U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2005-2006

PREPARED BY:

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

COMPLETED 17 JANUARY 2008

U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2005-2006

Table of Contents

	Page
INTRODUCTION	2
REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2005-2006 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES	3
A. General information	3
B. Legislative and regulatory measures	4
C. Compliance and enforcement measures	6
D. Administrative measures	10
D1. Management Authority (MA)	10
D2. Scientific Authority (SA)	11
D3. Enforcement Authorities	14
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	14
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	18
D6. Capacity building	21
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	24
D8. Areas for future work	28
E. General feedback	29
ANNEX 1 – HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION B OF THIS REPORT	30
ANNEX 2 – HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION C OF THIS REPORT	32
ANNEX 3 – HIGHLIGHTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT	41
D1 and D2. Management Authority (MA) and Scientific Authority (SA)	41
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	48
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	49
D6. Capacity building	51
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	52

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 2005-2006.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14), amended by the Parties at the 14th regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP14), recommends that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at CoP13 and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submits this 2005-2006 report in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format*, as provided in Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035.

The regulations implementing CITES in the United States were issued on 22 February 1977 (50 CFR Part 23). To date, there have been fourteen regular meetings of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (Berne, San Jose, New Delhi, Gaborone, Buenos Aires, Ottawa, Lausanne, Kyoto, Fort Lauderdale, Harare, Gigiri, Santiago, Bangkok, and The Hague). Since 1977, the United States has implemented new CITES Resolutions in the United States by modification of internal policy and administration, promulgation of special rules, and revision of specific regulations. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a final rule in the *Federal Register* on 23 August 2007, substantially updating the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. These updates reflect measures adopted by the Parties at their regular meetings through CoP13.

During 2005-2006, 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 highlights of some of the major measures that the United States took during 2005-2006, 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 2005-2006 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES

A. General information

Party	United States of America
Period covered in this report:	1 January 2005 to 31 December 2006
Details of agency preparing this report	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 212 Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 3582095 Fax: +1 (703) 3582280 Email: managementauthority@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/international
Contributing agencies, organizations or individuals	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority 4401 North Fairfax Drive, Room 110 Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 3581708 Fax: +1 (703) 3582276 Email: scientificauthority@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/international 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: http://www.fws.gov/le

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) ☒ Yes (partly) ☐ No ☐ No information/unknown ☐
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 ☐ No ☐ No information ☐
4	If yes, please attach a copy of the full legislative text or key legislative provisions that were gazetted.	legislation attached ☐ provided previously ☐ not available, will send later ☐
5	Which of the following issues are addressed by any stricter domestic measures adopted for CITES-listed species (in accordance with Article XIV of the Convention)?	Tick all applicable

	The conditions for:			The complete prohibition of:		
Issue	Yes	No	No information	Yes	No	No information
Trade	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Taking	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Possession	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transport	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Additional comments:

Major stricter domestic measures in the United States that in many instances affect CITES-listed species include the Endangered Species Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, the Asian Elephant Conservation Act, the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, the Great Ape Conservation Act, the Marine Turtles Conservation Act, and State natural resource and wildlife laws and regulations.

6	What were the results of any review or assessment of the effectiveness of CITES legislation, with regard to the following items?				Tick all applicable
	Item	Adequate	Partially Inadequate	Inadequate	No information
	Powers of CITES authorities	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Clarity of legal obligations	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Control over CITES trade	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Consistency with existing policy on wildlife management and use	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Coverage of law for all types of offences	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Coverage of law for all types of penalties	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Implementing regulations	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Coherence within legislation	☒	☐	☐	☐
	Other (please specify):	☐	☐	☐	☐

Please provide details if available:

During 2005-2006, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) continued to work on revising the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations (50 CFR Part 23). On 19 April 2006, the USFWS published a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* to respond to more than 200 comments from the public on a similar rule that was proposed in 2000 but never finalized, make appropriate changes based on these comments, and incorporate appropriate recommendations from CITES resolutions adopted by the Parties through the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP13). In the second half of 2006, the USFWS worked on addressing public comments on the proposed rule and began preparing the final rule to revise 50 CFR Part 23. Working on these revisions, we were able to assess the effectiveness of CITES legislation in the United States with regard to the above items.

