <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Improvement of national networks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Hiring of more staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Purchase of technical equipment for monitoring/enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Development of implementation tools <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Computerization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/>	
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.	What were the external sources?
	Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance Technical assistance Financial assistance Training Other (specify)
	Staff of Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	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"/>

3	Have the CITES authorities been the <i>providers</i> of any of the following capacity building activities?						Details
	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)	
	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"/>		
4	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.						

**D7 Collaboration/co-operative initiatives**

1	Is there an inter-agency 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? 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. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority</p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority</p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement</p> <p>National Atmospheric and Oceanic 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> <p>International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies</p> <p>U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection</p>																								
3	<p>If No, please indicated 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):</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Daily</th> <th>Weekly</th> <th>Monthly</th> <th>Annually</th> <th>None</th> <th>No information</th> <th>Other (specify)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Meetings</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consultations</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		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"/>	
	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	<p>At the national level have there been any efforts to collaborate with:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Tick if applicable</th> <th>Details if available</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Agencies for development and trade</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Provincial, state or territorial authorities</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Local authorities or communities</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Indigenous peoples</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Trade or other private sector associations</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NGOs</td> <td><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (specify)</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		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"/>	
	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): U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Law Enforcement and U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Other government agencies		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Private sector bodies		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	NGOs		<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>
		No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
8	If Yes, which one(s) and in what way?		
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? See Sections IX and XIII of the Annex for summaries of some of the major assistance the United States provided other countries during 2004 in relation to CITES.		
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. See Sections IV and VIII for examples of some CITES-related cooperative efforts the U.S. Government took during 2004 with the Food and Agriculture Agency and the International Tropical Timber Organization.
15	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Computerization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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: See Sections I, II, III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII, XI, XII, XIII, and XIV of the Annex for summaries of some of the major administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004.			



### 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 NOTE: Already provided.	Enclosed	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
C3	Details of violations and administrative measures imposed NOTE: See attached Annex	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
C5	Details of specimens seized, confiscated or forfeited NOTE: See attached Annex	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
C7	Details of violations and results of prosecutions NOTE: See attached Annex	Enclosed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input type="checkbox"/>
C9	Details of violations and results of court actions NOTE: See attached Annex	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 NOTE: These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.	Enclosed	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not available	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Not relevant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Comments		

## SUMMARIES OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2004 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES

### I. CITES IMPLEMENTING LEGISLATION IN THE UNITED STATES

REVISION TO U.S. REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT CITES: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* on May 8, 2000, to update the regulations that implement CITES in the United States. Since the existing regulations were finalized, the CITES Conference of the Parties (CoP) has held eleven meetings where Resolutions have been adopted. The USFWS proposes to incorporate certain applicable CITES Resolutions into 50 CFR Part 23, the U.S. CITES implementing regulations. Revised regulations will help the USFWS more effectively promote species conservation, fulfill its responsibilities as a CITES Party, and help those affected by CITES to understand how to conduct international trade in CITES-listed species.

In 2004, as it had been four years and three meetings of the CoP since the proposed rule was published, the USFWS was in the process of preparing a new proposed rule to update the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. When it is published in the *Federal Register*, this new proposed rule will respond to comments from the public on the proposed rule published in 2000, make appropriate changes to the rule based on these comments, and incorporate the recommendations made in CITES resolutions adopted through the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP13). The USFWS plans to have the final rule updating the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations published by the middle of 2007.

### II. CoP13-RELATED ACTIVITIES

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION IN U.S. PREPARATIONS FOR CoP13: CoP13 was held 2-14 October 2004, in Bangkok, Thailand. Between 12 January 2004 and 29 September 2004, the USFWS published three notices in the U.S. *Federal Register*, designed to allow NGOs and the public to participate in the preparations of the U.S. Government for CoP13. These notices provided information on the process for attendance of observers at CoP13; provided the public with an opportunity, prior to the submission deadline of 6 May 2004, to comment on species listing proposals, resolutions, and other agenda items that the United States was considering submitting for consideration at CoP13; provided the public with an opportunity, prior to the beginning of CoP13, to comment on the issues on the provisional CoP13 agenda; and announced two public meetings regarding CoP13.

The first public meeting was held on 5 February 2004, in Washington D.C. At this meeting the public was provided further opportunity to comment on species listing proposals, resolutions, and

other agenda items that the United States was at that time considering submitting for CoP13. The second public meeting was held on 12 August 2004, also in Washington, D.C. At this meeting the public was provided further opportunity to comment on the issues on the CoP13 agenda.

Additionally, at CoP13 in Bangkok, the United States held evening briefings for the NGOs following each day's meeting sessions to discuss what occurred in those sessions.

U.S. SUBMISSIONS FOR CONSIDERATION AT CoP13: On 6 May 2004, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) submitted the United States' species listing proposals, proposed resolutions, proposed decisions, and discussion documents to the CITES Secretariat for consideration at CoP13, which was subsequently held 2-14 October 2004, in Bangkok, Thailand. The United States submitted 12 species listing proposals, five of which were co-sponsored by other Party countries. The United States also submitted six discussion documents for inclusion in the agenda at CoP13. These discussion documents contained six proposed resolutions or revisions of existing resolutions (one of which was submitted by the United States in its capacity as Chair of a CITES Plants Committee working group on resolutions pertaining to plants) and one proposed decision for inclusion in the agenda at CoP13.

REGIONAL COORDINATION FOR CoP13: Canada, Mexico, and the United States held a North American Regional meeting in Queretaro, Mexico, 7-9 September 2004, to discuss proposals and other items on the agenda for consideration at CoP13. The meeting provided an excellent forum for the exchange of information among the three countries, and where possible, the three countries decided on unified regional positions for some agenda items and proposals. Such regional meetings generally include representatives of both Management and Scientific Authorities, as well as representatives of fisheries agencies, foreign affairs agencies, law enforcement, and other governmental participants who have an interest in CITES matters. These meetings have become a regular occurrence prior to CoPs.

U.S. APPROVES 20 OBSERVERS FOR CoP13: In accordance with CITES Article XI, paragraph 7, the USFWS approved 20 national non-governmental organizations to attend CoP13 as observers.

RESULTS OF CoP13: CoP13 was held 2-14 October 2004, in Bangkok, Thailand. The United States participated fully in the meeting. Of the 12 species listing proposals submitted by the United States at CoP13, 10 were adopted, one was rejected, and one was withdrawn. The six discussion documents submitted by the United States for consideration at CoP13 resulted in the adoption by the Parties of two revised resolutions and three new decisions. The Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, as the North American Regional Representative on the CITES Plants Committee for the intersessional period between CoP13 and CoP14. In addition, Mr. Gabel was also selected as the alternate North American Regional Representative on the CITES Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP13 and CoP14.

### **III. CITES PERMIT-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

CITES PERMIT APPLICATIONS HANDLED DURING 2004: The USFWS Division of Management Authority (DMA) is responsible for the review and arbitration of all permits involved in the international movement of CITES-listed species. Through the two branches of Permits, along with some permitting responsibilities delegated to USFWS Law Enforcement regional offices and ports, over 8,000 CITES applications were received during 2004, and over 25,000 telephone calls, e-mails, and faxes relating to CITES permitting questions were handled (see table below for types of CITES permits issued). 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, DMA is actively involved in disseminating outreach materials, producing fact sheets, holding public meetings, and fine tuning the permitting process within the United States.

