



# **U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2011-2012**

*PREPARED BY:*

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

*COMPLETED 30 SEPTEMBER 2013*

# U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2011-2012

## *Table of Contents*

	<u>Page</u>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	2
<b>REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2011-2012 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES</b>	3
A. General information	3
B. Legislative and regulatory measures	4
C. Compliance and enforcement measures	6
D. Administrative measures	8
D1. Management Authority (MA)	8
D2. Scientific Authority (SA)	10
D3. Enforcement Authorities	12
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	12
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	15
D6. Capacity building	18
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	20
D8. Areas for future work	24
E. General feedback	25
<b>ANNEX 1 – HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION B OF THIS REPORT</b>	26
<b>ANNEX 2 – HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION C OF THIS REPORT</b>	29
<b>ANNEX 3 – HIGHLIGHTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT</b>	36
D1 and D2. Management Authority (MA) and Scientific Authority (SA)	36
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	43
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	44
D6. Capacity building	45
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	50

## INTRODUCTION

Article VIII of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) prescribes that each Party shall prepare periodic reports on its implementation of CITES and shall transmit to the Secretariat, in addition to an annual report, a biennial report on legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of CITES. This U.S. biennial report covers the interval 2011-2012.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14) recommends that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP13) and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submits this 2011-2012 report in accordance with that recommended format.

The original regulations implementing CITES in the United States were issued on 22 February 1977 (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23). To date, there have been sixteen regular meetings of the Conference of the Parties to CITES. On 23 August 2007, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a final rule in the *Federal Register* substantially updating the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. These updates reflect measures adopted by the Parties at their regular meetings through CoP13. In 2008, the USFWS published revisions to the regulations to include provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14. In 2012, the USFWS published a proposed rule to incorporate into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations relevant provisions from resolutions adopted by the Parties at CoP14 and CoP15, and anticipates publication of a final rule in October or November 2013.

During 2011-2012, the United States took many legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures in its implementation of the Convention. On the following pages, using the tabular *Biennial Report Format*, the United States reports on the major measures taken during this biennial period. Attached to the tabular report are three Annexes providing narrative highlights of some of these measures with respect to Sections B, C, and D of the tabular report.

**REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN  
BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2011-2012 IN ITS  
IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES**

**A. General information**

Party	United States of America
Period covered in this report:	1 January 2011 to 31 December 2012
Details of agency preparing this report	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 212 Arlington, Virginia 22203 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 358 2095 Fax: +1 (703) 358 2280 Email: <a href="mailto:managementauthority@fws.gov">managementauthority@fws.gov</a> Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/international">http://www.fws.gov/international</a>
Contributing agencies, organizations or individuals	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 110 Arlington, Virginia 22203 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 358 1708 Fax: +1 (703) 358 2276 Email: <a href="mailto:scientificauthority@fws.gov">scientificauthority@fws.gov</a> Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/international">http://www.fws.gov/international</a>  U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement 4401 North Fairfax Drive MS-LE-3000 Arlington, Virginia 22203 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 358 1949 Fax: +1 (703) 358 2271 Email: <a href="mailto:lawenforcement@fws.gov">lawenforcement@fws.gov</a> Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/le">http://www.fws.gov/le</a>

## 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:					
	Title and date:	Status:				
	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)? <span style="float: right;">Tick all applicable</span>					
	The conditions for:					
	The complete prohibition of:					
Issue	Yes	No	No information	Yes	No	No information
Trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Taking	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Possession	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Transport	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Additional comments:  Major stricter domestic measures in the United States that in many instances affect CITES-listed species include the Endangered Species Act, the Lacey Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, and State natural resource and wildlife laws, and state and federal regulations associated with these laws.						

6	What were the results of any review or assessment of the effectiveness of CITES legislation, with regard to the following items? <span style="float: right;">Tick all applicable</span>				
	Item	Adequate	Partially Inadequate	Inadequate	No information
	Powers of CITES authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Clarity of legal obligations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Control over CITES trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Consistency with existing policy on wildlife management and use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Coverage of law for all types of offences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Coverage of law for all types of penalties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Implementing regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Coherence within legislation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please provide details if available:					
<p>During previous and current efforts to revise the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, the USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation with regards to each of the above subjects related to the effectiveness of CITES implementation.</p> <p>In March 2012, the USFWS published a proposed rule to incorporate into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23) relevant provisions from resolutions adopted by the Parties at CoP14 and CoP15, and anticipates publication of a final rule in November or December 2013.</p>					
7	If no review or assessment has taken place, is one planned for the next reporting period?			Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>
				No	<input type="checkbox"/>
			No information	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Please provide details if available:					
8	Has there been any review of legislation on the following subjects in relation to implementation of the Convention? <span style="float: right;">Tick all applicable</span>				
	Subject	Yes	No	No information	
	Access to or ownership of natural resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Harvesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Transporting of live specimens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Handling and housing of live specimens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Please provide details if available:					
<p>During previous and current efforts to revise the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, the USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation with regards to each of the above subjects related to CITES implementation.</p>					
9	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:				
	<p><i>See ANNEX 1 for highlights of some of the major legislative and regulatory measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012.</i></p>				

### 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): USFWS wildlife inspectors and special agents have also conducted random or intelligence-based intensified inspection “blitzes” to check cargo, mail shipments, passengers, and vehicles at the border. Special enforcement operations focused on internet-based wildlife trafficking have also been undertaken.	<input checked="" 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>Fines were assessed and collected for CITES-related violations on numerous occasions. However, the structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES-related violations under different statutes make it impossible to compile totals for the “number and type of violations” for which the United States took administrative measures.</p>			
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>Please note that seizure totals at right address the number or weight of CITES specimens seized, not the number of shipments seized for CITES violations. Some specimens included in this total may have been seized for violations of U.S. wildlife laws and regulations other than CITES. Each year, the United States submits detailed data on seizures as part of its CITES Annual Report.</p>	<p><b>Number</b></p> <p>In 2011, the USFWS seized 149,348 CITES specimens (including live wildlife, parts, and products) as well as 73,086 kilograms of “commodities” representing CITES species. In 2012, the USFWS seized 187,148 CITES specimens and 33,610 kilograms of CITES “commodities.” See ANNEX 2 under the category “CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES,” for details on representative seizures.</p>		
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>USFWS inspections and investigations resulted in multiple criminal prosecutions involving the smuggling of CITES-listed species and other significant violations. However, the</p>			

	<p>structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES violations under other U.S. laws (laws that often authorize higher penalties) make it impossible to compile totals for the “numbers and types of CITES violations” that resulted in criminal prosecution.</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2, under the category “CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES,” for summaries of some of the major criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations in the United States during 2011 and 2012.</i></p>
8	<p>Have there been any other court actions of CITES-related violations?</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><input type="checkbox"/>      <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>      <input type="checkbox"/></p>
9	<p>If Yes, what were the violations involved and what were the results? Please attach details as Annex.</p>
10	<p>How were the confiscated specimens usually disposed of? <span style="float: right;">Tick if applicable</span></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Return to country of export <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>– Public zoos or botanical gardens <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>– Designated rescue centres <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>– Approved, private facilities <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>– Euthanasia <span style="float: right;"><input type="checkbox"/></span></li> <li>– Other (specify) <span style="float: right;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></span></li> </ul> <p>Comments: Some confiscated specimens were also donated to educational facilities for use in conservation education to improve public understanding of wildlife conservation and trade issues.</p>
11	<p>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?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Comments:</p>
12	<p>Have there been any cooperative enforcement activities with other countries (e.g. exchange of intelligence, technical support, investigative assistance, joint operation, etc.)?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
13	<p>If Yes, please give a brief description:</p> <p>The USFWS routinely shared intelligence on potential CITES violations with the CITES Secretariat, appropriate enforcement authorities in other CITES Party nations, and Interpol.</p> <p>USFWS cooperative enforcement efforts during the reporting period included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducting cooperative inspection blitzes with Canadian wildlife and customs authorities at various ports of entry along the U.S.-Canada land border;</li> <li>• Conducting cooperative US-Canada investigations of reptile trafficking and smuggling of Asian arowanas;</li> <li>• Initiating a partnership building effort with Mexico via a meeting in Mexico City with Mexican wildlife authorities, Federal Police, and prosecutors; identified goals include intelligence exchange, development of protocols for cooperative investigations, and creation of a liaison office to allow USFWS agents to work directly with Mexican counterparts; and</li> <li>• Conducting a 2-week national and international buy/bust enforcement blitz to deter use</li> </ul>



	of the internet in wildlife trafficking that included coordinated efforts in the United States, Thailand, Singapore, and Indonesia.		
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>	
15	If Yes, please describe: The Endangered Species Act (which implements CITES in the United States) and other U.S. wildlife laws that regulate international trade (such as the Lacey Act, African Elephant Conservation Act, and Wild Bird Conservation Act) authorize the use of fine money to pay rewards to individuals who provide information that leads to the arrest and conviction of offenders.		
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:  The USFWS worked proactively to improve CITES compliance by maintaining and improving communication with the U.S. wildlife import/export community and working directly with key groups and individual companies involved in wildlife trade. Specific compliance assistance “measures” in 2011 and 2012 included:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilization of web and port-posted public bulletins to inform the import/export community about changes in CITES requirements and U.S. wildlife trade rules;</li> <li>• Regular meetings and liaison with such groups as the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, the Port Authority of New York, the Los Angeles Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders Association, and the New York City and Boston Custom House Brokers Associations;</li> <li>• Presentations and training on CITES and U.S. wildlife import/export requirements for brokers associations at ports of entry throughout the United States;</li> <li>• Compliance meetings and contacts with FedEx, DHL, and UPS;</li> <li>• One-on-one CITES compliance guidance to company representatives and individuals engaged in wildlife trade; and</li> <li>• Operation of an e-mail-based “contact” service to answer specific questions on wildlife import/export requirements and other enforcement issues.</li> </ul>		

#### D. Administrative measures

##### D1 Management Authority (MA)

1	Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the MA(s) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>	
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here.		

