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

_____

Seventeenth meeting of the Plants Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 15-19 April 2008

Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species

EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.

2. At the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Santiago, 2002) the Animals and Plants Committees sought and received a mandate to develop terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade. These were proposed and adopted at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok, 2004) and are currently found in Annex 1 to the Decisions of the Conference of the Parties in effect after its 14th meeting (CoP14, The Hague, 2007). For ease of reference, they are reproduced in Annex 1 to the present document.

3. Responsibility for overseeing the evaluation is vested with the Animals and Plants Committees, with the help of an advisory working group comprising Committee members, Parties, the Secretariat and invited experts. The Secretariat is responsible for administering the evaluation and for reporting regularly on progress to the Committees. Whilst the evaluation was to commence after CoP14, there is no fixed time by which it must be concluded.

4. In order to provide a starting point for the Committees' reflections on this matter, the Secretariat commissioned a short study from Ms Wendy Jackson of Lincoln University, Christchurch, New Zealand, who has spent time at the Secretariat studying this matter as an intern. The report of this study is contained in Annex 2 to the present document.

5. The Secretariat has included the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade in its priorities for external fund-raising. At the time of writing (January 2008), no specific pledges of funding had been received, but the Secretariat will update the Committees orally on this point at the present meeting.

6. The Animals and Plants Committees are invited to determine how the advisory working group will be established and to instruct the Secretariat on further steps needed to undertake the evaluation.

Terms of reference for an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade

Objectives

1. The objectives of the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade are to:

    a) evaluate the contribution of the Review of Significant Trade to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a);

    b) assess the impact over time of the actions taken in the context of the Review of Significant Trade on the trade and conservation status of species selected for review and subject to recommendations, taking into consideration the possible effects of these measures on other CITES-listed species;

    c) formulate recommendations in view of the results and findings of the evaluation and the impact assessment; and

    d) prepare a document on the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade and the resulting conclusions and recommendations for consideration at the first appropriate meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Process

2. The evaluation will commence immediately after the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, contingent on the availability of sufficient funds to ensure its completion.

3. The Animals and Plants Committees will oversee the evaluation, which will be administered by the Secretariat. Consultants may be engaged to assist it in this regard.

4. A working group composed of members of the Animals and Plants Committees, Parties, the Secretariat and invited experts will be responsible for advising on the evaluation process, reviewing the findings of associated research and developing recommendations for wider consideration by the Parties.

5. The Secretariat will regularly report on the progress of the evaluation at meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees.

6. A final report, which may include proposed amendments to existing Resolutions or Decisions, or other recommendations, and which will incorporate the comments of the Animals and Plants Committees and of range States addressed in the report, will be submitted by the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees for consideration at a future meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Chairman of the Animals or Plants Committee may submit an interim report to the Standing Committee when appropriate and considered useful.

Content of the evaluation

7. The evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade should include the following activities:

    a) assess:

        i)   the process used to select species for review (including the reliance on numerical data), and the species selected as a result;

        ii) the process and means used to compile and review information concerning the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), for the selected species (including communications with the range States), and the subsequent use of this information by the Animals and Plants Committees for the categorization of species and the issuance of recommendations;

iii) the types and frequency of recommendations made;

iv) the nature and rate of responses to recommendations, and problems identified;

v) the use of the recommendations by range States as guidance for managing target species and other CITES-listed species with similar characteristics;

vi) the nature and scale of the support provided to range States for implementing the recommendations, including field projects, financial aid and assistance in building local capacities;

vii) the ongoing process to monitor and review the implementation of recommendations, having regard to differing points of view as to where this responsibility should lie; and

viii) the impacts of the process on other aspects of CITES implementation, including how problems identified in the course of the review but not directly related to the implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), were addressed;

b) conduct case studies of a representative range of species and countries subject to recommendations to assess subsequent short- and long-term changes, and whether these could be attributed to the process, in:

i) conservation status of the target taxa in the range States;

ii) trade volumes and patterns of the target taxa, considering trade involving the range States subject to recommendations, other range States and non-range States;

iii) production or management strategies for the target taxa;

iv) market developments of conservation relevance (such as shifts in supply or demand);

v) costs and benefits associated with the management of and trade in the target taxa (such as the effects of trade suspensions and export quotas, shift in trade to non-CITES species or increased illegal trade);

vi) protection status of the target taxa within range States, and regulatory measures outside range States;

vii) trade patterns, conservation status and management for other CITES-listed species that might be suitable 'substitutes' for the target taxa; and

viii) changes in conservation policies in range States; and

c) analyse the information to assess the effectiveness, costs and benefits[1] of the Review of Significant Trade as implemented so far, by reference to the cost of the process and the time it takes, and identify means to improve the contribution it makes to the objectives of the Convention by reducing the threats to wild species.

---

[1] *The phrase 'effectiveness, costs and benefits' is intended to address issues such as whether or not the funds spent on the process give value for money comparable to that for other CITES activities, and whether the time-scale envisaged in the process is too long for species that are in rapid decline.*

PREPARATION FOR AN EVALUTION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE

Prepared by: Wendy Jackson

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PART A: INTRODUCTION TO DOCUMENT

Background

At the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, a Decision was adopted to undertake an evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade. The Terms of Reference for this review are contained in Annex 1 to the CoP14 Decisions.

Discussion paper

The parameters of this discussion paper are as follows:

Contribute elements for a discussion paper on the evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade for consideration at the 23rd meeting of the Animals Committee and 17th meeting of the Plants Committees particularly focused on paragraphs 7 a) i), ii) and iii) of the terms of reference for the evaluation.