*Table of CITES Permits Issued During 2004*

Type of Permits	Number of Permits Issued	Descriptions
Certificate of Scientific Exchange (new and renewed)	29	certificates issued to scientific institutions to allow the international movement of permanently accessioned specimens
Certificate of Artificially Propagated Plants	33	certificates issued to nurseries that are producing artificially propagated plants
Ginseng export applications (Artificially propagated and wild collected)	36	export permits issued under USFWS's State ginseng program
Mahogany re-exports	7	re-export permits for Appendix-II mahogany
Rosewood exports	6	exports of pre-Convention rosewood, primarily for guitar production
Other Plant applications	77	permits for plant related imports and exports not covered by other applications
Circus/Traveling exhibitions	167	permits and certificates issued

		to traveling exhibitions
Sport-hunted elephant trophies	102	import of sport-hunted elephant trophies from Africa (re-export permits are not allowed under domestic regulations)
Sport-hunted leopard trophies	899	import of sport-hunted leopard trophies from Africa
Sport-hunted white rhino	1	import of sport-hunted white rhinoceros trophies from South Africa
Marine mammals	1	CITES permits issued for marine mammals (in addition to CITES, there are other U.S. regulations involved in the international movement of marine mammals)
Pet exports/re-exports	378	permits and certificates issued for personally owned birds
General CITES applications	5,537	permits and certificates issued for commercial exports, scientific imports/exports, and all other situations involving CITES
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,268</b>	

DMA, in an effort to provide better customer service, has developed a number of different applications specifically designed to address particular import/export activities. By establishing different applications, the questions that are presented to the applicant apply specifically to the activity for which they are requesting authorization. The establishment of these application types ensures that the proper questions are being answered by the applicant and minimizes the need to go back to the applicant for additional information during the review process carried out by DMA.

A very large portion of the applications received relate 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, DMA must dedicate a large portion of its permitting staff to the processing of such applications. However, the smaller number of Appendix-I import and export applications also capture a significant portion of DMA'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, DMA works closely with other CITES Management Authorities. This close coordination, carried out through the Branches of Permits, allows DMA to identify concerns and problems before CITES documents are issued. Such coordination ranges from informing another Management Authority what documents DMA has issued, to discussions of how and when documents can be issued.

One type of coordination is the work DMA carried out during 2004, 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 the Japanese, DMA provides their Management Authority with a monthly report of all wildlife export permits and certificates that the United States issued during that month.

STATE COORDINATION: One aspect of the permitting process is to determine legal acquisition of specimens. As part of its review, DMA consults 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, DMA ensures that permit conditions on U.S. Federal permits comply with State regulations for take, introduction, transportation and management. DMA regularly consults with State agencies regarding the transport of any injurious species prior to the issuance of any injurious wildlife permit. DMA's coordination with the States also extends to providing State wildlife agencies copies of permits that DMA has issued to their residents. This allows the State wildlife agencies to better understand what wildlife trade is occurring within their States. Both DMA and the State wildlife agencies benefit from the maintenance of strong communication channels.

#### **IV. CITES STANDING COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

UNITED STATES CONTINUES AS CHAIR AND NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON THE STANDING COMMITTEE UP UNTIL CoP13: At CoP12 in November 2002, the Parties in North America elected the United States to continue as the North American Regional Representative on the CITES Standing Committee for the intersessional period between CoP12 and CoP13 (October 2004). The United States also continued as the Chair of the Standing Committee for the intersessional period between CoP12 and CoP13. Kenneth Stansell,

from the USFWS, continued to serve in that capacity. After CoP13, Canada took over from the United States as North American Regional Representative on the Standing Committee and Chile took over as Chair.

50<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE: The United States sent a six-person delegation to the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC50), which was held 15-19 March 2004, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, one from the Department of State, one from the International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (IAFWA), and one U.S. Congressional representative. The United States continued as the North American Regional Representative on the Standing Committee. Kenneth Stansell of the USFWS continued as the Chair of the Standing Committee and Chaired this meeting.

As the Regional Representative, the United States prepared the North American Regional Report for presentation at SC50. The Report covered the time period between the 49<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee (SC49 – April 2003) and SC50. It contained sections for the national reports of Canada, Mexico, and the United States. All three countries were once again in close contact in the preparation of the Report.

51<sup>st</sup> AND 52<sup>nd</sup> MEETINGS OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE: SC51 was held 1 October 2004, one day before the start of CoP13. The United States participated as the North American Regional Representative on the Standing Committee. Kenneth Stansell of the USFWS continued as the Chair of the Standing Committee and Chaired SC51. SC52 was held on 14 October 2004, immediately after the end of CoP13. At SC52, Canada took over from the United States as North American Regional Representative on the Standing Committee and Chile took over as Chair.

CITES IMPLEMENTATION WORKING GROUP: In accordance with Decision 12.23, the Standing Committee at SC49 established a joint working group comprising representatives of the Standing, Plants, and Animals Committees and the CITES Secretariat. The United States was named Chair of the working group. Terms of reference required the group to develop the following products: a list of outstanding implementation issues within CITES, functional categories of these issues; and a clearing-house process to refer these issues to the appropriate CITES body. The group submitted an interim report for SC50 transmitting these products and proposing that the Standing Committee send a revised or modified form of the group's products to CoP13 for further consideration and decision. In his Report to CoP13, the Standing Committee Chair reported on the progress made by the working group and on the Standing Committee's agreement to the clearing-house process proposed by the working group. This process included a small group of technical experts working with the Standing Committee Chair that would refer outstanding implementation issues to the appropriate CITES body. The Parties adopted this process at CoP13.

“MIKE”: During 2004, the United States was engaged in a number of ways in the MIKE (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants) Program, which was first established by CoP10 through Resolution Conf. 10.10. The United States is a member of the MIKE Subgroup of the Standing Committee. During 2004, the United States provided core funding to MIKE and also

provided significant funding to a number of MIKE-related projects in Africa, through the African Elephant Conservation Act; and in Asia, through the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

EXPORT QUOTAS: At CoP12 (November 2002), the Parties adopted Decision 12.72 tasking the Standing Committee with considering improving the management of annual CITES export quotas. In response, the Standing Committee established an Export Quota Working Group tasked with developing guidelines for Parties to establish, implement, monitor, and report voluntary national export quotas for CITES-listed species. At CoP13, the Parties agreed to extend the period of validity of Decision 12.72 until CoP14 in 2007, and also adopted Decision 13.66, tasking the Standing Committee Export Quota Working Group to complete the quota guidelines and present them for consideration of the Parties at CoP14 in 2007. The United States continues to serve as a member of this working group.

MANAGEMENT OF QUEEN CONCH: Via CITES Notification No. 2003/057, issued in September 2003, the Secretariat informed the CITES Parties of a number of recommendations made by the Standing Committee to Parties trading in queen conch (*Strombus gigas*). One of these recommendations was that Parties give consideration to development of a regional management regime. The need for a mechanism to manage trans-boundary fishery resources in the Wider Caribbean has long been recognized, but never achieved. At its most recent meeting in St. Georges, Grenada (21-24 October 2003), the Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) of the Food and Agriculture Agency (FAO) recommended the establishment of an intersessional working group to study how strengthened regional management cooperation could be achieved. The United States has actively supported implementation of this recommendation and, during 2004, hosted the following informal workshops to plan for the activity: a workshop at the White Water to Blue Water Partnership Initiative in March 2004, and one at the meeting of the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute in November 2004. The first meeting of the WECAFC working group to discuss strengthened management in the Wider Caribbean will be convened in July 2005 in the Dominican Republic and work will continue at the 12<sup>th</sup> Session of WECAFC in October 2005.