7	If no review or assessment has taken place, is one planned for the next reporting period?	Yes ☐ No ☐ No information ☐
	Please provide details if available:	

8	Has there been any review of legislation on the following subjects in relation to implementation of the Convention?			Tick all applicable
	Subject	Yes	No	No information
	Access to or ownership of natural resources	☒	☐	☐
	Harvesting	☒	☐	☐
	Transporting of live specimens	☒	☐	☐
	Handling and housing of live specimens	☒	☐	☐

	Please provide details if available: During the process of working on the revision of the U.S. CITES implementing regulations during 2005-2006, the USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation on each of the above subjects related to CITES implementation.
9	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: *See ANNEX 1 for highlights of some of the major legislative and regulatory measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006.*

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:	☒	☐	☐
	Inspections of traders, producers, markets	☒	☐	☐
	Border controls	☒	☐	☐
	Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐
2	Have any administrative measures (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related violations?	☒	☐	☐
3	If Yes, please indicate how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details. 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. *See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for a representative sampling of instances involving the imposition of administrative measures for CITES violations during 2005 and 2006.*			
4	Have any significant seizures, confiscations and forfeitures of CITES specimens been made?	☒	☐	☐
5	If information available: ☐ Significant seizures/confiscations ☐ Total seizures/confiscations If possible, please specify per group of species or attach details.	Number In 2005, the USFWS seized 63,847 CITES specimens (including live wildlife, parts, and products) as well as 4,818 kilograms of "commodities" representing		

	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.	CITES species. In 2006, the USFWS seized 93,535 CITES specimens and 19,167 kilograms of CITES "commodities." *See ANNEX 2 under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for details on representative seizures.*		
6	Have there been any criminal prosecutions of significant CITES-related violations?	☒	☐	☐
7	If Yes, how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details as Annex. USFWS inspections and investigations resulted in multiple criminal prosecutions involving the smuggling of CITES-listed species and other significant violations. However, the structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES violations under other U.S. laws (laws that often authorize higher penalties) make it impossible to compile totals for the "numbers and types of CITES violations" that resulted in criminal prosecution. *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 2005 and 2006.*			
8	Have there been any other court actions of CITES-related violations?	☐	☒	☐
9	If Yes, what were the violations involved and what were the results? Please attach details as Annex.			
10	How were the confiscated specimens usually disposed of?	Tick if applicable		
	– Return to country of export	☒		
	– Public zoos or botanical gardens	☒		
	– Designated rescue centres	☒		
	– Approved, private facilities	☒		
	– Euthanasia	☐		
	– Other (specify)	☒		
	Comments: Some confiscated specimens were also donated to educational facilities for use in improving public understanding of wildlife conservation and trade issues.			

11	Has detailed information been provided to the Secretariat on significant cases of illegal trade (e.g. through an ECOMESSAGE or other means), or information on convicted illegal traders and persistent offenders?	Yes No Not applicable No information	☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Comments:		
12	Have there been any cooperative enforcement activities with other countries (e.g. exchange of intelligence, technical support, investigative assistance, joint operation, etc.)?	Yes No No information	☒ ☐ ☐
13	If Yes, please give a brief description: The USFWS shared intelligence on potential CITES violations with the CITES Secretariat and appropriate enforcement authorities in other CITES Party nations. Specific trade problems involving intelligence sharing with foreign wildlife enforcement counterparts included trade in CITES-listed tortoises and other reptiles, illegal trade in Asian arowanas, and illegal imports of CITES Appendix-I big cat parts. Specific examples include information provided to Guyana on possible circumvention of the CITES permit process and to the United Kingdom on the smuggling of sperm whale teeth. USFWS cooperative enforcement efforts included a joint investigation with the Canadian Wildlife Service that resulted in both U.S. and Canadian criminal charges against an Internet-based wildlife trafficker dealing in products made from CITES species and coordination with South African authorities to secure the deportation of a U.S. citizen wanted for trafficking in black rhino horn and other CITES species parts.		
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 No No information	☒ ☐ ☐
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 No Not applicable No information	☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Comments: The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement Intelligence Unit completed a comprehensive assessment of wildlife inspection efforts and seizures to analyze the level of inspection effort and interdiction success for different wildlife trade sectors over a 5-year period. This review of illegal wildlife trade and USFWS trade enforcement looked at such		