3	If there is more than one MA in your country, has a lead MA been designated?	Yes No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If Yes, please name that MA and indicate whether it is identified as the lead MA in the CITES Directory.		
5	How many staff work in each MA?  The USFWS Division of Management Authority is the only CITES Management Authority in the United States. Currently, 33 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 No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <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 (Outreach/Education)		<input checked="" 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 No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <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:  <i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.</i>		

**D2 Scientific Authority (SA)**

1	Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the SA(s) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory?	Yes No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here.		
3	Is the designated Scientific Authority independent from the Management Authority?	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4	What is the structure of the SA(s)?	Tick if applicable	
	– Government institution		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Academic or research institution		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Permanent committee		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Pool of individuals with certain expertise		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>
5	How many staff work in each SA on CITES issues?  The USFWS Division of Scientific Authority is the only CITES Scientific Authority in the United States. Currently, 10 staff in the Division of Scientific Authority work on CITES issues.		
6	Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters If yes, please give estimation: About 80 percent.	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the SA(s)?	Tick if applicable	
	– Botany		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Ecology		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Fisheries		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Forestry		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Welfare		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Zoology		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Have any research activities been undertaken by the SA(s) in relation to CITES species?	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>

9	If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.						
	Species name	Populations	Distribution	Off take	Legal trade	Illegal trade	Other (specify)
	<i>Polyodon spathula</i>	Rangewide	United States				Research on the status and conservation of, with a goal of working with the States in best management practices for the species. A draft report is expected in Fall 2013.
	<i>Graptemys</i> with emphasis on <i>Graptemys sabinensis</i>	Southwestern Louisiana – the Mermentau, Calcasieu, and Sabine rivers	United States and Canada				Research conducted on status, abundance, and distribution in S.W. Louisiana.
	<i>Macrochelys temminckii</i>	Southwestern Louisiana – the Mermentau, Calcasieu, and Sabine rivers	United States				Research conducted on status, abundance, and distribution in S.W. Louisiana.
	<i>Hydrastis Canadensis</i>	Rangewide	United States and Canada				Update of NatureServe Global Rank, including economic botany, IUCN Red List, and Climate Change Vulnerability Index rankings (2012-2013).
	<i>Panax quinquefolius</i>	United States	United States and Canada				Research completed on the habitat, abundance, distribution, and genetic variation of <i>P. quinquefolius</i> in the United States (2009-2011).
	<i>Sclerocactus</i> spp.	United States and Mexico	United States and Mexico				Completed the taxonomic and conservation status review of the genus (2010-2011).
	<i>Lontra canadensis</i>	United States	United States and Canada				Status survey of U.S. States.
	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:						
	<i>See ANNEX 3, Section “D1 and D2,” for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.</i>						

**D3 Enforcement Authorities**

1	Has the Secretariat been informed of any enforcement authorities that have been designated for the receipt of confidential enforcement information related to CITES?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If No, please designate them here (with address, phone, fax and email).	
3	Is there a specialized unit responsible for CITES-related enforcement (e.g. within the wildlife department, Customs, the police, public prosecutor's office)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Under consideration <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	<p>If Yes, please state which is the lead agency for enforcement:</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: lawenforcement@fws.gov Web: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/le">http://www.fws.gov/le</a></p>	
5	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for information on criminal prosecutions and seizures of specimens of CITES-listed species.</i></p>	

**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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
3	Is there an electronic information system providing information on CITES species?						Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If Yes, does it provide information on: 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, as well as their protected status under U.S. stricter domestic measures, such as the Endangered Species Act, Wild Bird Conservation Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Marine Mammal Protection Act. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
5	Is it available through the Internet: Yes <input type="checkbox"/> <i>Note:</i> The USFWS is currently working on reprogramming the U.S. Combined Species database to make it available via the Internet. 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>2005 Checklist of CITES Species (book)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
	<i>2008 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: – 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:	Tick if applicable
9	Is there a government website with information on CITES and its requirements?  If Yes, please give the URL: <a href="http://www.fws.gov/international">http://www.fws.gov/international</a> ; <a href="http://www.fws.gov/le">http://www.fws.gov/le</a> ; and <a href="http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/cites_endangered_plants.shtml">http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/cites_endangered_plants.shtml</a>	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
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?  – 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> – Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/>  Please attach copies of any items.  <i>Note:</i> These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.	Tick if applicable
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>USFWS Law Enforcement and Management Authority representatives staffed a compliance outreach booth at the national convention of Safari Club International in Nevada in both 2011 and 2012. USFWS participation in this yearly event raises hunter awareness about CITES import/export permit requirements and helps improve compliance with the Convention by global big game hunters.</li> <li>In July 2011, USFWS Office of Law Enforcement conducted a media event in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, to announce the arrest of a major elephant ivory trafficker and spotlight threats to African elephants. There was an announcement at a media event at the U.S. Attorney's Office in Los Angeles, California, in February 2012, of</li> </ul>	

	<p>initial arrests and searches executed as part of the USFWS' ongoing investigation of rhino horn trafficking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In July 2012, USFWS Law Enforcement staff provided training on CITES and U.S. wildlife laws to appraisers assembled in Cincinnati, Ohio, for the filming of an episode of the popular public television program "Antiques Roadshow."</li> <li>• A similar training program was provided to members of the International Society of Appraisers at a meeting in Virginia in September 2012, and at the national conference of the Appraisers Association of America in New York City, New York, in November 2012.</li> <li>• Outreach activities explaining the USFWS role in policing global wildlife trade and enforcing U.S. wildlife laws and treaties included exhibits at such venues as the Kentucky and Florida State Fairs; Red River Valley Trade Show in Fargo, North Dakota; the Wildlife Conservation Network Expo in San Francisco, California; and Earth Day celebrations in California, Kentucky, and other States.</li> <li>• During the reporting period, USFWS Law Enforcement staff in Boston, Massachusetts, and Atlanta, Georgia, worked with airport managers at Logan International Airport and Hartsfield International Airport to design and install outreach displays to inform international travelers about CITES and other wildlife import/export requirements.</li> </ul> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D4," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012, with respect to communication, information management, and information exchange.</i></p>
--	--

**D5 Permitting and registration procedures**

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



3	Please indicate how many CITES documents were issued and denied in the two year period? (Note that actual trade is reported in the Annual Report by some Parties. This question refers to issued documents).				
Year 1 (2011)	Import or introduction from the sea	Export	Re-export	Other	Comments
How many documents were issued?	615	11,437	8,771	886	A total of 21,709 CITES documents were issued during 2011. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 886 "other" documents, 667 were for either export or re-export (cannot differentiate for these) and 219 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificates of ownership).
How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	-	-	-	-	A total of 78 applications were denied, either in whole or partially, during 2011. Due to the manner in which our permit computer system is programmed, a breakdown of this number by import, export, re-export, and other is not available. In addition, 143 applications were abandoned due to insufficient information being provided by the applicant.
Year 2 (2012)					
How many documents were issued?	501	8,663	10,989	442	A total of 20,595 CITES documents were issued during 2012. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 442 "other" documents, 262 were for either export or re-export (cannot differentiate for these) and 180 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificate of ownership).
How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	-	-	-	-	A total of 68 applications were denied, either in whole or partially, during 2012. Due to the manner in which our permit computer system is programmed, a breakdown of this number by import, export, re-export, and other is not available. In addition, 167 applications were abandoned due to insufficient information being provided by the applicant.

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
	Technical violations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspected fraud	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient basis for finding of non-detriment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient basis for finding of legal acquisition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Are harvest and/or export quotas used 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?		
	<p>During 2011-2012, the U.S. Scientific Authority was asked to provide opinions on more than 331 permit applications. Most application requests are for multiple species, especially for plant specimens. For example, 14 applications to trade in CITES-listed flora for which the Scientific Authority issued findings in 2011-2012 involved the review of more than 428 plant species, hybrids, or cultivars. The Scientific Authority also updated 17 "General Advices" for specimens of such species as American alligator, trophies, sturgeon, and artificially propagated American ginseng. These are positive findings issued by the U.S. Scientific Authority that can be applied by the U.S. Management Authority to numerous applications for the specified plant or animal specimens, when the permit application meets certain scientific and documentation requirements.</p>		
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.		
	<p>U.S. permit fees vary depending on the activity requested. The fees are listed in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 13, Section 13.11.</p>		

11	<p>Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Entirely: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Partly: <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Not at all: <input type="checkbox"/></li> <li>– Not relevant: <input type="checkbox"/></li> </ul> <p>Comments:</p>	Tick if applicable
12	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section “D5,” for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012, with respect to permitting and registration procedures.</i></p>	

**D6 Capacity building**

1	<p>Have any of the following activities been undertaken to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level?</p>		Tick if applicable
Increased budget for activities		<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The USFWS is participating in the development of the Automated Customs Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS) – a U.S. Government-wide project to centralize the policing and processing of all international trade entering or exiting the United States. The system, which is being designed and deployed over a multi-year period, will improve U.S. CITES enforcement and USFWS efforts to detect and interdict illegal wildlife trade by providing access to integrated trade and law enforcement intelligence information, as well as selectivity and targeting mechanisms.</p>			

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 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?						
	Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity.					Details	
	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

4	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USFWS wildlife inspectors nationwide conducted wildlife import/export training sessions for Customs and Border Protection (CBP) enforcement officers at U.S. ports of entry and border crossings.</li> <li>• In 2012, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement designed a pilot program to train and place wildlife detector dogs. The pilot program was launched at four U.S. ports of entry in early 2013.</li> <li>• In June 2011, the U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and USFWS conducted a CITES training workshop in Long Beach, California, for APHIS and CBP inspectors of the Western region of the United States.</li> <li>• In February 2012, USDA-APHIS and USFWS conducted a CITES training workshop in San Juan, Puerto Rico, for APHIS inspectors in Puerto Rico.</li> </ul> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D6," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012, with respect to capacity building.</i></p>
---	--

**D7 Collaboration/co-operative initiatives**

1	<p>Is there an interagency or inter-sectoral committee on CITES?</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p style="text-align: right;">No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p style="text-align: right;">No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
2	<p>If Yes, which agencies are represented and how often does it meet?</p> <p>The U.S. interagency CITES Coordination Committee (CCC) meets 5-7 times a year. The following agencies are represented in the CCC:</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior Office of the Solicitor</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior International Technical Assistance Program</p>

	<p>U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture Foreign Agriculture Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Justice</p> <p>U.S. Department of State</p> <p>Office of the U.S. Trade Representative</p> <p>U.S. Department of Commerce</p> <p>U.S. Agency for International Development</p> <p>Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies</p> <p>U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection</p> <p>Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History</p>																															
3	<p>If No, please indicate the frequency of meetings or consultancies used by the Management Authority to ensure co-ordination among CITES authorities (e.g. other MAs, SAs, Customs, police, others):</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>					<p>Tick if applicable</p>		<p>Details if available</p>																								
	<p>Agencies for development and trade</p>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
	<p>Provincial, state or territorial authorities</p>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
	<p>Local authorities or communities</p>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
	<p>Indigenous peoples</p>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
	<p>Trade or other private sector associations</p>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
	<p>NGOs</p>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>																										
	<p>Other (specify)</p>					<input type="checkbox"/>																										

5	<p>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?</p> <p>Scientific Authority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Customs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Police <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other border authorities (specify): USFWS Law Enforcement; U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA-APHIS); and U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection (DHS-CBP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other government agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Private sector bodies <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>NGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Tick if applicable
6	<p>Has Government staff participated in any regional activities related to CITES?</p> <p>Workshops <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Meetings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/></p>	Tick if applicable
7	<p>Has there been any effort to encourage any non-Party to accede to the Convention?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
8	<p>If Yes, which one(s) and in what way?</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">-Bahrain: Under the auspices of the U.S. Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI), U.S. Government officials encouraged Bahrain to accede to CITES. Bahrain acceded to CITES in August 2012.</p>	
9	<p>Has technical or financial assistance been provided to another country in relation to CITES?</p>	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
10	<p>If Yes, which country (ies) and what kind of assistance was provided?</p> <p>In 2011, USFWS Law Enforcement personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducted two 2-week criminal investigation training programs for enforcement officers from sub-Saharan African nations at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Botswana;</li> <li>• Provided ongoing training and investigative consultation to member nations of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations-Wildlife Enforcement Group (ASEAN-WEN);</li> <li>• Provided planning assistance and conducted 3-day investigations and intelligence training program at the 1<sup>st</sup> meeting of the newly created Central American Wildlife Enforcement Network (CA-WEN) in El Salvador;</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presented the first ever CITES enforcement training for customs officers in Morocco;</li> <li>• Teamed with U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Forest Service to conduct capacity-building workshop in Peru focused on both wildlife and timber trafficking issues; and</li> <li>• Conducted three weeks of wildlife enforcement training for village game scouts in Tanzania.</li> </ul> <p>In 2012, USFWS Law Enforcement personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hosted 22 inspectors from Central America and the Dominican Republic at the Miami International Airport for an intensive 2-week training program in support of the recently formed CA-WEN;</li> <li>• Helped conduct the first ever national coral identification workshop for officers with Environment Canada;</li> <li>• Conducted a 2-week training program at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Botswana on wildlife crime investigations for wildlife officers from sub-Saharan Africa;</li> <li>• Provided training on wildlife smuggling interdiction and detecting permit fraud in Panama to officers from that country and other nations participating in the CA-WEN;</li> <li>• Taught crime scene investigation techniques to Mexican Federal Police in Oaxaca, Mexico; and</li> <li>• Completed site visits to forensics laboratories in Southeast Asia and China to share information on use of genetic analysis in wildlife crime investigations.</li> </ul> <p>As part of the U.S.-China Nature Conservation protocol, the U.S. CITES Management and Scientific Authorities hosted a 6-member CITES delegation from the State Forestry Administration of the People's Republic of China in April 2012 (<i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D7"</i>, for more details).</p>									
11	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="261 1361 1114 1397">Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?</td> <td data-bbox="1129 1361 1184 1397">Yes</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1361 1414 1397"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1129 1406 1184 1442">No</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1406 1414 1442"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1129 1451 1327 1487">No information</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1451 1414 1487"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		No	<input type="checkbox"/>		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>								
	No information	<input type="checkbox"/>								
12	<p>If Yes, please give a brief description.</p> <p>The United States has taken an active role in improving the Wiki ID Manual, which currently presents challenges with respect to accessibility and content, and in its utility for inspection officers. <i>[Note: The United States led the Drafting Group for decisions adopted by the CITES Parties at CoP16 directing the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat to survey existing and needed identification materials, and explore improvements and dissemination of these materials.]</i></p>									
13	<table border="0"> <tr> <td data-bbox="261 1818 1114 1944">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)?</td> <td data-bbox="1129 1818 1184 1854">Yes</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1818 1414 1854"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1129 1863 1184 1899">No</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1863 1414 1899"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td data-bbox="1129 1908 1327 1944">No information</td> <td data-bbox="1375 1908 1414 1944"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </table>	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"/>
Have measures been taken to achieve co-ordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national authorities for CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the biodiversity-related Conventions)?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								
	No	<input type="checkbox"/>								
	No information	<input type="checkbox"/>								