## **V. CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

UNITED STATES SELECTED AS ALTERNATE NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE: The United States served as the Alternate Regional Representative on the CITES Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP12 and CoP13. At CoP13 in October 2004, the Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, as the Alternate Regional Representative on the Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP13 and CoP14.

20<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE ANIMALS COMMITTEE: The United States sent a five-person delegation to the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Animals Committee (AC20), which was held in Johannesburg, South Africa, 29 March through 2 April 2004. The interagency U.S. delegation included two representatives from the USFWS, two from the National Marine Fisheries Service, and a U.S. Congressional staff member. The United States submitted a document on the periodic



review of the CITES Appendices and a document on production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species. The United States also participated in the meeting of the Nomenclature Committee, and was a member of ten working groups: Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species; review of the criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II (co-chaired by the United States); periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices (chaired by the United States); process for registering operations that breed Appendix-I animal species for commercial purposes; relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation; trade in hard corals; production systems; conservation of and trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles; conservation of seahorses; and conservation of and trade in sea cucumbers.

TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP: The United States remains active on the Animals Committee Transport Working Group and intends to continue in this capacity for the foreseeable future. The United States believes that the group should continue its focus on addressing the most serious causes of transport mortality, injury, and extreme stress, and welcomes an increased effort from the Parties to alleviate existing problems. The United States supports the Working Group's intention to recommend updates to the CITES Transport Guidelines for methods of animal transport other than by air, and has been compiling non-air transport methods to contribute to this project. In November 2004, the USFWS attended the International Air Transport Association (IATA) Live Animals and Perishables Board (LAPB) meeting, representing both the United States and as a member of the Transport Working Group.

TRADE IN HARD CORALS: The United States has been an active member of the Working Group established at AC15. Among other things, the Coral Working Group has been working on several issues in the stony coral trade such as characterizing exempt fossil corals and identifying taxa that cannot easily be recognized at the species level. Working via e-mail and at AC20, the Coral Working Group continued to debate proper means to distinguish between fossil and non-fossil stony corals in trade. Although the term "fossil coral" remains undefined, the CITES Parties agreed to further examine the conservation risks associated with the coral trade before CoP14 (in 2007).

#### CONSERVATION OF SEAHORSES AND OTHER MEMBERS OF THE FAMILY

SYNGNATHIDAE: At AC20, the United States continued to participate in the working group on seahorses and other syngnathids. As per Decision 12.54, the Animals Committee worked diligently at AC20 to recommend a voluntary minimum export height of 10 cm for wild-caught specimens. Scientists from the Florida Marine Research Institute, the U.S. Scientific Authority, and the U.S. National Marine Fisheries Service were active participants in the 2004 discussions over this size limit.

In order to develop guidelines for sustainable harvest and non-detrimental trade (as per CITES Article IV), the United States worked with Mexico to organize and execute an international workshop on seahorse fishery management and international trade in Mazatlan (Sinaloa), Mexico, in February 2004. Proceedings are being finalized and will be available by April 2005.

CONSERVATION OF AND TRADE IN SEA CUCUMBERS: At CoP13, the United States worked with the government of Ecuador to successfully extend a deadline for the Animals Committee discussion paper on the conservation of selected sea cucumber taxa (Decision 13.48) from CoP13 to CoP14.

## **VI. CITES PLANTS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

UNITED STATES SELECTED AS NORTH AMERICAN REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVE ON THE PLANTS COMMITTEE: From mid-2003 through CoP13 in October 2004, Mr. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, served as the Alternate North American Regional Representative on the CITES Plants Committee. At CoP13, the Parties from North America selected Mr. Gabel as the Regional Representative on the Plants Committee for the intersessional period between CoP13 and CoP14.

14<sup>TH</sup> MEETING OF THE PLANTS COMMITTEE: The United States sent a two-person delegation to the 14<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC14), which was held in Windhoek, Namibia, 16-20 February 2004. Both delegates were from the USFWS. The United States prepared and submitted two documents for discussion on the agenda: PC14 Doc. 7.4, on review of resolutions on plants and plant trade; and PC14 Doc. 7.5.2, on the determination of the definition of mahogany plywood. The United States submitted PC14 Doc. 7.4 as the Chair of the Plants Committee Working Group on Resolutions Pertaining to Plants. The United States also submitted an informational document (PC14 Inf. 17) containing a list of plant and animal production systems and possible source codes. The U.S. delegation was active in numerous issues, including the review of the CITES listing criteria, review of existing resolutions pertaining to plants, evaluation of procedures for the Review of Significant Trade, selection procedures for inclusion of species in the Review of the Appendices, definition of mahogany plywood, and production systems.

PLANT RESOLUTIONS WORKING GROUP: At PC13, the United States was chosen to chair a working group to review and revise, as appropriate, the current CITES Resolutions related to plants, particularly Resolutions Conf. 9.19 and Conf. 11.11. This work was assigned for the period between PC13 and PC14. The group consisted of both Management Authorities and Scientific Authorities of countries representing the three official languages of the Convention. Revisions to Resolution Conf. 9.19 were limited to clarification of wording used in the French and Spanish versions of the Resolution. For Resolution Conf. 11.11, the working group focused on clarifying and simplifying the resolution, especially with regard to the definition of “artificially propagated,” but also examined other sections of the Resolution. Drafts of both resolutions were submitted for consideration by the Plants Committee at PC14. The Plants Committee decided that the Working Group should continue its work and submit drafts of the two revised resolutions at CoP13 in October 2004. The United States submitted the two draft revised resolutions at CoP13 and they were adopted by the Parties.

IATA: To reflect recent CoP13 decisions, Canada and the United States provided editorial suggestions for consideration in the next edition of the IATA Perishable Cargo Manual. These

suggestions focused on modifications to the existing table on more frequent CITES-listed plants (Table 15.1.A of the current version) to reflect CoP13 decisions on trade in orchids, palms, and medicinal plants, as well as editorial changes to more accurately reflect current live plant trade in some succulents and air plants.

## **VII. JOINT ANIMALS COMMITTEE – PLANTS COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES**

REVIEW OF CRITERIA FOR LISTING SPECIES IN THE CITES APPENDICES: At CoP12, the Parties adopted a Decision directing the Animals and Plants Committees to continue a review of the criteria with particular emphasis on evaluating their applicability to different taxa. The United States actively participated in the evaluation of the applicability of the criteria to a wide range of taxa, and subsequent revision of Resolution Conf. 9.24 at CoP13. In addition to being involved in eight taxonomic reviews for AC20 (March-April 2004) and three taxonomic reviews for PC14 (February 2004), the United States served as co-chair of the Listing Criteria Working Group at AC20 and was a member of the Listing Criteria Working Group at PC14.

REVIEW OF THE APPENDICES: The United States chaired a joint Animals Committee-Plants Committee working group that developed guidelines for conducting future reviews of animal and plant taxa in the Appendices. These guidelines were subsequently adopted by the Plants and Animals Committees.