	parameters as species, port, trader, mode of transport, commodity, time of year, etc. The results, which have been shared with members of the global wildlife trade enforcement community (including the Interpol Wildlife Working Group and the North American Wildlife Enforcement Officers Association), are being used to develop a risk assessment methodology that will help USFWS inspectors and investigators more effectively target their efforts to interdict illegal wildlife trade.
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 2005 and 2006 included: • 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. Notices alerted traders to new procedures for applying for U.S. CITES documents; permit requirements for Appendix-III species; requirements for trade in sturgeon caviar under CITES; the imposition or lifting of CITES trade restrictions for specific countries; and an update on trade restrictions for queen conch. • Work with the Ornithological Council to develop on-line guidance for importing CITES-listed and other protected bird specimens for scientific purposes, and a presentation on import/export requirements at the national conference of the American Ornithologists Union. • Training on CITES and other import/export requirements for curators and staff at museums affiliated with the Smithsonian Institution in Washington, D.C. • A 2-day import/export compliance course for New York-based international buyers from two major U.S. department store chains. • Import/export compliance seminars for employees of a major Dallas-based U.S. department store chain. • Assistance to a major internet auction site company in improving its efforts to target and remove listings promoting transactions that would violate CITES or U.S. wildlife protection laws. • Presentations on CITES and U.S. wildlife import/export requirements for brokers associations in New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, San Diego, El Paso, Phoenix, Tampa, and other locations. • Outreach booths at the 2006 BWI Cargo Expo in Baltimore, Maryland, and the International Air Cargo Convention in Houston, Texas. • Compliance briefings for U.S. big game hunters departing from Anchorage for hunting excursions in the Russian Far East. • Consultation with the American Watch Association in New York, the Airline Management Council in Louisville, and national representatives of a major U.S. department store chain to increase understanding of CITES requirements and

	improve compliance. • One-on-one CITES compliance guidance to company representatives and individuals engaged in wildlife trade. • Operation of an e-mail-based "contact" service to answer specific questions on import/export requirements and other enforcement issues.

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 ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here. The USFWS Division of Management Authority recently moved to a different floor within the same building, thus causing a change in the mailing address. This change is provided below, with new text underlined and deleted text struck out: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority 4401 N. Fairfax Drive Room ~~700~~ <u>212</u> ARLINGTON, VA 22203-3247	
3	If there is more than one MA in your country, has a lead MA been designated?	Yes ☐ No ☐ No information ☐
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, 27 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	☒ ☐ ☐
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the MA(s)?		Tick if applicable
	– Administration		☒
	– Biology		☒
	– Economics/trade		☐
	– Law/policy		☒
	– Other (specify)		☐
	– No information		☐
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	☐ ☒ ☐
9	If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.		
10	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: *See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.*		

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	☒ ☐ ☐
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here. The USFWS Division of Scientific Authority recently moved to a different floor within the same building, thus causing a change in the mailing address. This change is provided below, with new text underlined and deleted text struck out: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority 4401 N. Fairfax Drive Room ~~750~~ <u>110</u> ARLINGTON, VA 22203-3247		
3	Is the designated Scientific Authority independent from the Management Authority?	Yes No No information	☒ ☐ ☐
4	What is the structure of the SA(s)?		Tick if applicable

	– Government institution	☒
	– Academic or research institution	☐
	– Permanent committee	☐
	– Pool of individuals with certain expertise	☐
	– Other (specify)	☐
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, seven staff in the Division of Scientific Authority work on CITES issues.	
6	Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters If yes, please give estimation: About 60 percent.	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the SA(s)?	Tick if applicable
	– Botany	☒
	– Ecology	☒
	– Fisheries	☒
	– Forestry	☒
	– Welfare	☒
	– Zoology	☒
	– Other (specify)	☐
	– No information	☐
8	Have any research activities been undertaken by the SA(s) in relation to CITES species?	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐

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)
	Panax quinque-folius	United States	United States and Canada	ca. 26,000 kg. annually	ca. 26,000 kg. wild roots exported annually; also export ca. 149,000 kg. of artificially propagated roots annually	Not quantified	Research conducted on status of the species (abundance, distribution), as well as impacts of harvest, sustainable harvest levels (2004-2006).
	Hydrastis canadensis	United States	United States and Canada	Not quantified	ca. 850 kg. of artificially propagated roots exported annually; no exports of wild roots occurred in 2005-2006	Not quantified	Research conducted on habitat modelling and distribution throughout species' core range in the United States (2004-2006).
						No information	☐
10	Have any project proposals for scientific research been submitted to the Secretariat under Resolution Conf. 12.2?					Yes	☐
						No	☒
						No information	☐
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: *See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.*						

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 No No information	☒ ☐ ☐
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 No Under consideration No information	☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
4	If Yes, please state which is the lead agency for enforcement: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement 4401 North Fairfax Drive MS-LE-3000 Arlington, Virginia 22203-3247 United States of America Tel: +1 (703) 3581949 Fax: +1 (703) 3582271 Email: lawenforcement@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/le		
5	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: *See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for summaries of CITES enforcement activities, including criminal prosecutions, seizures, and administrative penalties.*		

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	☒
	– Monitoring and reporting of data on illegal trade	☒
	– Permit issuance	☒
	– Not at all	☐
	– Other (specify)	☐

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	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Scientific Authority	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Enforcement Authority	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	The central office of the Enforcement Authority has unrestricted access, but the field offices only have access through a dial-up connection.

3	Is there an electronic information system providing information on CITES species?	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
4	If Yes, does it provide information on: – Legislation (national, regional or international)? – Conservation status (national, regional, international)? – 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.	Tick if applicable ☐ ☐ ☒
5	Is it available through the Internet: *Note:* The USFWS is currently working on reprogramming the U.S. Combined Species database to make it available via the Internet. Please provide URL:	Yes ☐ No ☒ Not applicable ☐ No information ☐

6	Do the authorities indicated have access to the following publications?			Tick if applicable
	Publication	Management Authority	Scientific Authority	Enforcement Authority
	2005 Checklist of CITES Species (book)	☒	☒	☒
	2005 Checklist of CITES Species and Annotated Appendices (CD-ROM)	☒	☒	☒
	Identification Manual	☒	☒	☒
	CITES Handbook	☒	☒	☒
7	If not, what problems have been encountered to access this information?			
8	Have enforcement authorities reported to the Management Authority on:			Tick if applicable
	– Mortality in transport?			☐
	– Seizures and confiscations?			☒
	– Discrepancies in number of items in permits and number of items actually traded?			☐
	Comments:			
9	Is there a government website with information on CITES and its requirements?		Yes	☒
			No	☐
			No information	☐
	If Yes, please give the URL: http://www.fws.gov/international/cites/cites.html			

10	Have CITES authorities been involved in any of the following activities to bring about better accessibility to and understanding of the Convention's requirements to the wider public?	Tick if applicable
	– Press releases/conferences	☒
	– Newspaper articles, radio/television appearances	☒
	– Brochures, leaflets	☒
	– Presentations	☒
	– Displays	☒
	– Information at border crossing points	☒
	– Telephone hotline	☐
	– Other (specify)	☐
	Please attach copies of any items. *Note:* These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.	
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: • USFWS Law Enforcement and Management Authority representatives staffed a compliance outreach booth at the national convention of the Safari Club International in Reno, Nevada, in both 2005 and 2006. USFWS participation in this yearly event raises hunter awareness about CITES import/export permit requirements and helps improve treaty compliance by global big game hunters. • CITES outreach to the U.S. big game hunting community also included USFWS participation at the Dallas, Texas, meeting of the Safari Club International in both of the reporting years. Agency representatives staffed an exhibit and conducted a "Q&A" seminar on import/export issues for brokers, hunters, and attorneys. • USFWS Law Enforcement worked with the new Georgia Aquarium in Atlanta to develop an educational outreach display and learning center spotlighting efforts to combat illegal wildlife trade. The exhibit explains global and U.S. protections for species in trade and showcases USFWS investigations that broke up smuggling operations involving sea turtle eggs and other CITES-protected wildlife. • USFWS enforcement staff teamed with the Memphis Zoo to develop a permanent exhibit focused on illegal wildlife trade. • USFWS Law Enforcement staff participated in the Marine Aquarium Conference of North America, staffing an outreach booth that focused on coral reef conservation. USFWS officers provided information on CITES and other import/export requirements to aquarium industry officials, hobbyists, educators, and other conference participants. • Outreach activities explaining the USFWS role in policing global trade and enforcing U.S. wildlife laws and treaties included exhibits at such venues as the Oklahoma	

Wildlife Expo, the New Mexico Outdoor Expo, the Utah International Sportsmen's Exposition, Earth Day celebrations in San Diego, California, and State fairs in Kentucky, North Carolina, and Washington. Materials distributed included the agency's "Buyer Beware" brochure, which cautions U.S. travellers about buying and importing souvenirs made from protected species.