In particular, this entailed:

-providing a set of tables which give an overview of the species selected for the review over the years, the type and frequency of the recommendations made, and other salient facts which can be readily put in tabular form.

-providing a commentary (maximum 8 pages) on the contents of these tables and on the objectives of paragraphs 7 a) i), ii) and iii) of the terms of reference for the evaluation more broadly

-using this analysis as background, and in line with paragraph 7 b) of the terms of reference for the evaluation, suggesting a range of case studies exemplifying particular sets of circumstances or conditions that have been encountered or experienced in the course of implementation of the Review of Significant Trade over the years.

Information about this report

Inclusion of 'June 1986' species: Concerns that Appendix-II species were being traded without the benefit of non-detriment findings prompted the CITES Parties, as far back as 1984, to call for a review of trade in Appendix-II species in order to identify those that were or were likely to be impacted by current levels of exploitation for international trade. In response to this call, the CITES Technical Committee initiated a review of trade in all Appendix-II animal species. The results of this Review of Significant Trade were reviewed by the Technical Committee in 1986 and published in 1988. They demonstrated that a number of species were being traded at levels detrimental to their survival in the wild, while, for a larger number, the population status, trade levels or ecology were insufficiently known to enable a determination of the impacts of trade on their populations. Therefore, these species (referred to as 'June 1986' species) have been included in some tables because they provide an indication of what species were 'flagged' as being significantly traded before the process was formalized.

Part B tables: The tables in Part B are, to the extent possible, divided between Animals and Plants Committees processes, in order to reflect the fact that the Review of Significant Trade was applied to flora much later than fauna.

PART B: TABLES

Table 1: Dates of review phases (animals)

	CoP period	Dates of species selection	Number of species selected	Recommendations formulated
June 1986	up to CoP8	June 1986 (Second Technical Committee Meeting)	151	no recommendations made
Phase I	CoP8 to CoP9	Aug 1991 (AC5)	27	Mar 1992 (AC7)
Phase II	CoP8 to CoP9	Aug 1991 (AC5); Mar 1992 (AC7)	180	Sept 1993 (AC9)
Phase III	CoP9 to CoP10	May 1994 (AC10); Sept 1995 (AC12)	24	Sept 1995 (AC12)
Phase IV	CoP10 to CoP11	May 1998 (AC14); Apr 2000 (CoP11)	48	Jul 1999 (AC15); Dec 2000 (AC16)
Post-CoP11	CoP11 to CoP12	Aug 2001 (AC17); Apr 2002 (AC18)	20	Aug 2003 (AC19); May 2005 (AC21)
Post-CoP12	CoP12 to CoP13	Mar/Apr 2004 (AC20)*	20	July 2006 (AC22)
Post-CoP13	CoP13 to CoP14	May 2005 (AC21)	17	April 2008 (AC23)

Falco cherrug added in August 2003 as an exceptional case; recommendations formulated in May 2005 (AC21).

This table provides a general overview of how long the process has been operational, as well as the timing of the various phases. Phases I-IV and post-CoP11 species were reviewed under Resolution Conf. 8.9 (Rev.), while post-CoP12 and post-CoP13 species were/are being reviewed under Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13).

The need for and nature of any recommendations for species selected post-CoP13 will be determined at AC23 in April 2008.

Table 2: Dates of review phases (plants)

	CoP period	Dates of species selection	Number of taxa selected	Recommendations formulated
Post-CoP11	CoP11 to CoP12	Dec 2000 (PC10); Nov 2002 (CoP12)	5	Feb 2004 (PC14); Jul 2006 (PC15)
Post-CoP12	CoP12 to CoP13	Feb 2004 (PC14)	4	Jul 2006 (PC16)
Post-CoP13	CoP13 to CoP14	May 2005 (PC15)	11	April 2008 (PC17)

This table provides a general overview of how long the process has been operational, as well as the timing of the various 'phases.' While there have been comprehensive reviews of trade in Appendix-II plant species since the inception of the Plants Committee, it was only in the late 1990s that these reviews were conducted through the Review of Significant Trade.

Issues surrounding significant trade in plant species were discussed at CoP10 in June 1997. Document 10.56 (Paragraph 34) states that: "A draft resolution, to be presented at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties, will address the same issues as Resolution Conf. 8.9 but in relation to plants. It will also have to take into account specific aspects of the trade in plants (in particular the high number of species involved, and the inadequacies of reporting) and other issues following the completion of the studies proposed."

CoP11 (April 2000) adopted a revised version of Resolution Conf. 8.9 that addressed relevant concerns regarding significant trade in plant species (see Document Doc. 11.41.2). Since then, the Plants Committee has addressed significant trade in generally the same manner as the Animals Committee.

The need for and nature of any recommendations for species selected post-CoP13 will be determined at PC17 in April 2008.

Table 3: Information by phase and higher taxa (animals)

Taxa	June 1986	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Post-CoP11	Post-CoP12	Post-CoP13	Total reviews	Reviewed more than once	Total species
Amphibia		2			7			15	24	2	22
Arthropoda	2		8		4				14	2	12
Aves	78	13	53	8	11		4		167	46	121
Mammalia	28	7	21	3	17			1	77	22	51
Mollusca	1			10		1	6		18	7	11
Pisces						14			14		14
Reptilia	42	5	98	3	9	5	10	1	173	30	138
Total	**151**	**27**	**180**	**24**	**48**	**20**	**20**	**17**	**487**	**109**	**369**
Total subject to recommendations		*25*	*156*	*15*	*29*	*16*	*14*				

This table provides an indication of how many species have been reviewed under each higher taxa, and in what phase they were reviewed. The table indicates that birds and reptiles comprise a large percentage of the reviews (34.3% and 35.5%, respectively). Even when calculated by total number of species reviewed (i.e. taking into account species that have been reviewed more than once), the percentages remain roughly the same (32.8% and 37.4%, respectively). The vast majority of bird species reviewed are Psittaciformes (approximately 90%).