PRODUCTION SYSTEMS FOR SPECIMENS OF CITES-LISTED SPECIES: At PC14 and AC20, the United States submitted Documents PC14 Inf. 17 and AC20 Inf. 18 respectively, each containing a list of plant and animal production systems and possible source codes. Based on the review of this U.S. document and the IUCN/SSC draft report, an AC20 Production Systems Working Group recommended, and the Animals Committee agreed, that a joint working group of the Animals and Plants Committees be formed to examine the documents that have been developed thus far on production systems, identify and define different production systems for animals and plants, and determine the appropriate source codes for each production system. To help move this issue forward, the United States submitted Document CoP13 Doc. 49 at CoP13, which included a draft decision adopted by Parties as Decision 13.68, tasking the Animals and Plants Committees with establishing the joint working group and setting forth Terms of Reference for the working group.

## VIII. ACTIVITIES RELATED TO CITES TIMBER ISSUES

MAHOGANY IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES: Bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*) was listed in CITES Appendix II at CoP12. The listing became effective on 15 November 2003. As the Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany includes plywood, a commodity not covered under the previous Appendix-III listing of the species, the United States prepared and submitted a proposed revision of CITES Resolution Conf. 10.13 (on timber) proposing that Parties recognize the World Customs Organization's definition of plywood to define mahogany plywood under CITES. This proposed revision was endorsed by the Plants Committee at PC14 and the United States then submitted it at CoP13. The Parties adopted this revision at CoP13.

In May 2004, the United States attended the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) workshop on mahogany implementation in Pucallpa, Peru. At this workshop, the major range countries, Bolivia, Brazil, and Peru, reported on their implementation of the Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany.

During 2004, various U.S. agencies have been collaborating to identify potential mechanisms for providing capacity building, training, and other technical assistance to mahogany range countries. The USFWS remains in close contact with Peru regarding their implementation of the mahogany Appendix-II listing, and sent the Peruvian CITES Management and Scientific Authorities a letter in December 2004 asking for confirmation that Peru is making non-detriment findings on mahogany prior to its export from the country.

Also during 2004, the United States continued to review U.S. imports of bigleaf mahogany, with a view toward assessing implementation of the Appendix-II listing of the species.

RAMIN IMPLEMENTATION ACTIVITIES: Ramin (*Gonystylus* spp.) was listed in CITES Appendix II at CoP13. The listing became effective on 12 January 2005. In the weeks leading up to the effective date, the USFWS provided outreach to the U.S. ramin industry. On 2 December 2004, the USFWS sent a letter to more than 60 U.S. ramin importers and re-exporters on the requirements of the Appendix-II listing of ramin. The USFWS also updated its Internet timber Web page with information on the ramin Appendix-II listing, and prepared and posted on the Web a news release providing information on the Appendix-II listing.

Additionally, on 21 December 2004, the USFWS sent a letter to the ramin range countries and the major ramin re-exporting countries informing them of the U.S. policy regarding acceptance of CITES ramin permits and certificates before, on, and after 12 January 2005, the effective Appendix-II listing date. The USFWS included along with this letter a report summarizing U.S. ramin trade during 2001-2003.

## **IX. CITES TRAINING AND ASSISTANCE**

USFWS SUPPORTS NORTH AMERICAN INTELLIGENCE SEMINAR: The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement's Intelligence Unit helped conduct an Intelligence Led Enforcement for Wildlife Crimes Seminar in Ottawa, Canada, in January 2004. The seminar, which was sponsored by the Commission on Environmental Cooperation and the North American Wildlife Enforcement Group, featured USFWS presentations on species of concern, cross-border movement of hunters, sea turtle egg and meat trafficking, and caviar trade patterns. Attendees included representatives from U.S., Canadian, and Mexican wildlife enforcement agencies.

USFWS HOSTS CITES "EXPERTS" MEETING: In February 2004, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement hosted a five-day CITES Experts Law Enforcement meeting that was organized by the CITES Secretariat to address problems identified at the 12th Conference of Parties. Held at the USFWS National Conservation Training Center in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, the meeting focused on ways to improve the flow of enforcement-related data among relevant international, regional, and national law enforcement organizations, CITES management authorities, and the CITES Secretariat. Officials participating included delegates from Azerbaijan, the United Kingdom, Israel, Zambia, Kazakhstan, China, the Lusaka Task Force, the Tiger Enhancement Task Force, Chile, Canada, New Zealand, and the United States.

USFWS CONDUCTS CRIMINAL INVESTIGATORS COURSE FOR AFRICAN OFFICERS: In June 2004, a training team consisting of three special agents and a forensic scientist presented the Service-developed two-week Wildlife Poaching Investigators Course for the third time at the International Law Enforcement Training Academy in Botswana. Students included 30 enforcement officers from Botswana, Uganda, Kenya, South Africa, Zambia, and Tanzania. The course covered CITES and endangered species law; case initiation and management; intelligence gathering; forensics and crime scene processing; surveillance; undercover operations; interviewing; raid planning; and preparing cases for court. New components included modules on African bushmeat trade and wildlife poisoning investigations.

U.S., MEXICO OFFICERS FOCUS ON ENVIRONMENTAL CRIMES: In May 2004, USFWS officers participated in a bilateral transboundary environmental enforcement workshop in Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico, which reviewed regulatory requirements and explored ways to combat wildlife smuggling and other crimes. A USFWS presentation on protected species covered U.S. wildlife laws and recommendations for improving cooperative enforcement efforts. Other U.S. agencies participating included the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Justice, and Department of State; the program was sponsored by the Mexican Center for Environmental Rights, Commission on Environmental Cooperation, International Fund for Animal Welfare, and SEMARNAT (Mexico's Federal environmental enforcement agency).

TANZANIAN TRAINING TARGETS MARINE ISSUES: In August 2004, USFWS special agents conducted a two-week law enforcement training program for 23 local conservation officers in Bagamoyo, Tanzania, an area located along the Indian Ocean. The course covered the basics of wildlife law enforcement as well as watercraft safety. Students worked with a motorized patrol

boat, which was transferred to the Bagamoyo Fisheries District by the Interior Department to support efforts aimed at protecting sea turtles, coral reefs, and fishery resources. Service agents also supplied the students with \$3,500 worth of camouflage clothing donated by the Federal Wildlife Officers Association. This training program, which was coordinated by the Tanzania Coastal Management Partnership, marked the first instruction of its kind ever provided at the district level in Tanzania.

USFWS SUPPORTS MARINE ENFORCEMENT IN ECUADOR: In September 2004, a USFWS special agent provided on-the-job law enforcement training to officers at the Galapagos National Park and Marine Reserve in Ecuador. The training, which was coordinated by the Department of the Interior's International Technical Assistance Program, was timed to coincide with the annual sea cucumber harvest and included "on the water" instruction during actual patrol operations.

FORENSICS CONFERENCE DRAWS U.S., GLOBAL SCIENTISTS: The USFWS National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory hosted the 2004 fall meeting of the Northwest Association of Forensic Scientists during the week of October 25-29, 2004. The meeting, which drew some 100 scientists representing U.S. and international forensics laboratories, focused on the field of wildlife forensics; the schedule included two days of special workshops at the Laboratory itself as well as technical presentations by 40 Laboratory staff members.