- USFWS wildlife inspectors conducted a variety of educational programs focused on wildlife trade issues. Examples include community presentations in Houston to multicultural groups, a presentation on import/export compliance for the South Bay Bird Society in Los Angeles, California, and presentations on CITES at the 2005 UNA-USA Model United Nations Conference in New York City, New York.

- A new display on the USFWS's international and domestic law enforcement mission, which spotlights the work of the agency's wildlife inspectors as well as its criminal investigators, was developed for use in public outreach. Inaugural venues included the North Carolina State Fair and a trade expo in Houston, Texas.

See ANNEX 3, Section "D4," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006, with respect to communication, information management, and information exchange.

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 ☒ No ☐ Not applicable ☐ No information ☐
	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	☒	☐	☐
	Registration of traders	☒	☐	☐
	Registration of producers	☒	☐	☐

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 (2005)	Import or introduction from the sea	Export	Re-export	Other	Comments
	How many documents were issued?	989	2,935	5,780	521	A total of 10,225 CITES documents were issued during 2005. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 521 "other" documents, 178 were for either export or re-export, and 68 were for the import of specimens both listed under CITES and protected under a stricter domestic measure (i.e., the Endangered Species Act).
	How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	-	-	-	-	A total of 242 applications were denied or abandoned during 2005. 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.
	Year 2 (2006) How many documents were issued?	957	3,844	6,580	1,912	A total of 13,293 CITES documents were issued during 2006. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 1,912 "other" documents, 1,517 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificate of ownership), 335 were for either export or re-export, and 60 were for the import of specimens both listed under CITES and protected under a stricter domestic measure (i.e., the Endangered Species Act).
	How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?	-	-	-	-	A total of 302 applications were denied or abandoned during 2006. 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.

4	Were any CITES documents that were issued later cancelled and replaced because of serious omissions or misinformation?	Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐
5	If Yes, please give the reasons for this.	
6	Please give the reasons for rejection of CITES documents from other countries.	Tick if applicable

Reason	Yes	No	No information
Technical violations	☒	☐	☐
Suspected fraud	☒	☐	☐
Insufficient basis for finding of non-detriment	☐	☒	☐
Insufficient basis for finding of legal acquisition	☐	☒	☐
Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐

7	Are harvest and/or export quotas used as a management tool in the procedure for issuance of permits? Comments	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
8	How many times has the Scientific Authority been requested to provide opinions? During 2005-2006, the U.S. Scientific Authority was asked to provide opinions in more than 300 specific findings. However, the Scientific Authority has produced a series of "general advices" that can be used when a particular application meets established criteria. For example, for applications requesting the exports of pet birds of commonly bred species, the Scientific Authority has made a non-detriment finding that can be used provided that the applicant meets certain requirements.	
9	Has the MA charged fees for permit issuance, registration or related CITES activities?	Tick if applicable

- Issuance of CITES documents: ☒
- Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species: ☒
- Harvesting of CITES-listed species : ☐
- Use of CITES-listed species: ☐
- Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species: ☐
- Importing of CITES-listed species: ☒
- Other (specify): ☐

10	If Yes, please provide the amounts of such fees. 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 11.

11	Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation?	Tick if applicable
	– Entirely:	☒
	– Partly:	☐
	– Not at all:	☐
	– Not relevant:	☐
	Comments:	
12	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: *See ANNEX 3, Section "D5," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006, with respect to permitting and registration procedures.*	

D6 Capacity building

1	Have any of the following activities been undertaken to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level?			Tick if applicable
	Increased budget for activities	☒	Improvement of national networks	☒
	Hiring of more staff	☒	Purchase of technical equipment for monitoring/enforcement	☒
	Development of implementation tools	☒	Computerization	☒
	– Other (specify)			☒
	The USFWS is participating in the development of the Automated Customs Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS) – a U.S. Government-wide project to centralize the policing and processing of all international trade entering or exiting the United States. The system, which is being designed and deployed over a multi-year period, will improve U.S. CITES enforcement and USFWS efforts to detect and interdict illegal wildlife trade by providing access to integrated trade and intelligence information as well as selectivity and targeting mechanisms. The system will serve as the core technological infrastructure for future USFWS wildlife inspection and smuggling interception operations.			