14	If Yes, please give a brief description.  <i>For an example, see ANNEX 3, Section "D7," under "Expanded cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)."</i>
15	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:  <i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D7," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2011-2012, with respect to collaboration and cooperative initiatives.</i>

### D8 Areas for future work

1	Are any of the following activities needed to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level and what is the respective level of priority?			
		High	Medium	Low
	Increased budget for activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Hiring of more staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development of implementation tools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Improvement of national networks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Purchase of new technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Computerization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2	Were any difficulties encountered in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties?	Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No		<input type="checkbox"/>
		No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
3	If Yes, which one(s) and what is the main difficulty?  <i>Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP14), Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use: The United States worked with leopard (<i>Panthera pardus</i>) range countries to resolve problems associated with the import of some leopard hunting trophies. We developed a discussion document for consideration at SC62 in July 2012 (SC62 Doc. 35), and draft revisions to the resolution for consideration at CoP16. [Note: The draft revisions to Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP14) were adopted, with minor changes, at CoP16.]</i>			
4	Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance?	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>
		No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
5	If Yes, please describe the constraint and the type of attention or assistance that is required.			
6	Have any measures, procedures or mechanisms been identified within the Convention that would benefit from review and/or simplification?	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>
		No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
7	If Yes, please give a brief description.			
8	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:			

### E. General feedback

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

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

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

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

### *CITES-RELATED REGULATORY MEASURES*

Revision to U.S. regulations implementing CITES: The USFWS published revised CITES-implementing regulations (Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23) in 2007. These regulations, which became effective on 24 September 2007, incorporate provisions from resolutions adopted by the Parties through CoP13. In 2008, the USFWS published revisions to the regulations to include provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14. In March 2012, the USFWS published a proposed rule to incorporate into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations other relevant provisions adopted at CoP14 and CoP15. The final rule is currently in preparation and we expect it to publish in November or December 2013.

U.S. regulation to list hellbender in Appendix III: On 6 October 2011, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* to list the hellbender (*Cryptobranchus alleganiensis*), a large aquatic salamander, in Appendix III of CITES. The listing includes live and dead whole specimens, and all readily recognizable parts, products, and derivatives of the species. Listing the hellbender in Appendix III was necessary to allow the United States to adequately monitor international trade in the species and to determine whether further measures are required to conserve it. The effective date of the listing was 3 April 2012.

### *STRICTER DOMESTIC LEGISLATIVE MEASURES*

Amendments to the U.S. Lacey Act regarding plants: The Lacey Act, first enacted in 1900, is the United States' oldest wildlife protection statute. It makes it illegal to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce any wildlife specimen taken or traded in violation of U.S. or foreign law. However, with regard to plants, until 2008 the Act only applied to plants that were U.S. native species and its application to those plants was limited. In May 2008, the U.S. Congress adopted significant amendments to the Lacey Act expanding its protection to a broader range of plants, including foreign plant and timber species. Now, in addition to its application to wildlife, the Act makes it unlawful to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce any plant specimen (with some limited exceptions) taken or traded in violation of foreign law or the laws or regulations of a U.S. State. The Act also now makes it unlawful to submit any false record of any covered plant and to import any covered plant or plant product without a declaration indicating the genus and species, quantity, value, and country of origin of the covered plant material. During the reporting period, the U.S. Government took a number of steps toward fully implementing the 2008 Lacey Act amendments including: continuing its phased-in approach to the declaration requirement; drafting a final rule for the *Federal Register* providing definitions of the terms "common cultivar" and "common food crop," as they apply in the Lacey Act; drafting a report to the U.S. Congress examining the implementation of the 2008 amendments and how the import declaration assists with enforcement of the amendments; and providing additional national and international outreach. [Note: The report to the U.S. Congress was subsequently submitted in May 2013, and an interim final rule was published in the *Federal Register* in July 2013 defining the terms "common cultivar" and "common food crop," as they apply in the Lacey Act.]

Endangered Species Act listings: The USFWS published final rules in the *Federal Register* listing, delisting, or reclassifying the following CITES-listed species under the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA):

<b>Species</b>	<b>Publication Date</b>	<b>ESA Status</b>	<b>CITES Status</b>
Salmon-crested cockatoo ( <i>Cacatua moluccensis</i> )	05/26/2011	Threatened	Appendix I
Largetooth sawfish ( <i>Pristis perotteti</i> )	07/12/2011	Endangered	Appendix I
Slender-billed curlew ( <i>Numenius tenuirostris</i> )	08/11/2011	Endangered	Appendix I
Gulf of Maine Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of Atlantic sturgeon ( <i>Acipenser oxyrinchus</i> )	02/06/2012	Threatened	Appendix II
New York Bight and Chesapeake Bay DPS of Atlantic sturgeon ( <i>Acipenser oxyrinchus</i> )	02/06/2012	Endangered	Appendix II
Wood bison ( <i>Bison bison athabasca</i> )	05/03/2012	Reclassified from Endangered to Threatened	Appendix II
Morelet's crocodile ( <i>Crocodylus moreletii</i> )	05/23/2012	Delisted	Populations of Belize and Mexico = Appendix II; other populations = Appendix I
British Columbia DPS of Queen Charlotte Goshawk ( <i>Accipiter gentilis laingi</i> )	08/01/2012	Threatened	Appendix II
Wyoming population of wolf ( <i>Canis lupus</i> )	09/10/2012	Delisted	Appendix II

For additional details and the *Federal Register* publications see:

<http://www.fws.gov/policy/frsystem/default.cfm>.

Listing three python species and one anaconda species as Injurious: On 23 January 2012, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the Burmese python (*Python molurus*), the Southern African python (*Python natalensis*), the African python (*Python sebae*), and the yellow anaconda (*Eunectes notaeus*) as Injurious. By this action, the importation into the United States and interstate transportation between U.S. States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico, or any territory of the United States of any live animal, gamete, viable egg, or hybrid of these four snake species is prohibited, except by permit for zoological, education, medical, or scientific purposes. These four species are also listed under CITES.

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

### *CITES COMPLIANCE MEASURES*

U.S. efforts related to Peruvian mahogany: During the reporting period, the USFWS continued to work closely with Peru regarding Peru's implementation of the Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*). For 2011, Peru established a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota of 775.659 cubic meters but did not set a quota for 2012. The USFWS closely monitored the volume of bigleaf mahogany imported into the United States from Peru during the reporting period and provided Peru with periodic reports on those imports, which totalled 837 cubic meters of wood in 2011 and 100 cubic meters of wood in 2012.

United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement: Since the U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA) was concluded in 2008, the United States has worked very closely with Peruvian authorities in implementing the agreement, and in particular the Forest Sector Annex to the Environment Chapter. The Annex includes special focus on Peru's forest management with regard to CITES-listed tree species. In April 2012, the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA), an environmental NGO, petitioned the United States, asking that it request the Government of Peru to carry out audits and verifications of certain shipments, producers, and exporters of bigleaf mahogany and Spanish cedar (*Cedrela odorata*) in response to concerns about timber that may have been illegally harvested and exported to the United States. The United States undertook an extensive review of the information in the petition and determined not to request audits and verifications, but instead pursued a forward-looking five-point action plan with Peru targeted at addressing challenges highlighted during review of the petition.

### *CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES*

Administrative measures for CITES violations: U.S. CITES enforcement resulted in the imposition of administrative measures (specifically, monetary assessments called "civil penalties") on multiple occasions in 2011 and 2012. Examples include:

- Two California companies were each assessed a 10,000 USD civil penalty for importing and selling violin bows from China made with endangered CITES Appendix-I hawksbill and green sea turtle shell.
- An importer in Florida paid a 26,169 USD civil penalty and forfeited 19 African elephant ivory carvings that had been illegally imported from Uruguay.
- A New York company, previously cited for similar violations, paid a 16,000 USD civil penalty and forfeited a 3,000 USD unlawfully imported vicuna coat.
- A Texas animal import company paid a 5,000 USD civil penalty and forfeited 10 live CITES-listed African tree pangolins that had been imported from Cameroon in violation of the treaty's humane transport requirements. The shipment was intercepted in Los Angeles, California.
- A rare art dealer in New York who imported 10 elephant ivory pieces in violation of CITES paid a 10,000 USD civil penalty.

- A company that imported 2,125 strands of CITES-protected black coral beads via Anchorage, Alaska, without a valid CITES permit was assessed a 5,000 USD civil penalty. The beads (valued at 9,900 USD) were forfeited to the U.S. Government.
- An aquarium company that imported live corals from Tonga (a non-party country) into San Francisco, California, without a valid CITES “in lieu of” document paid a 5,000 USD civil penalty.
- The importer of a shipment of queen conch meat from Honduras that was presented for clearance at the port of Newark, New Jersey, paid a 5,000 USD civil penalty for importing more than the quantity authorized on its CITES export permit.
- A woman who arrived in Miami, Florida, from Nicaragua with 60 sea turtle eggs in her luggage abandoned the wildlife and paid a 1,100 USD civil penalty.