## **X. LAW ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES**

***STRENGTHENING U.S. CITES ENFORCEMENT CAPACITY:*** During 2004, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement worked to maintain and improve its CITES enforcement infrastructure and core investigative and inspection capabilities. Accomplishments in these areas include:

STRATEGIC PLAN CRAFTED FOR USFWS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS: During 2004, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement drafted a comprehensive strategic plan to guide all of its enforcement efforts through the end of the decade, including CITES enforcement. This plan, which addresses the mandates set in the most recent CITES resolution on compliance and enforcement (Conf. 11.3/Rev. CoP13) as well as the agency's domestic wildlife protection responsibilities, emphasizes the importance of USFWS efforts to prevent the unlawful import/export and interstate commerce of foreign fish, wildlife, and plants. Under this plan, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement will seek to improve its effectiveness in intercepting illegal trade through the use of risk assessment to target physical inspection activities. The agency will also focus investigative resources on disrupting or dismantling criminal enterprises engaged in the exploitation of CITES-listed and U.S. protected wildlife and plant resources. USFWS Law Enforcement will also work to enhance intelligence gathering and forensics support; increase cooperation with law enforcement partners worldwide (including investigative support and information sharing); and promote compliance through outreach and education that specifically targets industries and individuals engaged in wildlife trade and other activities that affect the viability of wildlife populations.

NEW DESIGNATED PORTS SET TO OPEN: In 2004, the USFWS completed the regulatory process needed to open new designated ports at Memphis, Tennessee, and Louisville, Kentucky –

two locations where the Service was not previously present to police wildlife trade. Both Memphis and Louisville are hubs for major express mail shipping companies that handle large volumes of international shipments each year. Recent USFWS wildlife smuggling investigations show that this form of transport is increasingly being used to smuggle wildlife products and even live wildlife (such as CITES-listed reptiles). The presence of USFWS wildlife inspectors at these new locations should improve the agency's ability to interdict illegal trade while facilitating clearance of lawfully imported shipments transported by private mail carriers. Both ports will begin inspection operations early in 2005.

**INTERAGENCY TRAINING BOLSTERS CITES ENFORCEMENT:** The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement continued its efforts to provide "cross-training" on CITES requirements and U.S. wildlife trade regulations to U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers. Training segments were provided as part of the basic training received by these officers. USFWS wildlife inspectors offered similar instruction to law enforcement counterparts at ports of entry and border crossings throughout the country. Also, two USFWS field Law Enforcement agents participated in training sessions conducted jointly by the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and USFWS for APHIS inspection officers in Honolulu, Hawaii, in April 2004. These two USFWS agents also participated in another joint session on non-living plant materials conducted for U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection Agriculture Specialists in Long Beach, California, in July 2004.

**USFWS INSPECTORS TAP TECHNOLOGY:** USFWS wildlife inspectors at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York City – the Nation's second busiest port of entry for wildlife trade – gained access to a new portable X-ray inspection van for screening passenger baggage and cargo shipments for illegal wildlife and wildlife products. The van, which can process up to 1,500 parcels per hour, allows rapid examination of large volume shipments and can differentiate between organic and inorganic material.

**TRADE DATA PROJECT PROMISES IMPROVED ENFORCEMENT:** In 2004, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement began working with U.S. Customs and Border Protection and more than 50 other U.S. regulatory agencies to overhaul the automated processing of U.S. imports and exports. A new International Trade Data System (ITDS) now under development will streamline the import/export process for businesses while improving cross-agency intelligence sharing, smuggling interdiction, and trade enforcement efforts (including those associated enforcement of the CITES treaty in the United States).

**USFWS SUSTAINS INVESTIGATIVE CAPABILITIES:** The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement hired a class of 19 new special agents in 2004, keeping force levels relatively stable despite continued attrition due to retirements. These agents completed basic training and reported to their duty stations in the field in October 2004. Maintaining an adequately staffed investigative program is important to USFWS efforts to uphold the CITES treaty and enforce U.S. wildlife trade laws.

**WILDLIFE TRADE REPORT SUPPORTS ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS:** In 2004, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement's Intelligence Unit completed a comprehensive analysis of U.S. wildlife trade, which included port-by-port reviews as well as identification of national trends for the period 1997 through 2003. This study assessed wildlife trade through a variety of lenses, including species, commodity, country, mode of transport, purpose, and refused species. This information will help USFWS law enforcement managers evaluate inspection operations and identify ways to improve U.S. policing of wildlife trade at ports of entry and border crossings.

**INSPECTIONS AND INVESTIGATIONS:** The enforcement of CITES and the interception of illegal wildlife trade remained a mission priority for the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement during 2004. USFWS wildlife inspectors monitored U.S. wildlife trade for CITES compliance and intercepted illegal shipments of CITES-protected species. USFWS special agents conducted criminal investigations of individuals and companies attempting to exploit protected wildlife and plants.

**Monitoring Wildlife Trade:** The USFWS wildlife inspection program remained the Nation's front-line defense against illegal wildlife trafficking. At the close of 2004, USFWS inspectors were stationed at 34 ports and border crossings where they are now processing more than 140,000 shipments per year. Selected program accomplishments for the reporting period include:

- Inspectors in New York City used the agency's new X-ray machine to respond to an anonymous tip about a smuggling attempt involving Asian arowanas. The machine was used to screen passengers, helping officers find the would-be smuggler, who was carrying eight of the Appendix-I fish.
- A courier service operating between New York and El Salvador paid a \$2,900 penalty for unlawfully importing 205 sea turtle eggs in October 2004.
- In New York, a leather goods company with a long history of CITES violations paid \$35,000 in civil penalties for importing three shipments containing 450 lizard watchstraps and 3 lizard handbags without appropriate permits.
- Seizures in Newark, New Jersey, included ivory carvings, two stuffed pangolins, and a commercial shipment of sunglasses with frames made from alligator, ostrich, and emu.
- In Boston, proactive inspection of a shipment from South Africa that was invoiced as wooden statues resulted in the seizure of carvings decorated with elephant ivory inlay.
- A researcher previously cited for CITES violations was stopped by inspectors in Boston when he arrived from the United Kingdom with 69 Appendix I white-tailed eagle feathers and six other (probably golden) eagle feathers for which he had no CITES permit.
- Seizures from passengers arriving at Boston's Logan International Airport included sturgeon caviar, sea turtle eggs, reptilian leather goods, and items made from elephant ivory. One traveler, caught with 50 pairs of shoes and 20 handbags made from CITES-protected reptiles, persisted in claiming that the items were all for personal use.
- Interceptions at the port of Atlanta included three seizures of sea turtles eggs that were being smuggled into the country by passengers arriving from El Salvador. Inspectors also seized a



shipment of corals and queen conch shells imported from Mexico without the required CITES permits.