Table 4: Information by phase and taxa (plants)

Taxa	Post-CoP11	Post-CoP12	Post-CoP13	Total
Cycadales (Cycadaceae)	1			1
Cyatheales (*Cibotium*, *Cyathea*)		2		2
Dipsacales (*Nardostachys*)			1	1
Euphorbiales (*Euphorbia*)			2	2
Fabales (*Pericopsis, Pterocarpus*)	1		1	2
Gentianales (*Pachypodium* x 2, *Rauvolfia*)			3	3
Liliales (*Aloe* spp., *Galanthus, Aloe*)	1	1	1	3
Myrtales (*Aquilaria*)	1			1
Orchidales (*Christensonia, Dendrobium, Myrmecophila*)		1	2	3
Pinales (*Taxus*)			1	1
Rosales (*Prunus*)	1			1
Total	**5**	**4**	**11**	**20**
Total subject to recommendations	*5*	*4*	*?*	

Trends in the reviews and issuance of recommendations for plant species are difficult to discern, given the lower number of taxa reviewed and the shorter period in which plants have been reviewed. In the post-CoP11 and post-CoP12 phases of reviews, all species selected received recommendations.

Table 5: Species reviewed more than once (animals)

This table indicates what species have been reviewed more than once. Most included in this table have been through the process twice, though if including those 'flagged' in June 1986, some can be considered to have been reviewed three times. The majority of species that have been reviewed twice were those flagged in June 1986 and then reviewed more comprehensively under Phase II, and the majority of these tend to be birds and reptiles.

Taxa	June 1986	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Post-CoP11	Post- CoP12	Post- CoP13
Amphibia								
Hoplobatrachus tigerinus		X			X			
Mantella aurantiaca					X			X
Arthropoda								
Ornithoptera caelestis	X		X					
Ornithoptera priamus	X		X					
Aves								
Agapornis canus		X			X			
Agapornis fischeri	X	X						
Agapornis personatus	X	X						
Alisterus amboinensis	X		X					
Alisterus chloropterus	X			X				
Amazona aestiva	X	X						
Amazona amazonica	X				X			
Amazona farinosa	X				X			
Amazona finschi	X		X					
Amazona viridigenalis	X	X						
Aprosmictus erythropterus	X		X					
Aprosmictus jonquillaceus	X		X					
Ara ararauna	X		X		X			
Ara chloropterus	X		X		X			
Aratinga acuticaudata	X		X					
Aratinga auricapilla	X		X					
Aratinga holochlora	X		X					

Aratinga mitrata	X		X					
Aratinga wagleri	X			X				
Brotogeris versicolorus	X		X					
Cacatua alba	X	X						
Cacatua galerita	X		X					
Cacatua goffini	X	X						
Cacatua sanguinea	X		X					
Cacatua sulphurea	X	X						
Cyanoliseus patagonus	X		X					
Deroptyus accipitrinus	X		X					
Eos bornea	X		X					
Eos reticulata	X	X						
Eos squamata	X		X					
Forpus xanthops	X		X					
Loriculus galgulus	X		X					
Loriculus pusillus	X			X				
Lorius garrulus	X		X					
Nandayus nenday	X		X					
Pionus maximiliani	X		X					
Poicephalus senegalus	X		X				X	
Psittacula longicauda	X		X					
Psittacula roseata	X		X					
Psittacus erithacus	X	X					X	
Pyrrhura frontalis	X		X					
Rhea americana albescens	X		X					
Tanygnathus heterurus	X		X					
Mammalia								
Cercopithecus petaurista	X			X				
Conepatus humboldtii	X		X					
Dusicyon culpaeus/ Pseudalopex culpaeus	X		X					

Dusicyon griseus / Pseudalopex griseus	X		X						
Felis manul/Otocolobus manul	X		X						
Lama guanicoe	X	X							
Lynx lynx/Felis lynx	X	X							
Macaca fascicularis	X		X						
Manis crassicaudata	X	X			X				
Manis gigantea	X				X				
Manis javanica		X			X				
Manis pentadactyla		X			X				
Manis temminckii	X				X				
Manis tetradactyla	X				X				
Manis tricuspis	X				X				
Monodon monoceros	X			X					X
Moschus berezovskii			X		X				
Moschus chrysogaster			X		X				
Moschus fuscus			X		X				
Moschus moschiferus									
Otocolobus manul	X		X						
Saimiri sciureus	X		X						
Mollusca									
Hippopus hippopus				X				X	
Strombus gigas				X			X		
Tridacna crocea				X				X	
Tridacna derasa				X				X	
Tridacna gigas				X				X	
Tridacna maxima				X				X	
Tridacna squamosa				X				X	
Reptilia									
Boa constrictor	X		X						
Caiman crocodilus	X		X						