Seizures, confiscations, and forfeitures of CITES specimens: The USFWS wildlife inspection program provides front-line enforcement of the CITES treaty at U.S. ports of entry. Selected seizures of unlawfully imported CITES specimens for 2011 and 2012 are provided below:

- A package of orangutan skulls shipped by mail to Los Angeles International Airport (LAX).
- 100 live juvenile spectacled caimans transiting New York’s John F. Kennedy International Airport (JFK) on their way from Guyana to the Czech Republic.
- Multiple seizures of elephant toenails in Los Angeles, California.
- 26 live corals arriving in Miami, Florida, from Indonesia with an invalid CITES permit.
- Two international mail shipments of CITES skins and feathers being exported from Chicago, Illinois, to Japan.
- In Newark, New Jersey, 75 elephant ivory carvings and sea turtle items imported from Great Britain falsely manifested as “toys.”
- 113 live CITES-listed corals hidden in a tropical fish shipment at JFK International Airport.
- 80 live giant catfish at LAX International Airport.
- A 30,000 USD shipment of python leather handbags imported into Houston, Texas, without a CITES permit.
- 107 CITES-listed corals from a container shipment exported from the Solomon Islands to Tampa, Florida.
- A 9,800 USD shipment of exotic wildlife mounts leaving Washington, D.C., for Saudi Arabia.
- 5,650 grams of sturgeon caviar from two travelers arriving at LAX International Airport from Turkey.
- 19 boxes of live rock in transit through Miami, Florida, from Haiti without CITES permits.
- Seven pallets of CITES Appendix-II agarwood products shipped as ocean cargo to the Port of Baltimore, Maryland, without permits.
- Two African elephant ivory tusks from a cargo shipment in Atlanta, Georgia.
- A shipment of CITES-listed arapaima from Brazil imported via Miami, Florida.
- In Norfolk, Virginia, over 8,900 artist brushes made from wildlife hair of CITES listed Siberian weasel.
- Seven ivory tusks, a hippo tooth, and several wildlife handbags from the luggage of a 63-year-old woman returning from Greece at LAX International Airport.
- A shipment imported via Miami, Florida, from Haiti containing 343 stony corals and 122 queen conch shells.
- 1,700 framed butterflies (including CITES-listed species) imported from China to Tampa, Florida.

- 24 pieces of elephant ivory being exported by an auction house via the International Mail Facility at Chicago, Illinois' O'Hare International Airport.
- A commercial export of live marine fish and invertebrates bound from Florida to Canada containing CITES-listed live rock that lacked a CITES permit.
- An unlawfully imported CITES Appendix-II bontebok trophy imported from South Africa via Houston, Texas.
- A tropical fish shipment from the Philippines that arrived in Miami, Florida, without a permit for 111 pieces of CITES Appendix-II stony coral.

Seizures of CITES plant parts and products in 2011 and 2012: During 2011 and 2012, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized the following specimens of CITES-listed non-living plant parts and products upon import into the United States:

### 2011

- 2 shipments of *Swietenia macrophylla*; 1 imported from Belize and 1 from Peru; containing a total of 283 cubic meters of sawn wood and 2 pieces of timber.
- 1 shipment of *Pterocarpus santalinus*; imported from Nepal; containing wood chips.
- 1 shipment of *Dalbergia nigra*; imported from Brazil; containing 446 kilograms of wood products.
- 1 shipment of *Bulnesia sarmientoi*; imported from Switzerland; containing 50 kilograms of essential oil.
- 1 shipment of *Prunus africana*; imported from China; containing 3,875 kilograms of extract.
- 56 shipments of *Aquilaria* spp.; 6 imported from China, 1 from Egypt, 1 from Ethiopia, 1 from Kuwait, 1 from Nepal, 1 from Oman, 1 from Pakistan, 35 from Saudi Arabia, 1 from Taiwan, 1 from Thailand, 2 from the United Arab Emirates 3 from Viet Nam, and 2 from unknown countries; containing a total of 450 wood chips and 6,208 kilograms of wood chips, 1.25 liters of derivatives, 56 kilograms of extract, 8 medicinal products, and 3.15 liters of essential oil.
- 13 shipments of *Hoodia gordonii*; 3 imported from South Africa and 10 from the United Kingdom; containing a total of 270 extracts and 310 grams of extract, 410 derivatives, and 1,170 medicinal products.
- 15 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*; 5 shipments imported from Canada, 4 from China, 1 from Taiwan, and 5 from unknown countries; containing a total of 40 kilograms of root and 23 individual roots.
- 184 shipments of *Saussurea costus*; 178 shipments imported from China, 2 from Hong Kong, 3 from Taiwan, and 1 from Thailand; containing a total of 10 kilograms of extract, 60 kilograms of root, and 1,043 medicinal products.
- 3 shipments of *Aloe* spp.; 2 imported from the Republic of Korea and 1 from Mexico; containing a total of 198 vials of extract and an unknown quantity of unspecified specimens.
- 10 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*; 4 imported from China, 2 from Taiwan, and 4 from Viet Nam; containing a total of 33 kilograms of extract and 665 medicinal products.
- 4 shipments of *Dioscorea deltoidea*; imported from Viet Nam, containing a total of 620 medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Cyathea medullaris*; imported from New Zealand; containing 192 flower pots.
- 18 shipments of *Gastrodia elata* orchid specimens; 1 imported from Cambodia, 13 from China, 1 from Hong Kong, 2 from the Republic of Korea, and 1 from an unknown country; containing a total of 300 kilograms of derivatives, 257 kilograms of extract, 134 kilograms of root, and 282 medicinal products.



- 14 shipments of other orchid specimens; containing 1,008 extracts and 246 kilograms of extract, 191 kilograms of root, 18 kilograms of medicinal products, and 240 medicinal products.

## 2012

- 2 shipments of *Swietenia macrophylla*; both imported from Belize; containing a total of 309 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 4 shipments of *Cedrela odorata*; 1 imported from Cote d'Ivoire and 3 from Ghana; containing a total of 137 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 1 shipment of *Pericopsis elata*; imported from Gabon; containing 24 veneer sheets.
- 4 shipments of *Pterocarpus santalinus*; 1 imported from Bhutan, 1 from India, 1 from Nepal, and 1 from Niger; containing a total of 105 extracts and 230 grams of extract, 2 kilograms of wood products, and an unknown quantity of wood chips.
- 1 shipment of *Prunus africana*; imported from an unknown country; containing 51,750 extracts.
- 131 shipment of *Aquilaria* spp.; 2 imported from Bahrain, 15 from China, 4 from Hong Kong, 2 from India, 1 from Iran, 1 from Kuwait, 1 from Niger, 5 from Qatar, 84 from Saudi Arabia, 1 from Sri Lanka, 1 from Tanzania, 4 from the United Arab Emirates, 1 from the United Kingdom, and 9 from unknown countries; containing a total of 230 wood chips and 35 kilograms of wood chips, 1 kilogram of derivatives, 35 grams of extract, 4 liters of oil and 2 kilograms of oil, 408 grams of powder, 10,488 wood products and 17 kilograms of wood products, and 306 medicinal products and 225 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Panax quinquefolius*; imported from China; containing 11 kilograms of root.
- 134 shipments of *Saussurea costus*; 1 imported from Canada, 128 from China, 1 from Germany, 1 from Hong Kong, 1 from Sri Lanka and 2 from Taiwan; containing a total of 200 grams of extract, and 1,028 medicinal products and 6 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Aloe* spp.; imported from France; containing 3 kilograms of powder.
- 1 shipment of cactus specimens; imported from China; containing 8 extracts.
- 11 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*; 8 imported from China and 3 from Hong Kong; containing a total of 1,004 medicinal products and 1 kilogram of medicinal products.
- 6 shipments of *Cibotium* spp.; 5 imported from China and 1 from Hong Kong; containing a total of 202 medicinal products and 5 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 18 shipments of *Gastrodia elata* orchid specimens; 13 imported from China, 4 from Hong Kong, and 1 from the Republic of Korea; containing a total of 89 kilograms of extract, 10 kilograms of root, and 654 medicinal products and 9 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 8 shipments of other orchid specimens; containing 4 kilograms of extract, 50 kilograms of dried plants, and 20 medicinal products and 29 kilograms of medicinal products.

Criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations: USFWS investigations of CITES violations resulted in criminal prosecutions for trafficking in CITES-listed species. Key cases from 2011 and 2012 are summarized below:

- In February 2012, USFWS special agents arrested eight individuals who were charged with Federal felony violations in connection with the unlawful interstate sale and export of rhinoceros horns. These arrests represent the “first wave” of prosecutions expected from the wide-reaching ongoing investigation of rhino horn trafficking. Seizures to date include over 40 rhino horns or horn products; over 1 million USD in cash; and over 1 million USD in gold. Of the eight arrestees, six had pleaded guilty by the end of the year. These included two

California businessmen (and their company) who pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court in Los Angeles, California, to conspiracy, smuggling, Lacey Act violations, money laundering and tax fraud in connection with interstate and international rhino horn trafficking. A Chinese national arrested in that city also pleaded guilty to smuggling. Pleas were also entered by a Texas resident who brokered rhino horn purchases for the two California businessmen and a defendant charged with conspiracy and Lacey Act violations in New Jersey. A Manhattan, New York, antiques dealer was the sixth individual to negotiate a plea agreement.

- In 2011, two Irish nationals who were arrested by USFWS undercover agents for trafficking in rhino horn were sentenced to prison terms.
- In Memphis, Tennessee, USFWS special agents completed a 10-month investigation of three subjects involved in the illegal sale and transportation of a pair of endangered black rhino horns. The horns, which were offered for sale as non-endangered white rhino horns at an auction business in Missouri, sold for 24,000 USD and were abandoned to the USFWS.
- A U.S. Virgin Islands-based manufacturer of high-end jewelry, art, and sculpture pleaded guilty to wildlife violations in connection with the illegal importation of CITES-listed black coral from a Taiwanese supplier and was sentenced to pay a criminal fine of 1.8 million USD. The company must also make 500,000 USD in community service payments to support black coral conservation and forfeit more than 2.1 million USD worth of raw black coral and black coral jewelry and sculptures. The aggregate financial penalty of more than 4.4 million USD makes this the largest penalty for illegal trade in coral and the fourth largest for any U.S. case involving illegal wildlife trade.
- A Texas couple, who were arrested and indicted for the illegal interstate sale of jaguar skins smuggled from Mexico, pleaded guilty to felony conspiracy and were sentenced to spend one year in Federal prison followed by deportation. The pair used a seed and plant business as a cover. They sold jaguar pelts to undercover USFWS special agents in Texas and Florida; offered purchasers future deals on up to 10 additional pelts; advertised skins to potential customers online; and made repeated trips to Florida to market their “wares.”
- A Miami, Florida, artist who fashioned taxidermied wildlife parts into "sculptures" for sale via galleries and the internet was sentenced to 20 months in prison and a 6,000 USD fine for trafficking in threatened wildlife. These activities included importing numerous protected species without the permits or declarations required by law. The shipments involved contacts in Bali, Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Canada, and China, and the resulting artwork fetched prices up to 80,000 USD.
- The owner of an African art store in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, who was arrested by USFWS special agents in July 2011, pleaded guilty to smuggling African elephant ivory – a crime that carries a possible prison sentence of up to 20 years. The defendant also agreed to forfeit 150,000 USD and one ton of seized elephant ivory worth an estimated 400,000 USD. This smuggling operation specialized in "traditional" carvings made from freshly obtained elephant ivory and involved one of the largest seizures ever of this elephant ivory in the United States.
- A man was sentenced in Brooklyn, New York, to 33 months in prison and a 25,000 USD fine for smuggling elephant ivory into the United States. The defendant (one of six successfully

prosecuted in connection with this trafficking scheme) was convicted after a jury trial in June 2010 for importing two air cargo shipments containing 71 concealed elephant ivory carvings, one shipment from Nigeria and one from Uganda. The carvings, which had an estimated market value of 73,300 USD, were hidden inside the hollow cavities of wooden and metal handicrafts.