- Inspection of an ocean freight container at the port of Miami resulted in the seizure of 12,000 pounds of coral imported from the Philippines without a CITES permit. Other coral seizures at this port included a shipment from Haiti containing 11,000 pounds of coral and 39 boxes of soft coral and live rock that were concealed in a shipment of tropical fish imported from Kenya.
- USFWS officers seized approximately 23,250 pounds of queen conch meat from a commercial shipment that arrived at Port Everglades, Florida, from Honduras with an expired CITES permit.
- Seizures from passengers entering the country via Miami International Airport included 258 sea turtle eggs, 85 pounds of sea turtle meat, 10 sea turtle shells, 61 jars of sea turtle oil or cream, 106 pieces of live coral, 21 live seahorses, and 78 pounds of dried sea horses.
- In Puerto Rico, the USFWS foiled smuggling attempts involving sea turtle shells, queen conch meat, and queen conch shells.
- At Chicago's O'Hare International Airport, USFWS wildlife inspectors stopped a shipment of CITES Appendix II live rock from Fiji that contained 2,166 kilograms more than authorized by the accompanying CITES permit; the excess live rock was refused entry and was re-exported to Fiji.
- Inspectors in Houston intercepted a shipment containing 18 pieces of carved elephant ivory imported from Belgium. The ivory was encased in plaster and smoked cloth and shipped with a collection of wooden carvings.
- A missionary returning to Houston from Panama was caught trying to smuggle a large collection of wildlife parts in his luggage. Items seized included 63 pieces of sea turtle shell, crocodile and primate skulls, bird beaks, and primate skins.
- In San Francisco, inspectors discovered 23 live giant clams concealed in a commercial shipment of tropical fish.
- Individuals in northern California fined for CITES violations included a man who unlawfully imported an Asian arowana; a subject who smuggled a live Appendix II Burmese star tortoise; and a big game hunter who unlawfully imported a brown hyena trophy from Namibia.
- Inspectors in San Francisco refused clearance on a \$33,000 shipment of beluga caviar from Bulgaria that was not in compliance with CITES labeling requirements.
- A Los Angeles fish importer who tried to smuggle in 234 pieces of live CITES-listed coral and clams from Indonesia abandoned the shipment and was fined \$1,000.
- A passenger arriving at the Los Angeles International Airport from China was caught with 10 vials of bear bile in his baggage – contraband worth more than \$1,700.
- Inspectors “blitzing” a flight arriving in Los Angeles from China intercepted unlawful medicinals made from CITES-listed wildlife; items seized included 60 bottles labeled as containing musk deer as well as products purportedly made from bear and tiger.
- In December 2004, a multi-agency inspection blitz at two ports of entry along the U.S./Mexico border in southern California resulted in the arrest of a man who entered the country with 42 red-lored Amazon parrots hidden in his vehicle.

- Seizures at Denver International Airport included a commercial shipment of 38 elephant skin leather products.
- A headdress made from macaw feathers that was seized from a Mexican traveler arriving in Denver without the required CITES permit was officially forfeited to the Service; the headdress is now on display at the Denver International Airport as part of an educational exhibit on wildlife trade laws.
- A U.S. reptile dealer was caught smuggling two ball pythons (a CITES-listed species) into Canada at Dunseith, North Dakota, and was fined by wildlife authorities in both countries. The snakes were concealed in a pillowcase hidden in the bottom of an open bag of corn chips.
- Inspectors in Anchorage intercepted multiple shipments of smuggled CITES-listed reptiles destined for the Midwest and Southeast. The resulting investigations resulted in convictions involving more than 50 months worth of prison sentences.
- A major watch importer faces a \$20,000 civil penalty for importing 11 shipments via Anchorage in violation of the CITES treaty. Inspectors seized 351 items made from CITES-protected wildlife.
- While inspecting a shipment from the Philippines that was declared as furniture, Anchorage wildlife inspectors discovered that it actually contained undeclared hunting trophies, including two water buffalo and two CITES-protected civet cats; the importer was fined \$1,100 and forfeited the civet cats.
- Charges are expected against an Alaska ivory dealer who falsely declared an import of five walrus jawbones as Stellar sea cow, an extinct species.
- Inspectors in Anchorage seized a number of unlawfully imported wildlife items brokered via the Internet; examples include elephant ivory pool cues and leather goods made from CITES-listed crocodylians, lizards, and pythons.
- Anchorage inspectors also seized 507 elephant skin watch straps imported from Hong Kong without a valid CITES permit.

### ***Smuggling Investigations***

**U.S. MUSEUM OFFICIAL FORFEITS ARTIFACT COLLECTION:** In January 2004, the director of the Smithsonian Institution pleaded guilty to wildlife charges in connection with his purchase and possession of unlawfully imported Amazonian tribal art made from the parts of protected birds, including CITES-listed species. The USFWS investigation showed that this individual paid \$400,000 to buy over 1,000 items for his personal collection. Under a plea agreement, he must forfeit that collection to the government and serve two years probation. He was also ordered to write a letter of explanation to four major U.S. newspapers and *National Geographic* magazine and perform 100 hours of community service.

**REPTILE SMUGGLER, U.S. “CLIENT” SENTENCED:** In March 2004, a Singapore national was sentenced to serve 41 months in prison for smuggling more than 150 CITES-protected reptiles valued at more than \$200,000 from Thailand to buyers in the United States and for laundering the money received from these sales. The reptile dealer, who ran his business from Thailand, had been indicted on 13 counts alleging conspiracy to smuggle, false labeling of wildlife, trade in

endangered species, and money laundering. In April 2004, the owner of a Wisconsin pet store, who was indicted in connection with this smuggling operation, was sentenced to serve 10 months in prison and pay a \$500 fine for his role in this conspiracy. This defendant must also reimburse the government \$2,223 for costs incurred in caring for seized reptiles and serve two years probation during which he is prohibited from operating any business involving live exotic wildlife.

WEST AFRICAN ART DEALER INDICTED: An operator of several internet-based wildlife and West African art businesses was indicted in March 2004 for smuggling elephant ivory into the United States from Cameroon. She was charged with two felony wildlife counts and two counts of aiding and abetting the smuggling of goods into the United States. The ivory was concealed in two shipments of terra cotta pottery and falsely labeled as wood terra cotta sculptures and terra cotta flowerpots. The art dealer is in custody in Canada, where she was arrested at the request of the United States, and is awaiting extradition. The maximum penalty for each charge is five years imprisonment and a fine of \$250,000.

ORCHID SMUGGLER FINED: In April 2004, USFWS officers at George Bush Intercontinental Airport in Houston, Texas, caught a woman returning to the United States from the Philippines who was smuggling 28 live CITES Appendix I and II orchids concealed inside a sealed tin labeled "tea." She paid a \$3,300 fine for importing the orchids without the required permits and abandoned the plants to the government.

CAVIAR COMPANY PRESIDENT SENT TO PRISON: In May 2004, the president of a Polish caviar company pleaded guilty and was sentenced to 30 months in prison for his part in a smuggling conspiracy that paid couriers to bring suitcases filled with caviar into the United States. The subject admitted that he purchased caviar on the black market in Poland and that co-conspirators then hired couriers to smuggle it into the United States. A forged Fish and Wildlife Service import/export license and false invoices citing a non-existent company were used to facilitate sale of the caviar to a Miami company. The president of the Polish company was directly responsible for the smuggling of 619 kilograms of caviar worth an estimated \$1.8 million. In total, the courier-based smuggling scheme arranged the illegal importation of 1,539 kilograms of caviar.

U.S. PROBE FUELS WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING ARRESTS IN BRAZIL: A USFWS investigation of wildlife smuggling that sent a Florida businessman to prison for 40 months helped Federal authorities in Brazil break up a criminal network illegally trafficking in tribal handicrafts made from CITES-protected species. In May 2004, the Brazilian Federal Police announced the arrests of 11 individuals linked to an international trafficking scheme and the seizure of 1,000 wildlife items. The arrests marked the culmination of an investigation that began after the USFWS notified the Brazilian government that tribal handicrafts decorated with macaw feathers, jaguar teeth, and other wildlife parts were being smuggled to the United States and possibly other countries from Brazil. Those arrested in Brazil were employed by that country's National Indian Foundation (FUNAI), a government agency tasked with defending the interests and rights of Indian peoples in Brazil.