Chamaeleo gracilis	X			X				
Chamaeleo jacksonii	X				X			
Crocodylus novaeguineae	X		X					
Crocodylus porosus	X		X					
Eunectes murinus	X		X					
Eunectes notaeus	X	X						
Furcifer cephalolepis		X					X	
Geochelone pardalis	X		X		X			
Iguana iguana	X		X					
Malacochersus tornieri	X	X						
Phelsuma abbotti	X		X					
Phelsuma cepediana	X		X					
Phelsuma comorensis	X		X				X	
Phelsuma dubia	X		X				X	
Phelsuma laticauda	X		X					
Phelsuma madagascariensis	X		X					
Phelsuma v-nigra	X		X				X	
Python curtus	X		X					
Python reticulatus	X		X					
Python sebae	X		X					
Testudo graeca	X		X					X
Testudo horsfieldii	X	X						
Tupinambis nigropunctatus/teguixin	X		X					
Tupinambis rufescens	X		X					
Varanus exanthematicus	X		X					
Varanus indicus	X			X				
Varanus niloticus	X		X					
Varanus salvator	X		X					

Table 6: Reviews and recommendations since Phase I (animals)

Phase	Year of species selection	Total species	Species for which recommendations were issued	Species with recommendations as a percentage
Phase I	Aug 1991	27	25	92.5%
Phase II	Aug 1991/ Mar 1992	180	156	86.6%
Phase III	May 1994/ Sept 1995	24	15	62.5%
Phase IV	May 1998/ Apr 2000	48	29	60.4%
Post-CoP11	Apr 2000	20	16	80%
Post-CoP12	Nov 2002	20	14	70%
Post-CoP13	Apr 2004	17		
Total		**336**	**255**	**75.8%**

This table indicates how many species selections have actually resulted in recommendations being issued, since many do not end up with recommendations. Until Post-CoP11, the number of species/countries subject to recommendations was decreasing, but the percentage has since increased. The process has also become more consistent over the years: in earlier phases (I and II), countries may have had populations of species "of possible concern", but were not necessarily subject to recommendations. Since Phase IV, there has been more consistency, and generally, countries with populations "of possible concern" have been subject to recommendations. Species in Phase III seem not to have been categorized at all (though over half have been subject to recommendations).

Table 7: Overview of phases by species, recommendations, etc. (animals)

Phase	Species selected	Species for which recommendations issued	Species / country combinations reviewed in Phase*	Species subject to a trade suspension recommendation at any point	Species / country combinations subject to a trade suspension recommendation at any point	Trade suspension recommendations still in effect (species)	Species/pops moved to Appendix I
Phase I	27	25	58	12	20	5	6
Phase II	180	156	188	13 (+ *Chamaeleo* and *Phelsuma*)	15 (+ *Chamaeleo and Phelsuma*)	9 (+ *Chamaeleo* and *Phelsuma*)	5**
Phase III	24	15	63				
Phase IV	48	29	62	9	14	9	***
Post-CoP11	20	16	74	1 + Acipenseriformes	2 + Acipenseriformes	2	1
Post-CoP12	20	14	89	1	5	1	
Post-CoP13	17						
Total	**336**	**255**	**534**	**36** (+ *Chamaeleo* and *Phelsuma***)**	**56** (+ Acipenseriformes**)**	**26** (+ *Chamaeleo* and *Phelsuma***)**	**12**

* Calculated by adding the number of countries subject to recommendations for each species selected in the phase. Figure does not include recommendations issued to Secretariat or to "All Parties".

** Some populations of *Moschus* spp., *Crocodylus niloticus* and *C. porosus* were already on Appendix I.

*** Some populations of *Moschus* spp. and *Vicugna vicugna* were already on Appendix I.

Tables 7 and 8 provide an idea of how many actual reviews are being conducted (i.e. how many countries/species in total are in the process), how many species have been subject to a recommendation to suspend trade, and how many have been transferred to Appendix I.

Table 8: Overview of phases by species, recommendations, etc. (plants)

Phase	Species selected	Species for which recommendations issued	Individual reviews in Phase*	Species subject to a trade suspension recommendation at any point	Reviews subject to a suspension at any point	Suspensions still in effect (species)	Species/pops moved to Appendix I
Post-CoP11	5	5	24	2	5	1 (Cycads)	
Post-CoP12	4	4	5				
Post-CoP13	11						
Total	**20**	**9**	**29**	**2**	**5**	**1**	

* Calculated by adding the number of countries receiving recommendations for each species selected in the Phase. Figure does not include recommendations issued to Secretariat or to "All Parties".

Table 9: Nature and frequency of recommendations (animals)

This table provides an overview of what types of recommendations are being issued from the Committee, and their frequency. The taxonomy of recommendations is based on the range of recommendations that have been issued since the inception of the Review of Significant Trade; although the wording of recommendations may vary over the years, their general nature has been consistent. The majority of recommendations that have been issued are those: (a) calling for some type of export control (moratoria, quotas, etc.), or (b) requesting information about the scientific basis of non-detriment findings.

The total number of recommendations in Phase II is substantial, as six recommendations were issued to 67 species of *Chamaeleo* in Madagascar (402 recommendations in total). Also, although only 20 species were selected in the post-CoP12 phase, a comprehensive range of recommendations was issued for *Falco cherrug* and various *Tridacnidae* species, resulting in a high total.

Recommendations are counted by the number of times they are given to each country (e.g. for *Psittacus erithacus* reviewed in the post-CoP12 phase, "Institute a moratorium on exports effective 1 January 2007" is counted eight times – once for each country receiving that recommendation). The rationale for counting in this manner is that follow-up requires looking at each recommendation issued for each country.