- Other USFWS investigations of ivory trafficking secured the convictions of a Florida pool cue manufacturer and an Atlanta, Georgia, piano import company.
- A Chinese national purportedly dealing in antiques was sentenced in New York to time served, four years probation, immediate deportation, and a 50,000 USD fine for attempting to smuggle 18 African elephant ivory carvings out of the United States. The subject was arrested during an export passenger inspection blitz at New York's JFK International Airport, where the ivory (which had been wrapped in aluminum foil to avoid detection on x-ray screening) was found in his carry-on luggage. The carvings, valued at 55,000 USD, were forfeited.
- A company in Skokie, Illinois, pleaded guilty to Federal charges in connection with the illegal export of African elephant ivory for use in manufacturing billiard cue sticks; the company was fined 150,000 USD.
- A Massachusetts antique dealer found guilty of trafficking in sperm whale teeth was sentenced to serve 33 months in prison. In this same case, a Ukrainian national was sentenced in Boston, Massachusetts, to time served (9 months) and ordered deported for his involvement in a conspiracy to smuggle sperm whale ivory into the United States. In a plea agreement, the man admitted smuggling large amounts of sperm whale ivory to supply a well-known Nantucket, Massachusetts, scrimshaw artist. The latter was convicted of six felony counts of smuggling, wildlife trafficking, conspiracy, and false statements.
- A Japanese national investigated for spearheading an international wildlife trafficking ring specializing in CITES-listed turtles and tortoises was sentenced to 21 months in Federal prison and ordered to pay an 18,403 USD criminal fine. This individual was arrested at Los Angeles International Airport in January 2011 in a foiled smuggling attempt involving 55 live turtles and tortoises. USFWS investigators showed that this defendant and his paid couriers made 42 trips to and from the United States from 2004 through 2011. One of this individual's couriers – a Japanese citizen who smuggled 42 turtles in his luggage at the Honolulu International Airport – was sentenced in Federal court to time served (six months) and was immediately deported. The wildlife smuggled included 20 CITES-listed Burmese star tortoises.
- The main subject of Operation Spiderman – an investigation of tarantula trafficking – was sentenced to six months in prison, three years probation, and a 4,000 USD fine. He also forfeited 13,000 USD in connection with the case, which documented his smuggling of live Appendix-II tarantulas to Los Angeles, California, via international mail.

CITES Secretariat's enforcement officers visit the United States: In May 2012, Ben Janse van Rensburg, Chief of Enforcement Support, and Pia Jonsson, Enforcement Support Officer, with the CITES Secretariat visited the United States. The USFWS Divisions of Management Authority (DMA) and Scientific Authority (DSA) and Office of Law Enforcement hosted a series of meetings with Mr.

van Rensburg and Ms. Jonsson. These meetings included a session with the U.S. Government Interagency CITES Coordination Committee and an informal meeting with U.S. CITES NGO stakeholders. In addition, Mr. van Rensburg and Ms. Jonsson met with a number of our CITES interagency partners including the Department of the Interior's Office of the Solicitor and International Technical Assistance Program, the Department of Justice, the Department of State, and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID).

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

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

#### *COP-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

Public participation in U.S. preparations for CoP16: CoP16 was held 3-14 March 2013 in Bangkok, Thailand. In 2011 and 2012 leading up to CoP16, the USFWS published five notices in the U.S. *Federal Register* as part of the process designed to allow NGOs and the public to participate in the preparations of the U.S. Government for CoP16. The first notice, published on 14 June 2011, solicited recommendations from the public on species proposals the United States should consider submitting for CoP16; the second notice, published on 7 November 2011, solicited recommendations from the public on proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items the United States should consider submitting for CoP16; the third notice, published on 11 April 2012, described and invited public comments on species proposals the United States was considering submitting for CoP16; the fourth notice, published 21 June 2012, described and invited public comments on proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items the United States was considering submitting for CoP16, and provided information on how NGOs based in the United States could attend CoP16 as observers; and the fifth notice, published 9 November, 2012, announced the provisional agenda for CoP16, solicited public comments on the items on the agenda, and announced a public meeting held on 13 December 2012 to discuss the items on the provisional agenda.

Also, in 2011 the USFWS launched a webpage dedicated to housing information related to CoP16. This page contained links to all *Federal Register* notices that solicited public input for CoP16. A downloadable Fact Sheet outlining preparations for CoP16 was made available on the webpage, as well as frequently asked questions related to issues of particular interest to the public.

U.S. SUBMISSIONS FOR CoP16: On 4 October 2012, the United States submitted 12 proposals to amend Appendices I and II (10 animal proposals and two plant proposals) for consideration at CoP16. In addition, the United States submitted two discussion documents, including a proposal for a new resolution and revisions to an existing resolution.

U.S. provides financial support to the Secretariat: In 2011, the USFWS amended an existing grant to provide an additional 125,000 USD in financial support to the CITES Secretariat to conduct certain activities stemming from CoP15. These activities include: a joint meeting of the Animals and Plants Committees; support for the Introduction from the Sea Working Group meetings; and completion of a timber trade study.

#### *STANDING COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

61<sup>st</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent a 12-person delegation to the 61<sup>st</sup> meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC61), which was held 15-19 August 2011, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included five representatives from the USFWS, four from the U.S. Department of State, one from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), one from the Office of the United States Trade Representative, and one from the Association of Fish and

Wildlife Agencies. The United States submitted three working documents for consideration at the meeting: one on the first technical exchange meeting between producing, consuming, and transiting nations to reduce illegal trade in elephant ivory; one on development and application of annotations, and one containing the regional report for North America (the United States submitted the last two documents as the North American Regional Representative to the Standing Committee).

62<sup>nd</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent a 12-person delegation to SC62, which was held 23-27 July 2012, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included five representatives from the USFWS, one from the Department of the Interior's Office of the Solicitor, three from the U.S. Department of State, one from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), and one from NMFS. The United States submitted seven working documents for consideration at the meeting: one on physical inspection of timber shipments; one on leopard export quotas; one on streamlining the process for cross-border movement of musical instruments containing species included in the CITES Appendices; one on the development and application of annotations (submitted as the North American Regional Representative to the Standing Committee); one to address numerous issues regarding illegal trade in listed tortoises and freshwater turtles (submitted as Chair of the Standing Committee's Working Group on Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles); one to discuss implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens (submitted as Chair of the Standing Committee's intersessional working group on this issue); and one containing the regional report of North America (submitted as the North American Regional Representative to the Standing Committee).

Communications with the Chair of the Standing Committee and the Secretariat: The United States served as both the North American Regional Representative and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee throughout the reporting period, and in the capacity of Vice-Chair had regular communications with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Standing Committee, primarily by e-mail. These communications were largely for the purpose of the Secretariat providing informal updates on its activities, such as preparations for meetings (including CoP16), interactions with UNEP, and further investigation into the GEF as a potential funding source for CITES.

Introduction from the sea: The United States was an active participant in the Introduction from the Sea Working Group since it was first established by the Standing Committee at SC57 in 2008 to consider implementation and technical issues related to specimens taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State. Following CoP15, Fabio Hazin (Brazil) was elected Chair of the working group and Robert Gabel (United States) was elected Vice-Chair of the working group. The group worked electronically and held two face-to-face meetings, one hosted by Norway (May 2011) and one hosted by the United States (April 2012), and developed a discussion document and draft revisions to Resolution Conf. 14.6 (Rev. CoP15), *Introduction from the sea*, for consideration by the Standing Committee at SC62. At SC62 (July 2012), the Standing Committee agreed to forward the outcomes of the working group to CoP16 for consideration by the Parties. The draft revisions to Resolution Conf. 14.6 (Rev. CoP15) developed by the working group were adopted by the Parties at CoP16. The United States was a strong supporter of these efforts to reach a common understanding of implementation of the Convention for specimens taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State.

Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens: At SC61 (August 2011), the United States and Hungary, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, submitted a document on implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens. The resulting discussion led to the creation of an intersessional working group,

chaired by the United States. The United States introduced a document at SC62 (July 2012) describing the working group's activities and presenting a series of recommendations, including several draft decisions for CoP16. The Standing Committee accepted these recommendations and draft decisions, with some revisions. *[The Secretariat prepared a document for CoP16, and the Parties subsequently adopted the draft decisions in that document at that meeting.]*

Working group on development and application of annotations: At SC61 in August 2011, the Standing Committee formed an intersessional working group, under the chairmanship of the Regional Representative of North America (United States), to explore the shared understanding among Parties of annotations, and to explore the adoption of appropriate and reasonable procedures for crafting plant annotations, which may include: recommending that annotations be developed in consultation with the Plants Committee; revising the discussion of annotations in the listing proposal format in Annex 6 to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II* to recommend, in addition to the elements already listed, that a proponent Party discuss the practical implementation of the annotated listing if adopted; and providing guidance in resolution or other appropriate location, including in identification materials as appropriate. The working group was unable to complete its work by SC62 in July 2012, so at that meeting the Standing Committee directed the group to continue its work and prepare a document for consideration at CoP16. In October 2012, the United States, as Chair of the working group, submitted a document for CoP16 on the development and application of annotations that proposed amendments to six resolutions, adoption of three new decisions, revisions to one existing decision and the retention of one existing decision, and adoption of a definition of the term "extract" as it applies in existing annotations in the Appendices. *[These proposals were subsequently adopted by the Parties at CoP16, with several changes.]*

Working group on timber identification and physical inspection: At SC61 in August 2011, Italy, the Chair of this working group, tasked with collecting and assessing relevant existing materials on CITES timber identification and measurement (Decision 14.61 (Rev. CoP15)), announced that it would not be able to continue as the Chair. Therefore, the working group requested that the United States consult with the other members of the working group to identify a new Chair to progress the work of the group. Following SC61, Italy provided a written version of its oral report provided at SC61 to the United States. Further, during the intersessional period between SC61 and SC62, the United States consulted with other members of the working group, but no member was able to undertake the chairmanship. The United States submitted a document for SC62 (July 2012) describing these efforts, including the written report from Italy as an Annex, and asking the Standing Committee to decide whether further work on this topic is needed and how to proceed. The Standing Committee directed the United States to prepare a document for consideration at CoP16 on behalf of the working group. In October 2012, the United States submitted a document for CoP16 recommending that the Parties adopt a decision directing the Secretariat to obtain and post on its website information and materials from Parties on tools and procedures they have developed for the identification and measurement of CITES-listed tree species, and the physical inspection of timber shipments, and to incorporate this information into its capacity-building activities related to timber trade. *[The recommendations in this document were subsequently adopted by the Parties at CoP16.]*

Other Standing Committee working groups: In addition to the working groups discussed above, the United States was also an active member of the following intersessional Standing Committee working groups during the reporting period: 1) CITES strategic vision; 2) review of resolutions; 3) purpose codes; 4) use of taxonomic serial numbers; 5) e-commerce of specimens of CITES-listed species; 6) personal and household effects; 7) humphead wrasse; 8) Asian snake trade management, conservation,

and enforcement; 9) conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses; and 10) review of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15), *Trade in elephant specimens*.

#### *CITES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

The United States serves as the alternate regional representative of North America to the Animals Committee: At CoP15 in March 2010, the Parties from North America selected Dr. Rosemarie Gnam, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, to serve as the alternate regional representative of North America to the Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP15 and CoP16.

19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC19), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 18-21 April 2011. The U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, one from the USDA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), and one from the U.S. Forest Service. The United States prepared and submitted a document for the meeting regarding the status of the U.S. periodic review of *Sclerocactus*. In addition, the United States collaborated with and submitted jointly with Canada a document regarding the proposed terms of reference for technical committee discussions on climate change. The United States also prepared with Canada and Mexico a document regarding the development and application of annotations to the listings of plant taxa in the Appendices, which was submitted by the North American Region. Finally, the United States submitted an informational document prepared by and submitted jointly by Mexico and the United States regarding the trade in Agavaceae species native to Mexico and the United States. The U.S. delegation was active on numerous issues and participated in nine working groups: non-detriment findings; preparation of clarification and guidance on the meaning of "packaged and ready for retail trade" and other terms used in the annotations; orchids: annotations for species included in Appendix II; tree species: annotations for species included in Appendices II and III; review of significant trade in specimens of Appendix-II species; periodic review of plant species included in the CITES Appendices; Madagascar plant species; agarwood-producing taxa; and *Aniba rosaeodora* and *Bulnesia sarmientoi*.