ANTIQUES DEALER FINED FOR WILDLIFE TRAFFICKING: In May 2004, a Michigan antiques dealer was sentenced to pay a \$15,000 fine and \$10,000 in restitution after pleading guilty to charges related to the unlawful importation and interstate sale of items made from hawksbill sea turtle and elephant ivory. He also forfeited 70 unlawfully imported items made from CITES-protected species that were seized by the USFWS when special agents searched his business in May 2003. The USFWS investigation showed that the dealer made annual trips to England where he would purchase turtle shell and elephant ivory products for future sale at his Michigan business.

ORCHID SMUGGLER AND CO-CONSPIRATOR SENTENCED: In July 2004, a Peruvian national, who was indicted for orchid smuggling along with his U.S. "customer," was sentenced to serve 21 months in prison and fined \$5,000 for his role in a conspiracy to import protected tropical lady's slipper orchids into the United States. The Peruvian plant dealer obtained legal CITES documents in that country, but then substituted falsely labeled wild orchids for legal specimens. His co-conspirator, a Texas plant dealer, was sentenced in October 2004 to spend 17 months in prison followed by two years of supervised release. Sales records that were seized during a search of his business revealed dealings involving three separate shipments containing protected orchids valued at \$45,000.

NEW CHARGES FILED IN ONGOING PROBE OF REPTILE SMUGGLING: An ongoing USFWS investigation of large-scale smuggling of rare reptiles from Southeast Asia (which secured the successful prosecutions of a Singapore reptile dealer and a Wisconsin pet store owner described above) saw two new defendants indicted on Federal felony charges in Florida in July 2004. A third individual who was involved in the smuggling began negotiating a pre-indictment plea agreement with Federal prosecutors.

COMPANY PLEADS GUILTY IN PRIMATE IMPORTATION CASE: In August 2004, a South Carolina breeder and seller of monkeys for medical research pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court in Chicago to one felony count of submitting false records in connection with a 1997 shipment of CITES-listed monkeys. The company misrepresented the primates as having been bred in captivity when in fact many had been taken from the wild. Under the plea agreement, the firm, which was charged with multiple felony counts related to the importation of four primate shipments, will pay a \$500,000 fine and spend two years on probation.

IVORY TRAFFICKER CHARGED: In August 2004, USFWS special agents arrested a former Alaska resident, who now lives in Bali, Indonesia, for trafficking in elephant, walrus, narwhal, and woolly mammoth ivory as well as the teeth of endangered bears. The arrest, which occurred in Washington State, culminated a 14-month undercover investigation in which agents in Alaska posed as potential ivory buyers. Items involved in the case included a mammoth tusk that the defendant claimed to have removed from Federal land in Alaska and a 10-foot-long narwhal ivory carving for which he was asking \$10,000. The man faces wildlife and smuggling charges.

WEST COAST REPTILE SMUGGLERS PROSECUTED: A California man who smuggled CITES-protected tortoises into the United States from Thailand pleaded guilty to one felony count; he was sentenced to two years probation and ordered to pay a \$7,500 fine. USFWS special agents

seized \$76,000 worth of rare tortoises during the investigation. Another West Coast reptile smuggling case involved a San Diego man who pleaded guilty to smuggling after the USFWS intercepted an international mail package containing five pancake tortoises and four green tree monitor lizards – both CITES Appendix II species.

LARGEST SOUTHEAST CAVIAR DEALER PLEADS GUILTY: In November 2004, a Florida-based company that is one of the largest U.S. importers of sturgeon caviar pleaded guilty to Federal wildlife and smuggling charges and agreed to pay a \$1 million fine. The company, whose business dealings will remain subject to government and court supervision while it serves five years of probation, admitted that it purchased approximately 5.9 tons of smuggled caviar from five separate smuggling rings. The USFWS investigation documented criminal activity dating back as far as late 1999 and early 2000 and continuing through the opening years of this decade.

ORCHID ENTHUSIAST PLEADS GUILTY TO SMUGGLING: An orchid grower from Virginia pleaded guilty to two counts of violating the Endangered Species Act (through which the United States enforces the CITES treaty). The Virginia plant dealer discovered a new species of orchid on a trip to Peru and subsequently smuggled the rare plant into the United States; he then had the orchid described and named after himself by a Florida botanical garden. In November 2004, the smuggler was fined \$1,000 and ordered to serve two years probation during which he cannot travel outside of the United States – a restriction that will curtail his orchid collecting activities.

SMUGGLED BIRDS RETURNED TO MEXICO: Ninety rare parrots, all smuggled into the United States for the black market pet trade, were returned to Mexico by Federal authorities on December 20, 2004, at Otay Mesa, located south of San Diego on the U.S./Mexico border. The smuggled birds, which included 68 lilac-crowned Amazons and 22 red-headed Amazons, were recovered during two USFWS wildlife trafficking investigations in southern California; in both instances, the defendants pleaded guilty to Federal smuggling and wildlife trafficking charges.

MAHOGANY AND RAMIN SEIZURES IN 2004: During 2004, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized two shipments of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*) wood. One of these shipments was imported from Belize and the other from an unidentified country of export. The shipments contained 2 cubic meters of sawn wood, plus an additional 18 bundles of sawn wood, and the total estimated dollar value of the wood in these shipments is 28,770 USD.

Also during 2004, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized four shipments of ramin (*Gonystylus* spp.) wood products. Two of these shipments were imported from Italy, one from China, and one from Indonesia. The shipments contained 613 baby cribs, and 908 cartons and 594 bundles of wood mouldings. The estimated dollar value of the wood products in these shipments is 191,577 USD.

## **XI. PUBLIC EDUCATION EFFORTS**

**U.S. CITES WEBSITE:** The USFWS has continued to update and improve its CITES Website (at <http://www.fws.gov/international>). Among other items, the site contains the CITES treaty, CITES Fact Sheets, lists of CITES Party countries and non-Parties, a directory of Management and Scientific Authorities in Party countries and of equivalent authorities in non-Parties, copies of recent U.S. CITES biennial reports, copies of recent CITES Updates, a CoP13 page, and links to the CITES Secretariat's Website. It also contains a Web page on CITES timber, one on queen conch, and one ginseng. The USFWS has also continued to update and improve its U.S. permits Website (at <http://www.fws.gov/permits>), which includes information on permits issued under CITES and other U.S. domestic conservation laws.

**COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE EFFORTS HELP BIG GAME HUNTERS:** In January 2004, USFWS Law Enforcement and International Affairs staff conducted CITES compliance outreach at the annual meeting of the Safari Club International in Reno, Nevada. USFWS participation in this event raises hunter awareness about CITES import/export permit requirements and helps improve treaty compliance by global big game hunters. The 2004 meeting marked the 15<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Service attendance as an outreach exhibitor at this event.

**OUTREACH SPOTLIGHTS WILDLIFE IN THE MEDICINAL TRADE:** In March 2004, USFWS wildlife inspectors in New York City participated in the annual convention of the Association of Chinese Herbalists, presenting information about CITES-protected species used in medicinal products and wildlife import/export requirements. Those attending the meeting included practitioners of traditional Chinese medicine from the New York metropolitan area, community representatives from New York City's Chinatown, and a representative of the Consulate General of the People's Republic of China.