Nonetheless, the frequency is only an approximate number, for various reasons: (1) some 'single' recommendations contain elements that fall under two different types (e.g. "provide details of the source of specimens and inform the Secretariat of the basis of non-detriment findings" – this would be counted once under "Species ID" and once under "Basis of NDFs"); (2) in situations where multiple recommendations issued to the same country fall under the same type (e.g. "provide details of any harvest management programme" and "provide details of the population management programme"), they are counted as separate recommendations under the same type (so would appear twice under "Harvest mgmt/mgmt programme"); and (3) there were some species that had complex approaches to issuing recommendations, and so these were not included in this first draft:

Phase III:

Strombus gigas: The recommendations issued to countries under Phase III for these species were formulated inter-sessionally and are not available in contemporary references.

Phase IV:

Moschus spp.: The evolution of recommendations for China is very complicated. The process started with one recommendation to provide information on the basis of NDFs (AC16 - 2000), but as this was unsatisfactory, a series of other recommendations were made at AC18 (2002). Because implementation of these recommendations was deemed unsatisfactory, six more recommendations were issued by the Standing Committee in 2005. This makes it impractical to include them in the table.

Post-CoP11 (animals):

Acipenseriformes: The nature and evolution of these recommendations, and subsequent adoption of various Decisions, Resolutions and the Paris Agreement makes recommendations for this species difficult to classify.

Two other important notes regarding counting/classifying of recommendations: (1) recommendations that refer to "Advising the Secretariat of the results, etc." have not been included; and (2) recommendations that were considered "Action outside of the formal process" were included.

	Phase I	Phase II	Phase III	Phase IV	Post-CoP11	Post-CoP12	Post-CoP13
Providing information							
Basis of NDFs/ scientific basis of mgmt	6	119	8	30	3	70	
Species identification		75	8	9			
Population info		7		22	1	67	
Breeding operation info	1	6		4	2	38	
Harvest management/management programme	9	8		12			
Export info	5	19	4	8	2	27	
Legislation/legal info	9	5	1		1		
Trade data		3	3	1	4		
Other*	3	3	10	2			
Action-oriented recommendations							
Export quotas/ controls/ moratoria	26	158	1	23	17	53	
Species identification actions		3		7		6	
Wildlife management/ population monitoring programmes	4	23		18	18	35	
Initiate survey/ studies	15	78	6	14	18	25	
Implement harvest quotas/moratoria		10	1	5	16		
Amend legislation	2						
Enact enforcement measures	1	1		13		6	
Other**	9	85	3	10	29	8	
	87	**603**	**45**	**178**	**111**	**335**	

* Includes: confirming moratorium on trade; details of research activities; Regional Representative and Management Authority to consult regarding NDFs; etc.

** Includes: determining taxonomic status; determining original source of skins; inventorying stockpiles; ensuring accurate permits; consider Appendix-I listing; establish regional management plan, improve permitting techniques, etc.

Table 10: Nature and frequency of recommendations (plants)

	Post-CoP11	Post-CoP12	Post-CoP13	Total
Providing information				
Provide info on the basis of NDFs	8	8		16
Provide info on seizures	2			2
Provide info on monitoring/regulating measures	4			4
Provide info on species identification	3			3
Provide trade data	4			4
Provide/clarify information on trade routes/patterns	3			3
Provide info on training of harvesters		1		1
Provide info on the nature of export products		10		10
Action-oriented recommendations				
Improve trade controls	3			3
Assess effectiveness of existing regulations	1			1
Develop new measures as necessary	1			1
Collaboration between MAs to enhance monitoring	5	1		6
Liaise w/ Secretariat regarding Action Plan	1			1
Implement/improve NDF methodology	3			3
Examine national legislation	2			2
Convene workshop on NDF methodologies	2			2
Establish a cautious quota	1	12		13
Establish harvest monitoring system	1	12		13
Implement management programme; w/ follow-up		1		1
Undertake population studies		8		8
Encourage international cooperation projects		1		1
Report to Secretariat		7		7
TOTAL	**44**	**61**		**105**

Recommendations for plants were easier to classify than those for animals, as there were only two 'phases' to analyse and recommendations were therefore more consistent.

PART C: COMMENTARY ON OBJECTIVES AND TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION OF THE REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE.

General comments

The evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade is to focus on two elements. The first element is the contribution of the process to the implementation of Article IV of the Convention. Indeed, it would be more accurate to state that any contribution will be to *improved* implementation of Article IV, since – in theory – if Parties are correctly implementing the relevant paragraphs, they would not be involved in the Review. Therefore, it might be more accurate to ask: Does the Review improve Parties' ability to implement Article IV?

Because the relevant paragraphs of Article IV refer to non-detrimental trade, a corollary question would be whether the Review has improved Parties' ability to ensure that trade is non-detrimental. For some, this entails examining a Party's capacity to conduct non-detriment findings (NDFs). There is no consensus on what a correct, adequate or satisfactory NDF entails; however, looking at the recommendations that have been issued over the years with the intention to ensure implementation of Article IV, one can assume that it involves a combination of, *inter alia*, providing information, undertaking studies or implementing export controls. Therefore, if the Review is to make a contribution in this regard, then, in theory, over time, Parties' abilities to, *inter alia*, provide information, undertake studies or implement export controls (i.e. conduct NDFs) should improve, and their inclusion in the Review should decrease.

Various methods of exploring Parties' implementation of Article IV may be relevant, such as assessing Parties' NDFs over time, or comparing NDFs of species selected for review and those not selected (i.e. if a Party is not conducting NDFs for species that are included in the Review, what is happening vis-à-vis other species? Are adequate NDFs being conducted?). This element of the evaluation largely focuses on procedural or administrative aspects of the Review.