The United States also served as co-Chair (as the Plants Committee designee) of an intersessional working group (consisting of both Plants and Animals Committee members) on climate change, which was charged with drafting findings and recommendations to the joint PC20/AC26 meeting in Dublin, Ireland, in March 2012.

20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to PC20, which was held in Dublin, Ireland, 26-30 March 2012. The U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, one from APHIS, and one from the U.S. Forest Service. The United States participated in intersessional working groups leading up to PC20, several having to do with annotations to CITES-listed plants, including Cactaceae and Orchidaceae: review of annotations, and preparation of clarification and guidance on the meaning of "packaged and ready for retail trade" and other terms used in the annotations. In preparation for other PC20 agenda items, the United States also responded to requests for information regarding the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, the capacity-building programme for science-based establishment and implementation of voluntary national export quotas, and non-detriment findings. The United States submitted two informational documents; a questionnaire for the personal care products and herbal products industries on finished products manufactured from orchids that are packaged and ready for retail trade, and "A decade of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla* King) management, harvest and export in the Sico-Paulaya Valley, Honduras" (submitted by the United States of



America at the request of the U.S. NGO, GreenWood). The U.S. delegation was active on numerous issues and participated in several working groups, including those for the review of significant trade in Appendix-II plants and the periodic review of the Appendices for plants. These two long-standing working groups serve fundamental roles within CITES, providing the scientific committees with mechanisms to help ensure that international trade is not detrimental to the survival of species in the wild and that species remain appropriately listed on the CITES appendices, respectively. The United States also participated in working groups on Madagascar's proposals to amend the Appendices, annotations, non-detriment findings for plants, bigleaf mahogany and neotropical timber, nomenclature, and the review of the resolution on the periodic review of the Appendices.

Joint session of the 26<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee and the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to the Joint session of the 26<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee and the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee (AC26/PC20), which was held in Dublin, Ireland, 22-24 March 2012. The U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, one from NMFS, and one from APHIS. In addition, Dr. Rosemarie Gnam participated in AC26/PC20 as the alternate regional representative of North America to the Animals Committee. The United States participated in intersessional working groups leading up to AC26/PC20, including working groups on non-detriment findings and climate change. As the Plants Committee co-Chair, the United States along with Canada (as the Animals Committee co-Chair) submitted the report of the joint intersessional working group on climate change. The North America Region submitted an informational document on a draft resolution for non-detriment findings. The U.S. delegation was active on numerous issues and participated in several joint working groups during the meeting, including: transport of live specimens; evaluation of the review of significant trade; and non-detriment findings.

25<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to the 25<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Animals Committee (AC25), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 18–22 July 2011. The interagency U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS and two from NMFS. In addition, Dr. Rosemarie Gnam participated in AC25 as the alternate regional representative of North America to the Animals Committee. The United States submitted five documents for the meeting: periodic review of Felidae; review of *Lynx* species; review of *Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*; review of *Tympanuchus cupido attwateri*; and review of *Crocodilurus amazonicus*. As the alternate regional representative of North America, Dr. Gnam co-chaired the working group on the periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices. The United States was a member of seven working groups at AC25 on the following topics: ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II; periodic review of animal species in in the CITES Appendices; sturgeon and paddlefish; conservation and management of sharks – report on the implementation of NPOA-sharks and regional plans, and on relevant information from the range countries; snake trade and conservation management; tortoises and freshwater turtles ; and nomenclatural matters. The United States also participated in four intersessional working groups between AC25 and AC26 on the following topics: criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II; sea cucumbers; transport of live animals; and identification of CITES-listed corals in trade.

26<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to AC26, which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 15-20 March 2012. The interagency U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, one from NMFS, and one from the U.S. Department of State. In addition, Dr. Rosemarie Gnam participated in AC26 as alternate regional representative of North

America to the Animals Committee. The United States submitted four documents for the meeting. These documents included: a report of the intersessional working group on the periodic review of Galliformes; “Publications on iguanas;” “Extract from the preliminary report with recommendations and conclusions from the Singapore Workshop on Asian Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles;” and “Conservation of Asian Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles: Setting Priorities for the Next Ten Years.” As the alternate regional representative of North America, Dr. Gnam co-chaired the working group on the periodic review of animal species included in the CITES Appendices and participated in the drafting group on sea cucumbers and the working group on the review of objections to the registration of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes. The United States also participated in eight other working groups at AC26 pertaining to: criteria for the inclusion of species in Appendices I and II; sturgeons and paddlefish; implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.6 (Rev. CoP15) on conservation and management of sharks (Class Chondrichthyes); snake trade and conservation management; tortoises and freshwater turtles; review of significant trade in specimens of Appendix-II species; nomenclatural matters; and identification of CITES-listed corals in trade.

#### Periodic Reviews of the Appendices:

- *Felidae*: The Animals Committee supported the following U.S. recommendations resulting from the U.S.-lead periodic review of *Lynx* spp.: that *Lynx rufus*, *L. canadensis*, and *L. lynx* be retained in Appendix II and that *L. pardinus* be retained in Appendix I.
- *Colinus virginianus ridgwayi*: The Animals Committee supported the U.S. recommendation, developed in collaboration with Mexico, to maintain this taxon in Appendix I.
- *Tympanuchus cupido attwateri*: The Animals Committee agreed to follow Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) Annex 4 procedures and recommended that this taxon be transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II at this time, instead of being delisted, as had been recommended by the United States for this endemic subspecies that is not affected by trade.\*
- *Crocodilurus amazonicus*: The Animals Committee supported the U.S. recommendation, developed in collaboration with the range countries, to maintain this taxon in Appendix II.
- Galliformes: Noting the backlog of species waiting for review (including 16 species of Galliformes), the Animals Committee agreed to consider new measures to expedite these reviews. These measures included the creation of an intersessional working group that would – in part – consult with IUCN specialist groups and use IUCN information on species’ conservation. The United States had a major role in the activities and results of this group that were presented at AC26.
- *Sclerocactus*: The United States is conducting a periodic review of the genus *Sclerocactus* (Cactaceae); a document regarding the status of the periodic review was submitted to PC19 (August 2011).
- *Dudleya stolonifera*: The United States completed a periodic review of *Dudleya stolonifera*, which resulted in a proposal to delist the species from Appendix II at CoP16.

\*[Note: This proposal was subsequently adopted at CoP16.]

CITES Advisory Working Group for the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade: The United States sent Dr. Rosemarie Gnam to Vilm, Germany, in 2012, to participate in a meeting of the Advisory Working Group (AWG), which was established to assist the Animals and Plants Committees in overseeing the evaluation of the review of significant trade under Decision 13.67 (Rev. CoP14). In this meeting, the AWG focused on areas for improvement in the review of significant trade process.

Transport Working Group: The United States remains active on the Animals Committee Transport Working Group. A representative of the USFWS participated in the International Air Transport

Association (IATA) Live Animal and Perishables Board (LAPB) meetings in Montreal, Canada, in October 2011 and April 2012, during which proposals to change penguin and turtle transport requirements were presented and discussed. In addition, a representative of the USFWS participated in meetings of the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) in September 2011 and 2012, gave a presentation on the United States Plant Rescue Center Program, and discussed CITES-related issues that affect transport.

#### *OTHER CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES*

U.S. submits its 2010 and 2011 CITES annual reports: On 25 October 2011, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2010. The file (136,095 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2010. On 26 October 2012, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2011. The file (139,751 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2011. The data in these data files represent actual trade and not just numbers of CITES permits issued.

U.S. submits its 2009-2010 CITES Biennial Report: On 26 October 2011, the USFWS submitted to the CITES Secretariat its CITES biennial report for the years 2009 and 2010. This report summarized some of the major legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken by the United States during 2009-2010 in its implementation and enforcement of CITES. Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14) recommended that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at CoP13 and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submitted its 2009-2010 biennial report in accordance with that format. The USFWS has posted this report on its CITES website at <http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/biennial-report-us-cites-2009-2010.pdf>.

Turtle Farming Best Management Practices in the United States: The USFWS's International Wildlife Trade Program in partnership with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) convened a freshwater turtle workshop in St. Louis, Missouri, in September 2010, to discuss pressing management, regulatory, scientific, and enforcement needs associated with the wild harvest and trade of freshwater turtles in the United States. One of the priority recommendations that came out of the workshop was to develop best management practices for turtle farms operating in the United States. The workshop was held in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, in November 2011, and brought together a select number of specialists who deal with aquaculture, species management, wildlife trade management, turtles, turtle farming, health issues, water quality, invasive species, and genetic pollution – all topics relevant to turtle farms. The goal of the workshop was to develop Best Management Practices (BMPs) for Turtle Farming in the United States to improve trade practices and industry standards, while minimizing impacts to natural wild populations, for farmers, regulators, researchers, and other stakeholders.

Asian snake trade management conservation and enforcement: The USFWS International Wildlife Trade Program provided funding to the CITES Secretariat to organize the CITES Asian Snake Trade Workshop authorized by the Parties in Decision 15.75, adopted at CoP15 in March 2010. The four-day workshop, hosted by China, was held in Guangzhou in April 2011, and representatives of the U.S. Management and Scientific Authorities participated. The U.S. delegation gave a presentation on U.S. trade in Asian snake species and co-chaired a working group with China at the workshop. The workshop primarily served as a venue for wildlife managers, biologists, and law enforcement

personnel from across South and East Asia to discuss what may be the largest under-regulated terrestrial wildlife trade in the world. A series of science, management, and law enforcement recommendations drafted by the participants were conveyed to the Secretariat for consideration at AC25 and SC61.

A second workshop, the IUCN/SSC Global Reptile Assessment Workshop, was held in August 2011, in Beijing, China. The workshop was funded by USFWS with the purpose of collecting information that may inform both global and regional reptile conservation actions, including the identification of priority species (including those for possible consideration for CITES listing), sites, and regions for conservation action. The workshop assessed 500 Asian snake species and produced species accounts and maps that were conveyed to the Secretariat for consideration at AC26 when considering the conservation and trade management of snakes in Asia.

Ongoing activities to assess the impact of international trade on the chambered nautilus (*Allonautilus* spp. and *Nautilus* spp.): USFWS and NMFS are working with species and trade experts to investigate gaps in chambered nautilus biology and trade data. In 2011 and 2012, population research was conducted in the Philippines and Australia. A trade study is also underway to investigate and quantify chambered nautilus harvest practices and trade. Population studies in two additional range countries are planned. This information will be shared with range countries to better understand fisheries management and protections for chambered nautilus throughout its range. Background and additional information on these activities are found at: <http://www.fws.gov/international/animals/nautilus.html>.