**USFWS PROMOTES CONSERVATION AT FOOD SHOW:** USFWS International Affairs and Law Enforcement teamed to staff an educational exhibit at the 2004 East Coast Fancy Food Show – a trade exhibition sponsored by the National Association of the Specialty Food Trade. USFWS representatives discussed CITES protections and U.S. laws and regulations governing the importation of CITES-listed wildlife foods that range from caviar to queen conch meat. The trade show, which was held in late June, was attended by an array of food industry representatives, including many involved in the importation and sale of caviar.

**USFWS PROMOTES CITES COMPLIANCE FOR MAIL SHIPMENTS:** The senior wildlife inspector at the new USFWS designated port in Louisville, Kentucky, participated in the United Parcel Service (UPS) Compliance Outreach Fair to help company employees learn more about wildlife trade regulations. The USFWS was slated to begin processing wildlife imports and exports (many of which are shipped by international mail) at this location in January 2005. Topics covered included CITES permit requirements as well as USFWS declaration, inspection, and clearance procedures.

U.S. UPDATES GUIDANCE FOR GLOBAL TRAVELERS: The USFWS and World Wildlife Fund/Traffic North America updated the popular “Buyer Beware” brochure, which provides travelers guidance on purchasing wildlife and plant products overseas. The brochures are distributed via airport displays and are used to conduct public outreach across the country.

PUBLIC BULLETINS ALERT TRADE COMMUNITY TO CITES CONCERNS: During 2004, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement successfully used its public bulletin system to keep U.S. wildlife importers and exporters informed about changes in CITES requirements. Bulletins were issued via the Internet, posted at ports of entry, and sent to the National Customs Brokers and Forwarders Association of America for distribution to member companies. This notification network was used to inform the U.S. trade community about CITES universal labeling requirements for sturgeon caviar; changes affecting the import/export of seahorses and other tropical fish; new procedures for applying for U.S. CITES certificates; plans to designate new ports for wildlife trade; species listing changes from the 13<sup>th</sup> COP; and the imposition or lifting of CITES trade restrictions for specific countries.

## **XII. NATIONAL COLLABORATIVE EFFORTS**

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 exports 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 25 years ago to streamline the USFWS’s CITES permit issuance process for the exports of skins of these species. The USFWS currently cooperates with 45 States and 7 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. 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 2004, the USFWS issued over 667,000 tags. Between January 2004 and December 2004, the USFWS approved into the program one State for exports of river otter.

U.S. CITES GINSENG EXPORT PROGRAM: In order to implement 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. Subsequently, the USFWS relies on those State agencies to provide information on legal 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. The USFWS is then able to streamline its evaluation of permit applications to export American ginseng roots from the United States. During the period covered by this report, the USFWS has regularly communicated with the

States on issues including revision of State ginseng management regulations and administrative changes to the State programs.

### **XIII. CONSERVATION FUNDING**

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUNDS: The Multinational Species Conservation Funds consist of five programs created to fulfill direct congressional mandates to conserve populations of and habitats for neotropical migratory birds, African and Asian elephants, great apes, rhinoceroses, and tigers. Four 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, and the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000. 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. In addition to these funded programs, a new USFWS program has been recently created to fulfill congressional mandates under the Marine Turtles Conservation Act of 2004. This program received funding in Fiscal Year 2005 (October 2004 – September 2005).

The USFWS administers the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. During 2004, the USFWS granted a total of \$5,316,657 for various projects around the world in support of conservation of African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses and tigers, and great apes. Listed below is a breakdown of this project funding by species group:

African elephants:	24 projects granted a total of \$1,233,354 in funding
Asian elephants:	36 projects granted a total of \$1,533,297 in funding
Rhinoceroses/Tigers:	36 projects granted a total of \$1,220,110 in funding
Great apes:	37 projects granted a total of \$1,329,896 in funding

### **XIV. OTHER U.S. CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES**

U.S. SUBMITS ITS 2003 CITES ANNUAL REPORT: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare annual reports on its trade in CITES-listed species. On 28 October 2004, the USFWS submitted, directly to the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2003. The file (120,853 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2003. The data represent actual trade and not just numbers of CITES permits issued.

U.S. SUBMITS ITS 2002-2003 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 1 December 2004, the USFWS submitted to the CITES Secretariat the U.S. biennial report covering the interval 2002-2003. This report summarized some of the major legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken by the United States during this biennial period in its implementation of CITES.



The USFWS has also posted this U.S. biennial report and the one covering the interval 2000-2001 on its CITES Website at <http://www.fws.gov/international/cites/cites.html>.

**ARGENTINA PETITION FOR APPROVAL OF A SUSTAINABLE-USE MANAGEMENT**

**PLAN:** The Wild Bird Conservation Act of 1992 (WBCA) limits or prohibits import of exotic bird species into the United States in order to ensure that wild populations are not harmed by international trade. Since 1993, imports into the United States of all CITES-listed birds have been prohibited except as provided under certain exemptions. One of the exemptions provided under the WBCA is for the import of species from countries that have approved sustainable-use management plans (SUMPs) for those species. In January 2003, the USFWS completed a Draft Environmental Assessment of Argentina's petition for approval of a SUMP for blue-fronted amazon parrots (*Amazona aestiva*). In August 2003, the USFWS published a rule in the *Federal Register* proposing approval of Argentina's petition. The USFWS has not yet made a final decision regarding approval of Argentina's SUMP. In response to the receipt from Argentina of the 2004 study entitled, "Modeling the Sustainable Use of the Blue-Fronted Parrot (*Amazona aestiva*) in the Dry Chaco Region of Argentina," the USFWS reopened the public comment period on its proposed rule in March 2005. The USFWS will enter the study from Argentina into the record and accept comments on it as it relates to the USFWS proposal to approve Argentina's petition.

**FREE TRADE AGREEMENT:** As part of Free Trade Agreement (FTA) negotiations in the United States, the USFWS continues to contribute to an interagency Environmental Assessment of wildlife trade and policy with various countries. The USFWS has completed summaries for Singapore, Chile, and Morocco, and the Central American FTA countries of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua, and has prepared reports for Ecuador, Peru, and Colombia for a U.S.-Andean FTA. Additionally, the USFWS provided a review of wildlife issues for an interim environmental review for a U.S.-Panama FTA. These assessments summarize trade of CITES-listed species between those countries and the United States and provide an overview, for each particular country, of its wildlife legislation, including CITES implementation, trade enforcement, and other relevant wildlife activities and issues.

**BELUGA STURGEON LISTED AS THREATENED:** The USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* on 21 April 2004, listing the beluga sturgeon (*Huso huso* – included in CITES Appendix II) as Threatened under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. Following this listing, on 26 October 2004, the USFWS published an interim rule in the *Federal Register* allowing trade in the Threatened beluga sturgeon and its by-products to continue, provided that specimens are accompanied by valid permits issued under CITES. This interim rule allows the take, import, export, re-export, and interstate and foreign commerce in beluga sturgeon, without the issuance of a U.S. Endangered Species Act Threatened Species Permit for those specimens that are traded in accordance with the requirements of CITES. The interim rule remained in effect through the end of 2004.