The second element of the evaluation is an examination of the impact of Parties' actions under the process on the trade and conservation status of species. However, there should be a distinction made between the impact of Party actions on trade levels and the impact on conservation status. For example, Parties' actions – particularly recommendations regarding export activity – should, in principle, have direct impacts on legal trade levels. However, these impacts may not necessarily translate to conservation improvements. This raises the question of whether adequate or satisfactory implementation of Article IV necessarily results in conservation improvements, and if not, whether this should be a basis for evaluating the contribution of the Review to the implementation of Article IV.

Comments on objectives in paragraphs 7 a) i), ii) and iii)

7 a) i) The process used to select species for review (including the reliance on numerical data), and the species selected as a result

> Given that the Review of Significant Trade has gone through a number of iterations, an analysis of the various methods of selection might be useful. In particular, it might be useful to see how many species have been selected (overall) under each iteration, in comparison with how many are eventually included in the Review, and how many are actually subject to recommendations. Fewer species have been included for review under Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), but have less been selected in the screening process? If so, is this because implementation of Article IV is improving? Is the capacity of Parties increasing?

> Also worth exploring is the use of both trade and conservation data in the selection of species. While Article IV is based upon more ecological principles (i.e. language regarding "non-detrimental" trade, species survival, levels consistent with role in ecosystems, etc.), the Review is in fact triggered by trade data. Is this a logical or efficient system? What is the yardstick by which we gauge the implementation of Article IV: improvements in the bureaucratic actions of Parties, reductions in legal trade levels, or improvements in conservation status?

7 a) ii) The process and means used to compile and review information concerning implementation of Article IV, paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a), for the selected species (including communications with the

range States), and the subsequent use of this information by the Animals and Plants Committees for the categorization of species and the issuance of recommendations

There are two aspects of an evaluation of the compilation and review of information concerning the implementation of Article IV: information submitted in writing to the Secretariat; and information presented orally at AC and PC meetings. In terms of written responses, elements of an analysis might include: initial NDFs for species selected (if conducted); and Party responses to Secretariat correspondence, as well as their distribution to AC and PC members, other Parties and observers. Currently, distribution of this information is inconsistent: e.g. letters from range States (see for example PC16 Doc. 10.3) are distributed at some meetings, but not others (as these letters are considered to involve compliance matters, they are distributed on a 'need to know' basis). Other documents may be available at the meeting, but may not be on the CITES website. Verbal submission at AC and PC meetings is also important. While this method of submission permits all AC and PC members and observers to have access to the information, concerns have been raised that this may encourage more *ad hoc* responses to important information requests.

Looking at the information compiled and reviewed – especially in light of the categorization of species and issuance of recommendations – would be an integral part of any examination. Does the frequency of categorizations vary by type of response? For example, do verbal responses tend to result in "least concern" categorizations? If so, why is this the case? Are verbal responses more detailed? Does having an audience of technical experts (who can ask direct questions) provide an incentive to be more thorough?

An assessment of the information about the selected species (i.e. that provided by IUCN/TRAFFIC) might also be valuable. One way of examining this would be to ask different groups who use the information (the Secretariat, AC and PC members, observers) to evaluate it against various criteria (quality, balance, utility, content, etc.). The format for information submitted regarding selected species has been uniform for many years, and seems to be generally well-received by all stakeholders. Nonetheless, soliciting input may yield some observations or suggestions to streamline or improve this information.

7 a) iii) The types and frequency of recommendations made

This element of the analysis is particularly important, since the recommendations are meant to address issues with implementation of Article IV. An examination of the actual recommendations should be conducted to assess whether they actually address implementation of Article IV (non-detrimental trade of Appendix-II species). Over the years, the nature of the recommendations has stayed relatively consistent, with a focus on providing information (particularly providing information on the scientific basis of NDFs) and implementing various types of export controls (moratoria, quotas, etc). This would imply that these types of recommendations are effective – are they? However, the relevance of the type/frequency of recommendations on the Review of Significant Trade may only be clear when examined in the context of responses to recommendations by Parties i.e. paragraph 7 a) iv). How have Parties responded? Are responses improving? Has compliance improved with increased sophistication of the Review? How long does it take for Parties to respond? Do Parties response rates continue to improve? Do the speed, frequency and nature of response vary with the type of recommendation? An analysis of the type and frequency of recommendations is valuable insofar as the nature of responses to the recommendations is examined.

Comments on terms of reference in general

In general, the terms of reference for the evaluation are comprehensive and cover all elements of the Review that are essential for understanding its contribution to implementation of Article IV (i.e. its effectiveness). What must be clear in evaluating the Review of Significant Trade is the objective against which it is being evaluated; i.e. how do we evaluate how Scientific Authorities ensure trade in Appendix-II species is non-detrimental to their survival? One underlying assumption of the process that should be addressed is the role of trade as a primary threat to the species. Preliminary assessments of the Review reveal that although the process has had immediate and direct impacts on trade levels, these impacts have not translated into "reducing the threats to wild species" [paragraph 7. c) of the content of the evaluation]. Although threats from legal trade have been reduced, conservation status may not be improved. Whether this should be factored into the Review process, and how it could be addressed, should be considered.

Other questions that have arisen in the rudimentary stage of this evaluation, and that should be considered, include:

a) What constitutes implementation of recommendations? There is no uniformity to the scope and nature of information distributed to Parties regarding the implementation of recommendations as per paragraphs q) and r) of the Resolution. While some of this information may not be appropriate for widespread distribution, there may be options available in terms of increasing transparency on this matter. An examination of how this aspect of the process can be made more consistent and clear would be valuable.

b) Can the process be made more efficient (i.e. shorter)? When the Review of Significant Trade was in its early phases, time lags between Animals Committee meetings were shorter. The table below indicates timing of meetings between AC1 (November 1988) and AC10 (May 1994) and between AC10 and AC19 (August 2003).