Native Plant Conservation Initiative (NPCI) and CITES-listed species: The U.S. Scientific Authority serves on the selection committee for NPCI project proposals through a collaboration between the Plant Conservation Alliance (PCA; <[www.nps.gov/plants](http://www.nps.gov/plants)>) and National Fish and Wildlife Foundation. With funding from USFWS, the Bureau of Land Management, and the U.S. Forest Service, NPCI addresses the conservation, maintenance, rehabilitation, and restoration of native plants and their ecosystems on a national level, funding projects across the continental United States to Alaska and Hawaii, and as far away as American Samoa. In 2011, the NPCI grant program funded the U.S. Red List Authority for Plants, NatureServe, to review the status of U.S. Southeastern cacti, including Red List and climate change vulnerability assessments, and in 2012, a similar project for all U.S. orchids was funded. Information emanating from the cactus project during the reporting period includes:

**Assessing Chihuahuan Desert Cacti for Vulnerability to Climate Change (2011)**

Frances, A., J. Cordeiro, E. Kabay, L. Oliver, S. Young, and B. Young

*Abstract:* <[2011.botanyconference.org/engine/search/index.php?func=detail&aid=587](http://2011.botanyconference.org/engine/search/index.php?func=detail&aid=587)>

**Climate Change Vulnerability and Adaptation Strategies for Natural Communities: Piloting methods in the Mojave and Sonoran deserts (2012)**

Comer, P. J., B. Young, K. Schulz, G. Kittel, B. Unnasch, D. Braun, G. Hammerson, L. Smart, H. Hamilton, S. Auer, R. Smyth, and J. Hak

<[www.fws.gov/refuges/whm/pdfs/NatureServe\\_HCCVI\\_Report.pdf](http://www.fws.gov/refuges/whm/pdfs/NatureServe_HCCVI_Report.pdf)>

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

Redesign of U.S. CITES website and use of social media: In July 2012, USFWS launched a redesigned website to make information more accessible to relevant user groups, including CITES permit applicants, media, and the general public. Additional web content was developed to assist potential permit applicants, including guidance on traveling with personal pets and importing sport-

hunted trophies. USFWS has been using Facebook (USFWS\_International Affairs), Twitter (@USFWSInternatl), and the USFWS blog (<http://www.fws.gov/news/blog/>) to educate the public, media, and interested groups about CITES generally, and also significant decisions that are made with regard to implementation and enforcement.

U.S. elephant seizure data: On 23 February 2011, in response to CITES Notification No. 2010/041, regarding monitoring of illegal trade in ivory, USFWS submitted to TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa data files containing U.S. elephant part and product seizure data for the year 2010 for inclusion in the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS). On 30 April 2012, in response to CITES Notification No. 2012/034, regarding the same issue, USFWS submitted to TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa data files containing U.S. elephant part and product seizure data for the year 2011 for inclusion in ETIS.

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

CITES permit applications handled during 2011 and 2012: DMA (the U.S. CITES Management Authority) is responsible for the review and arbitration of all permit applications involved in the international movement of CITES-listed species. Through DMA's Branch of Permits, along with some permitting responsibilities delegated to USFWS Law Enforcement regional offices and ports, over 21,700 CITES applications were received during 2011. Likewise, in 2010, over 20,500 CITES applications were received. In each year, over 26,000 telephone calls, e-mails, and faxes relating to CITES permitting questions were handled by DMA, along with countless calls and e-mails sent directly to USFWS Law Enforcement regional offices and ports. Along with work involving other permitting processes under additional domestic legislation, such as the U.S. Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, DMA is actively involved in disseminating outreach materials, producing fact sheets, holding public meetings, and fine-tuning the permitting process within the United States.

During the reporting period, DMA, in an effort to provide better customer service, continued to develop applications specifically designed to address particular import/export activities. By establishing different applications, applicants respond to specific questions related to the activities for which they are requesting authorization. The responses to these questions allow DMA and DSA (the U.S. CITES Scientific Authority) to make the required findings under the U.S. regulations that implement CITES. The establishment of these application types ensures that applicants respond to the proper questions and minimizes the need to go back to an applicant for additional information during the review process carried out by DMA.

A large portion of the applications received during the reporting period related to the export or re-export of commercially traded Appendix-II specimens. Since the United States is one of the largest wildlife-trading countries, with a large number of captive breeding facilities producing a vast number of birds, reptiles, and mammals, DMA must dedicate a large portion of its permitting staff to the processing of such applications. The bulk of CITES import permits issued by DMA are for the import of sport-hunted trophies from Southern Africa. However, the smaller number of Appendix-I import and export applications also capture a significant portion of 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 Branch of Permits, allows DMA to identify concerns and problems before CITES documents are issued. Such coordination ranges from informing other Management Authorities what documents DMA has issued, to discussions of how and when documents can be issued.

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

## **D6. Capacity building**

United States participates in the Masters Course module on plant trade: The United States continued its long history of participating in the International University of Andalucia's Master's Course: Management, Access and Conservation of species in trade: The International Framework. In 2011, the USFWS provided instructors to participate in the modules on introduction and implementation of CITES and the scientific aspects related to flora.

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

### *Central America and the Dominican Republic*

#### *Costa Rica*

- In 2012, DOI-ITAP provided technical assistance to Costa Rica by donating computer and related equipment to improve their system of CITES permit issuance.

#### *El Salvador*

- In 2011, DOI-ITAP and TRAFFIC assisted with the production of an illustrated manual of species at risk in El Salvador due to wildlife trafficking.

#### *Guatemala*

- In 2011 and 2012, DOI-ITAP worked with Guatemala to produce a diagnostic study of *Tillandsia* spp. in Guatemala.

- In 2011, DOI-ITAP and TRAFFIC assisted with the production of a detailed visual and taxonomic identification guide for *Tillandsia* spp. in Guatemala.

#### *Honduras*

- In 2011 and 2012, DOI-ITAP worked with Honduras to conduct and finalize an assessment that recommended monitoring psittacine birds in the Mosquitia area of Honduras.

#### *Nicaragua*

- In June 2011, DOI-ITAP sponsored a 3-day workshop in Nicaragua regarding electronic permits and new technologies in CITES. CITES officials and other officials from Central America and the Dominican Republic participated. Additional participants were present from the U.S. Department of State, the CITES Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC, IBAMA/Brazil, and the Central American Commission on Environment and Development (CCAD).
- In August 2012, DOI-ITAP conducted a 2-day workshop in Nicaragua to present and review the first draft of the Government of Nicaragua's Decree 8-98, which updates CITES regulations in Nicaragua. In September 2012, DOI-ITAP conducted a 1-day follow-up workshop in Nicaragua to validate this Decree.

#### *Regional*

- In 2011, DOI-ITAP sponsored an economic valuation study of CITES species in Central America and the Dominican Republic.
- In March 2012, DOI-ITAP sponsored a study group of 22 inspectors and CITES officials who visited the U.S. Port of Miami, Florida, for 3 days. The group received hands-on and classroom training from the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement and also observed actual wildlife shipment inspections conducted by USFWS Law Enforcement wildlife inspectors. In addition, the USDA provided a presentation and tour of their animal quarantine facilities in Miami.
- In December 2012, DOI-ITAP sponsored a 2-day regional CITES coordination meeting in Nicaragua. CITES Management and Scientific Authority officials from Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Panama, and USFWS attended.
  - The meeting was facilitated by DOI-ITAP's Regional Coordinator and the Nicaraguan CITES Management Authority. Each country provided presentations on CITES implementation, activities, and concerns in their respective countries.

#### *Bi-national*

- In 2011, DOI-ITAP provided technical assistance to Nicaragua and Honduras by donating computer and related equipment to improve their systems of CITES permit issuance.

#### *Regional – CITES Enforcement*

- In 2011 and 2012, officials from the CITES Management and Scientific Authorities of Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama attended the following meetings and training workshops of the Central American Wildlife Enforcement Network (CAWEN, or ROAVIS in Spanish), sponsored in part or in whole by DOI-ITAP. Other government officials from Police, Customs, maritime and fisheries agencies, Public Ministries, Attorney Generals' Offices, Solicitors' Offices, military, and judges are also member agencies of CAWEN/ROAVIS and attended these meetings and workshops:
  - September 2011, El Salvador: Annual regional meeting of CAWEN/ROAVIS; 2 days. Additional participants included: USFWS, TRAFFIC, Interpol-South America.

- March 2012, Nicaragua: Workshop – Best Practices to Enhance Wildlife Enforcement; 2 days. Training provided by USFWS.
- March 2012, Costa Rica: Workshop – Best Practices to Enhance Wildlife Enforcement; 2 days. Training provided by USFWS and Costa Rican authorities.
- April 2012, Dominican Republic: Workshop – Best Practices to Enhance Wildlife Enforcement; 2 days. Training provided by USFWS, Dominican authorities (including the Dominican CITES Scientific Authority from the National Botanic Gardens), and the NGO, Grupo Jaragua.
- April 2012, El Salvador: Workshop – Best Practices to Enhance Wildlife Enforcement; 2 days. Training provided by USFWS and Salvadoran authorities.
- May 2012, El Salvador: Workshop – One day workshop on Enhancing Wildlife Enforcement in El Salvador.
- May 2012, Nicaragua: Workshop – One day workshop on Enhancing Wildlife Enforcement in Nicaragua.
- June 2012, Honduras: Workshop – Enhancing Wildlife Enforcement in Honduras; 2 days. Training provided by USFWS and Honduran authorities.
- June 2012, Guatemala: Workshop – Enhancing Wildlife Enforcement in Guatemala; 2 days. Training provided by USFWS and Guatemalan authorities.
- July 2012, Nicaragua: Workshop – One day workshop on wildlife enforcement along the Nicaraguan border.
- August 2012, Nicaragua: Workshop – One day workshop on general wildlife enforcement.
- September 2012, Panama: 2-day general workshop on wildlife enforcement. Training provided by USFWS and Panamanian authorities.
- December 2012, Nicaragua: 2-day annual regional meeting of CAWEN/ROAVIS. Additional participants included representatives from TRAFFIC (co-host), CITES Secretariat ICCWC, USFWS, CBP, and Interpol-Central America.

USAID work to advance CITES objectives: USAID’s approximately 185 million USD annual biodiversity conservation portfolio includes a range of field and policy interventions designed to address key threats to biodiversity in over 50 countries. Illegal and unsustainable exploitation and trade in terrestrial and marine wildlife, as well as commercially important timber species, is a challenge common to many countries. Through support for community-based natural resource management, protected area management and planning, policy development, law enforcement, and other approaches, USAID programs build the knowledge and capacity of local people, NGOs, and government institutions to conserve biodiversity through a variety of actions.

In 2011 and 2012, USAID programs advanced legality of timber trade in Peru, Southeast Asia, and globally with the private sector; supported legal and sustainable fishing in Indonesia and Honduras; improved relevant policies and laws in Afghanistan and Tanzania; improved wildlife monitoring in Rwanda, Senegal and Tanzania; addressed illegal hunting of wildlife in Kazakhstan, Kenya and Mozambique; and addressed illegal wildlife trade in Mongolia and Guinea. More detail on a selection of activities focus on conservation of CITES-listed species or support government compliance with CITES is provided below:

*Southeast Asia*

- USAID’s Asia’s Regional Response to Endangered Species Trafficking (ARREST) Program strengthens wildlife law enforcement, reduces consumer demand, and promotes regional and inter-agency coordination in combating wildlife trafficking. In 2012, the ARREST project



trained 809 law enforcement officers, protected area managers, customs authorities, judges and others. This has resulted in frequent and high profile arrests and convictions of major criminals, with 499 wildlife law enforcement actions in 2011 and 2012 with an estimated market value of US\$ 27.9 million, and at least 77,519 live animals and 56,166 dead animals or animal parts recovered. There were at least 696 related arrests and 99 convictions resulting.

#### *Tiger range States*

- USAID invested in the Project PREDATOR Partnership of Interpol, World Bank, and the Smithsonian Conservation Biology Institute to support and enhance governance and law enforcement capacity in the 13 tiger range countries, to improve the conservation of wild tigers and other big cats. Project PREDATOR aims to contribute to the apprehension of criminals and organized groups; and develop a global picture of criminal activity affecting the ongoing conservation of tigers and Asian big cats. PREDATOR holds high level police, customs, and wildlife enforcement seminars and calls upon countries to establish National Tiger Crime Task Forces connected regionally and internationally through INTERPOL.

#### *Nepal*

- The National Tiger Genome Project (NTGP) is a two-year project started in 2011, which is developing genomics-based tools to introduce the latest technology in addressing many challenges of tiger conservation in Nepal, including wildlife trafficking. NTGP employs a scientific and conservation-friendly method of extracting DNA of tigers from non-invasively collected scat samples. Findings of this research are expected to facilitate a better understanding of landscape-level genetics of tiger species and aid in designing effective conservation policies and strategies at local, national, and international levels.