	Less than 12 months between meetings	More than 12 months between meetings
AC1 – AC10	7	2
AC10 – AC19	5	4
AC19 – AC23	1	3

Methods of expediting progress through the Review should be explored (e.g. encouraging intersessional work of the AC or PC, finding ways to expedite or encourage responses from range States, etc.). While the analysis conducted so far has not examined in detail how long individual reviews have taken, this would be a valuable (but time-consuming!) exercise. Looking at response rates and total time in the Review – e.g. by country and/or by nature of the recommendations – may indicate some patterns that could lead to more efficient progress through the process. For example, looking at the table below, an investigation of the recommendations that were responded to most quickly (e.g. within six months) might be instructive.

Timing of first response from countries (Phase-I species)

Timing of first response from country (Based on when recommendations sent – 06/92 and 07/92 for *Lynx lynx*)	Number
First response within 3 months (by 09/92)	9
First response within 6 months (by 12/92)	15
First response within 12 months (by 06/93)	11
First response within 18 months (by 12/93)	9
First response after 18 months	6
No response	6
Species moved to Appendix I before response sent	2
TOTAL	**58**

Information issues

The information requirements to conduct a thorough evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade will be considerable. Extensive use of the Secretariat's hard copy archives will be necessary, as they contain an enormous amount of data in the form of correspondence and reports. With decreased use of fax correspondence since the early 1990s, much of this documentation is only accessible by enquiring to the appropriate CITES staff members (who may maintain email records). Moreover, extensive cooperation with range States will be an integral element of the evaluation, in order to address elements such as those in paragraphs 7 a) v); 7 b) i); 7 b) iii); and 7 b) v) to viii). However, these are all highly germane to the Review's effectiveness, and funding for the evaluation should provide for a high level of consultation with range States.

PART D: SUGGESTED RANGE OF CASE STUDIES

Case study selection was based on the assumption that comparison of different elements of the Review process may reveal variables that impact on its contribution to the implementation of Article IV. Once these variables are isolated, they may indicate how responses and results from the Reviews can be improved. Such improvements will vary by Review: will the quality and speed of Party responses be increased? Will export controls be made more effective? Will the scientific basis of NDFs be made more explicit?

Given the objectives of the evaluation, it is assumed that case studies will entail an examination of both trade and conservation data, within the context of Parties' implementation of Article IV. Many species appear more than once; the rationale for this is that examining the same species using different 'lenses' (e.g. looking at *Prionailurus bengalensis* in terms of number of times through process, as a Phase I species, etc.) will reduce the total number of species to be investigated.

No species reviewed after the Post-CoP11 phase are suggested as case studies in order to provide as much time series data as possible for trade and conservation trends. However, elements of the analysis that focus solely on administrative/bureaucratic aspects of the Review of Significant Trade may include species selected from any of the Phases.

	Method of comparison	Possible cases	Justification
Comparison among number of times in process – does going through the process twice improve responses or results?	One time in process	*Prionailurus bengalensis* (Phase I); *Chalcopsitta atra* (Phase II); *Geochelone sulcata* (Phase III); *Dendrobates auratus* (Phase IV)	Species from each phase are selected to give an overview of one-time species as the process has become better implemented; various higher taxa were selected, also for comparison
	Two times in process	*Tridacna* spp. (Phase III, Post-CoP12); *Moschus* spp. (Phase II and IV); *Hoplobatrachus tigerinus* (Phase I + IV)	A range of higher taxa were selected and from different phases
Comparison among phases – do any of the phases indicate better results than others?	Phase I	3-5 species from Phase I	Species should vary across taxa (would also be efficient to select ones examined under other criteria)
	Phase II	3-5 species from Phase II	Species should vary across taxa (would also be efficient to select ones examined under other criteria)

	Phase III	3-5 species from Phase III	Species should vary across taxa (would also be efficient to select ones examined under other criteria)
	Phase IV	3-5 species from Phase IV	Species should vary across taxa (would also be efficient to select ones examined under other criteria)
	Post-CoP11	3-5 species from Post-CoP11	Species should vary across taxa (would also be efficient to select ones examined under other criteria)
Comparison of species-specific vs. genera – are there better results if genera are looked at more broadly?	Species-specific	*Prionailurus bengalensis* (Phase I); *Chalcopsitta atra* (Phase II); *Geochelone sulcata* (Phase III); *Hippopotamus amphibius* (Phase IV)	Species are selected across Phases and among higher taxa
	Genera	*Tupinambis* spp. (Phase II), *Moschus* spp. (Phase II and Phase IV), *Tridacna* spp. (Phase III and Post-CoP12)	Species are selected across Phases and among higher taxa
Comparison by classification – do different categories fare differently?	Least concern	*Tauraco persa* (Phase IV); *Manis temminckii* (Phase IV)	There are no species before Phase IV classified as 'least concern'; Phase IV species are selected among higher taxa
	Possible concern	*Psittacula longicauda* (Phase II); *Chamaeleo jacksonii* (Phase IV)	Species are selected across Phases and among higher taxa
	Urgent concern	*Manis* (Phase IV), *Moschus* (Phase IV), *Saiga tatarica* (Phase IV), *Cuora amboinensis* (Post-CoP12)	There are no species before Phase IV classified as 'urgent concern'; Species are selected among higher taxa;
Comparison of species that receive recommendations vs. those that do not – do recommendations make a difference?	Phase I	Recommendations: *Amazona aestiva; Python regius* No recommendations: *Amazona oratrix; Amazona viridigenalis*	Species were selected from each of the higher taxa to provide a range of examples; (Note: only two species did not receive recommendations in Phase I, limiting the selection)
	Phase II	Recommendations: *Ornithoptera victoriae; Psittaculirostris desmarestii; Pecari tajacu; Varanus niloticus* No recommendations: *Ornithoptera croesus; Psittaculirostris edwardsii;*	Species were selected from each of the higher taxa to provide a range of examples