#### *Philippines*

- Following successful support for the enhancement of the Philippine judiciary's capacity to address environment related crimes, which led to the promulgation of the U.S. Supreme Court's new Rules of Procedure for Environmental Cases, USAID supported completion of wildlife law enforcement codes, publication of the codes' primer, and trainings of 177 judicial representatives and wildlife enforcement officers. These activities resulted in a 50 percent decrease in the time of adjudication. In addition, USAID supported a Special Boat Unit in Palawan to help enforce environmental law, in which 136 individuals were arrested and vessels illegally carrying 1 million USD of lumber, mangrove bark, sea turtles, and fish were seized.

#### *Central Africa*

- USAID supported conservation in 12 landscapes, monitoring of legal logging and forest cover change across the basin, and other actions which address unsustainable and illegal exploitation of trees and wildlife. In 2012, USAID partners raised the alert and facilitated response to elephant poachers in Salonga National Park. The Democratic Republic of the Congo's army and park service conducted a sweep of the park, resulting in 30 poachers arrested, seven prison sentences, more than 120 firearms confiscated, and one ton of bushmeat destroyed. Following the removal of poachers, elephant circulation tripled inside the park boundaries and surveys and patrols resumed.

#### *South Sudan*

- Since 2008, USAID partner the Wildlife Conservation Society has worked to address multiple threats to biodiversity in the Boma-Jonglei landscape, home to a large mammal migration

comparable in size to that of the Mara-Serengeti. In 2011 and 2012, the program trained wildlife officers on investigation and anti-poaching techniques, resulting in more disciplined local law enforcement, including in the Ministry of Wildlife Conservation and Tourism (MWCT). MWCT law enforcement operations resulted in several arrests and the recovery of automatic weapons, including the arrest of a convoy trafficking bushmeat.

#### *Zambia*

- As a result of USAID-supported work in the Caprivi Region of Southern Africa, the Zambian government in March 2012 placed a ban on Devil's Claw (*Harpagophytum*) harvesting and trading, and is now working on an enabling regulatory framework to manage the sustainable use of this resource.

#### *Guatemala*

- USAID supported biodiversity monitoring in the Mayan Biosphere Reserve and helped register 32 active scarlet macaw nests, totalling 128 eggs and 77 hatchlings with 48 successful fledges in the 2012 breeding season. This year's fledgling success index is the highest value on record during 11 years of monitoring breeding seasons.

Non-detriment findings for plants: A botanist with the U.S. Scientific Authority participated in a technical expert workshop convened by the German Scientific Authority to develop training modules for making non-detriment findings for CITES-listed plants. The workshop, which was hosted by TRAFFIC North America and World Wildlife Fund Mexico, was held in Mexico City, Mexico 1-3 February 2012.

Workshop to develop regional indicators for making non-detriment findings: The Caribbean Fishery Management Council and NMFS hosted a workshop 22-24 May 2012, to continue regional collaboration in the Wider Caribbean on sustainable queen conch fisheries. The workshop convened experts to develop draft indicators for making CITES non-detriment findings for exports of queen conch.

USFWS participates in African wildlife workshops: USFWS CITES authorities participated in and provided presentations at the African Wildlife Consultative Forum workshops held in Swaziland in October 2011 and Botswana in September 2012. Participants included government officials from southern Africa, wildlife researchers, professional hunters, and leaders of community and regional organizations that promote natural resource conservation and development. Discussion topics at the 2011 Forum included: significant trade review; periodic review of species; export and import permit requirements to ship personal, sport-hunted trophies; species conservation issues; national conservation, enforcement, and wildlife management issues; training of professional hunters; and preparation of species proposals for CoPs. Much of the discussion at the 2012 Forum focused on topics that were likely to come up at CoP16 in Bangkok or that the Service and southern African countries were involved in, including: preparation of species proposals for CoP16; proposals that the US was considering bringing to CoP16, such as the proposal for musical instrument passports; the permitting system for leopard trophies; and the status of lions in Africa.

Multinational Species Conservation Funds: The Multinational Species Conservation Funds consist of six programs created to fulfill direct congressional mandates to conserve populations of and habitats for neotropical migratory birds, African and Asian elephants, great apes, rhinoceroses, tigers, and marine turtles. Five of these programs involve CITES-listed species: the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1989, Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, Asian Elephant

Conservation Act of 1997, Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000, and Marine Turtles Conservation Act of 2004. These programs provide direct support to range countries through broad-based partnerships with national governments, NGOs, and other private entities for on-the-ground activities to conserve these species and their habitats. USFWS administers the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. During the period from January 2011 through December 2012, USFWS granted a total of 17,633,523 USD for various international projects focused on the conservation of African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, great apes, and marine turtles. Listed below is a breakdown of the funding by grant program:

African elephant:	26 projects totalling 2,841,491 USD in funding
Asian elephant:	63 projects totalling 3,229,108 USD in funding
Rhinoceros & tiger:	85 projects totalling 4,343,150 USD in funding
Great ape:	65 projects totalling 4,055,288 USD in funding
Marine turtles:	73 projects totalling 3,164,486 USD in funding

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

U.S. CITES Export Tagging Program: The United States cooperates with its States and Indian Tribes in utilizing a tagging program for the export of skins of the following Appendix-II species: bobcat (*Lynx rufus*); river otter (*Lontra canadensis*); Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*); gray wolf (*Canis lupus*); brown bear (*Ursus arctos*); and American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*). USFWS initiated this program over 30 years ago to streamline USFWS's CITES permit issuance process for the export of skins of these species. USFWS currently cooperates with 48 States and 21 Indian Tribes that have instituted approved harvest programs. USFWS approves a State or Indian Tribe for inclusion in the CITES Export Tagging Program when it can make the two CITES findings based on that State's or Tribe's harvest program and enforcement regime. Each approved State or Tribe applies CITES tags, provided by USFWS, to new skins of approved species taken in that State or Tribe 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 2011, USFWS issued nearly 660,000 tags, and during 2012, the USFWS issued over 755,000 tags. During the reporting period, USFWS approved into the program three States for exports of river otter and two Indian Tribes for exports of bobcat.

U.S. CITES American ginseng export program: In implementing the CITES Appendix-II listing of American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*), USFWS works closely with other Federal agencies and the 25 States that have approved American ginseng export programs. The State natural resource and agricultural agencies are responsible for managing this species on State and private lands within their jurisdiction. The U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service manage the species on Federal lands. Subsequently, USFWS relies on those State and Federal agencies to provide information on legal and illegal harvest of American ginseng, the status of the species in the wild, and population trends. Using the information received annually from the States, USFWS is able to make State-wide legal acquisition and non-detriment findings. This approach allows USFWS to streamline its evaluation of CITES permit applications to export American ginseng roots from the United States. During the reporting period, USFWS regularly communicated with the States on issues related to American ginseng, including revision of State ginseng management regulations and administrative changes to the State programs. In 2012, the Menominee Tribe of Wisconsin became the first U.S. Indian Tribe approved for export of American ginseng.

American ginseng meetings: USFWS participated in a ginseng meeting 8-10 May 2012, hosted by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (DNR). The first day of the meeting focused on recent program changes by the DNR for the regulation of wild American ginseng, and activities of the Menominee and Chippewa Indian Tribes. The second day focused on meeting with ginseng dealers and exporters to discuss State regulations for wild and artificially propagated American ginseng, including changes in the certification of wild roots for the 2012 harvest season. In addition, USFWS staff had the opportunity to tour the facilities and growing fields (field cultivation and woods-grown ginseng) of a major American ginseng grower.

USFWS participates in Association of Stringed Instrument Artisan Symposium: In June 2011, the USFWS Division of Management Authority and Office of Law Enforcement participated in an Association of Stringed Instrument Artisans Symposium focused on CITES and the U.S. Lacey Act. The symposium, attended by approximately 150 people involved in the manufacture of and trade in guitars and other stringed instruments, provided an opportunity to explain how CITES works and to bring the industry into closer compliance with CITES requirements and broader U.S. wildlife trade laws and regulations. These discussions led, in part, to the U.S. submission of a document at CoP16 that resulted in adoption of Resolution Conf. 16.8 Frequent cross-border non-commercial movements of musical instruments.

USFWS participates in Violin Society of America meeting: A representative of USFWS participated in the 2012 annual meeting of the Violin Society of America, which was held in Cleveland, Ohio, in November 2012. The meeting provided an opportunity to discuss issues related to CITES CoP16, and present the U.S. proposal to develop a musical instrument certificate for the frequent cross-border movement of musical instruments containing CITES-listed species. The audience of violin and bow makers, as well as musicians, was extremely engaged and interested in the implementation of CITES.

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

During 2011, APHIS confiscated 64 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 29,518 plants, 265 seeds, and an additional 10 grams of seeds. Of these 64 shipments, 54 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 3,000 venus flytraps, 2,403 pitcher plants, 2,316 orchids, 1,384 cacti, 11 euphorbias, 10 aloes, and 10 plants of other taxa; plus 265 cycad seeds and an additional 10 grams of pachypodium seeds.

During 2012, APHIS confiscated 32 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 1,230 plants and 50 kilograms of seeds. Of these 32 shipments, 31 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 665 euphorbias, 201 aloes, 135 cacti, 51 orchids, 43 tillandsias, 25 podophyllums, and 10 plants of other taxa; plus 50 kilograms of palm seeds.

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

USFWS Pollinator Work Group: The U.S. Scientific Authority continued its contributions to the USFWS Pollinator Work Group, as part of an on-going collaboration with the Pollinator Partnership (formerly the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign-NAPPC), an international consortium of individuals, government agencies, and organizations who work together to protect and promote pollinators in Canada, the United States, and Mexico. This partnership provides opportunities to promote a better understanding of CITES and the activities undertaken by CITES Authorities. In 2011 partnership activities included “Take Action for Pollinators,” highlighting activities that people could take to better understand native plants and pollinators, including several included in the CITES Appendices. Information on several CITES-listed pollinator species featured in the 2012 Pollinator poster was provided on the USFWS Pollinator web portal at [www.fws.gov/pollinators/pdfs/Species\\_in\\_the%202012\\_pollinator\\_poster-final.pdf](http://www.fws.gov/pollinators/pdfs/Species_in_the%202012_pollinator_poster-final.pdf).

Trilateral meetings: The CITES Table did not meet during the 2011 or 2012 annual meetings of the Canada/Mexico/U.S. Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management, held in Oaxaca, Mexico, and Santa Fe, New Mexico, respectively. At each of the meetings, a representative of the CITES Table presented the Table’s annual report to the Executive Table. Much of the work of the CITES Table focuses on regional coordination in preparation for CITES meetings. The members of the CITES Table did not meet separately face-to-face during the period covered by this meeting, but coordinated and worked together at meetings of the Standing Committee, Animals Committee, and Plants Committee. Shared issues of concern among the countries in the region include: marine species, climate change, and annotations to listings in the CITES Appendices.

China CITES delegation visit to United States: As part of the U.S.-China Nature Conservation protocol, the U.S. CITES Management and Scientific Authorities hosted a 6-member CITES delegation from the State Forestry Administration of the People's Republic of China in April 2012. The first part of the visit consisted of meetings at the Arlington office between Chinese and U.S. officials discussing issues of mutual interest such as preparations for CoP16. The second part of the visit consisted of a trip to Louisiana to highlight successful sustainable use management programs in the United States. The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries hosted USFWS and the Chinese delegation. They provided history and background on American alligator management efforts and opportunities to see wildlife habitat and to release head-started alligators. The delegation also had a chance to visit an alligator farm that produces 70,000 animals per year and a local turtle farm that ships turtles to China.