		Conepatus humboldtii; Varanus exanthematicus	
	Phase III	Recommendations: *Psittacula alexandri; Cercopithecus petaurista; Chamaeleo gracilis* No recommendations: *Aratinga wagleri; Hippopus hippopus*	Species were selected from each of the higher taxa to provide a range of examples (all Mammalia and Reptilia received recommendations in this Phase)
	Phase IV	Recommendations: *Dendrobates auratus; Tauraco hartlaubi; Manis pentadactyla; Cordylus tropidosternum* No recommendations: *Dendrobates histrionicus; Tauraco persa; Manis temminckii; Calabaria reinhardtii*	Species were selected from each of the higher taxa to provide a range of examples
Comparison of recommendations – information-based vs. action-based – does it make a difference?	Information-based	*Hoplobatrachus tigerinus* (Phase I); *Cacatua galerita* (Phase II); *Poicephalus gulielmi* (GN – Phase III); *Dendrobates auratus* (Phase IV)	Species were selected across Phases, among higher taxa, and with various range States
	Action-based	*Cacatua alba* (Phase I); *Varanus niloticus* (CM, ML – Phase II); *Tridacna gigas* (PH – Phase III); *Amazona amazonica* (Phase IV)	Species were selected across Phases, among higher taxa, and with various range States
Comparison by range State variance – do better results emerge for species that occur in one range State vs. those that have larger ranges?	One range State	*Cacatua alba* (ID - Phase I); *Loriculus philippensis* (PH - Phase II); *Mantella aurantiaca* (MG – Phase IV)	Species were selected across Phases, among higher taxa, and with various range States
	Multiple range States	*Amazona aestiva* (Phase I); *Pionus senilis* (Phase II); *Strombus gigas* (Phase III); *Hippopotamus amphibius* (Phase IV)	Species were selected across Phases, among higher taxa, and with various geographic regions

PART E: FLOW CHART OF REVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT TRADE:

THE SIGNIFICANT TRADE REVIEW PROCESS
How to use this diagram:

- STAGES are numbered; they are differentiated by colour
- STEPS are lettered (A, B, C); they are the same colour as the stage under which they are included
- DASHED LINE BOXES indicate steps at which species can come out of the review process

COP takes place

1 SELECTION OF SPECIES

A — WITHIN 90 DAYS OF COP, **Secretariat** asks WCMC to produce trade data

B — Based on trade data, **AC or PC** selects "species of priority concern" for review

AC or PC can add a species where new information indicates an urgent concern

2 CONSULTATION WITH RANGE STATES

A — WITHIN 30 DAYS OF AC/PC MEETING where species are selected, **Secretariat** to notify range States of species selected, explanation for selection, and requesting comments on Article IV implementation

B — **Range States** have 60 days to respond to Secretariat

C — **Secretariat** to report responses to AC or PC

D — If AC or PC satisfied that Article IV is correctly implemented, species is eliminated from review with respect to State concerned; **Secretariat** to notify State WITHIN 60 DAYS

3 COMPILATION OF INFORMATION

A — If AC or PC not satisfied that Article IV is correctly implemented, **Secretariat** proceeds with compilation of information regarding the species

B — **Secretariat** or consultants compile information, and summarise conclusions about the effects of international trade on the selected species, and provisionally divide the selected species into three categories:
1. species of urgent concern
2. species of possible concern
3. species of least concern

C — **Secretariat** transmits report with categorisation to relevant range States, seeking comments and/or additional information

D — **Range States** have 60 days to respond to Secretariat

4 REVIEW OF INFORMATION AND CONFIRMATION OF CATEGORISATION

A AC or PC reviews Secretariat's report and range State responses, and if necessary, revise categorisation

B(i) Secretariat addresses problems NOT related to Article IV implementation

B(ii) SPECIES OF LEAST CONCERN eliminated from the review

5 FORMULATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TRANSMISSION TO RANGE STATES

A AC or PC formulates recommendations for remaining species

(i) SPECIES OF URGENT CONCERN

Recommendations may include*:
-establishment of administrative procedures
-application of adaptive management procedures
-conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments

(ii) SPECIES OF POSSIBLE CONCERN

Recommendations may include*:
-conducting of taxon- and country-specific status assessments
-establishing cautious export quotas

AC or PC determines deadlines; deadlines to be not less than 90 days but not more than two years after recommendations transmitted

B Secretariat to transmit recommendations to range States

6 IMPLEMENTATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

A Secretariat, in consultation with AC or PC Chair, determines whether recommendations have been implemented; reports to SC

B(i) If recommendations met, Secretariat - after consultation with SC Chair - notifies Parties that species is removed from process

B(ii) If recommendations not met, Secretariat recommends to SC appropriate action, which may include as a last resort, a suspension of trade

C SC decides on appropriate action and makes recommendations, based on Secretariat's report

D Secretariat notifies Parties of any recommendations or actions taken by the SC

If State can demonstrate compliance with Article IV to satisfaction of SC, recommendation to suspend trade can be withdrawn

E SC, in consultation with Secretariat and AC or PC Chair, reviews recommendations to suspend trade that have been in place for longer than two years; if appropriate, SC takes measures to address situation