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. Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	What were the external sources?
	Staff of Management Authority	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	Other U.S. Government agencies, traders, NGOs, scientific experts, and the public.
	Staff of Scientific Authority	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	
	Staff of enforcement authorities	☒	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

3	Have the CITES authorities been the *providers* of any of the following capacity building activities?						
	Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity. Target group	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)	Details
	Staff of Management Authority	☒	☒	☐	☒	☐	
	Staff of Scientific Authority	☒	☒	☐	☒	☐	
	Staff of enforcement authorities	☒	☒	☐	☒	☐	
	Traders	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	
	NGOs	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	
	Public	☒	☒	☐	☐	☐	
	Other parties/International meetings	☒	☒	☒	☐	☐	
	Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

4	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: • In 2005, the USFWS launched wildlife inspection operations at Memphis, Tennessee, and Louisville, Kentucky – two locations where the agency had not previously been present to police wildlife trade. Both cities are hubs for major express-mail shipping companies that handle large volumes of international trade each year – a form of transport that is increasingly being used to smuggle wildlife products and even live wildlife (such as CITES-listed reptiles). The presence of USFWS wildlife inspectors at these new locations has improved the agency's ability to enforce CITES and interdict illegal wildlife trade. • The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement extended the reach of U.S. CITES enforcement by providing "cross training" on treaty requirements to other Federal officers that police trade at U.S. ports of entry. A total of 1,126 new U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) inspectors, 402 new CBP agriculture specialists, and 116 military customs clearance agents received instruction in CITES and other U.S. wildlife import/export rules and regulations as part of their basic training in 2005. In 2006, such training was provided to 1,194 new CBP inspectors, 452 CBP agriculture specialists, and 180 military customs clearance agents. • USFWS wildlife inspectors nationwide conducted wildlife import/export training sessions for CBP enforcement officers already in place at U.S. ports of entry and border crossings. • USFWS enforcement staff also provided instruction in CITES and other wildlife import/export requirements to U.S. Coast Guard boarding officers in Washington State that police vessels entering U.S. waters and ports in the Pacific Northwest; Air Force military customs inspectors in Minot, North Dakota; and military customs inspectors stationed at Navy facilities in San Diego, California, and Everett, Washington. • In 2005, USFWS special agents helped conduct workshops on environmental law enforcement for territorial officers in American Samoa and the U.S. Virgin Islands. The workshops, which were sponsored by the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force, reviewed CITES protections for corals and other reef species as well as U.S. wildlife laws and regulations. • In 2005 and 2006, scientists at the USFWS National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory conducted research that resulted in the development of new forensic procedures and protocols for supporting investigations involving CITES violations. Examples include a technique that uses the chemical signature of keratin (a substance found in horn, hoofs, nails, claws, etc.) to identify the species of a given wildlife sample, and expanded genetics analysis capabilities (including the ability to infer geographic source for certain taxa). • Other forensic advances in support of CITES enforcement included a new protocol for analyzing bear bile, expanded DNA capabilities for identifying the species origin of African and Asian bushmeat, and crime scene investigation protocols for use with coral reefs. *See ANNEX 3, Section "D6," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006, with respect to capacity building.*

D7 Collaboration/co-operative initiatives

1	Is there an interagency or inter-sectoral committee on CITES?	Yes No No information	☒ ☐ ☐
2	If Yes, which agencies are represented and how often does it meet? The U.S. interagency CITES Coordination Committee (CCC) meets 5-8 times a year. The following agencies are represented in the CCC: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service U.S. Department of Agriculture Foreign Agriculture Service U.S. Department of Justice U.S. Department of State Office of the U.S. Trade Representative U.S. Department of Commerce U.S. Agency for International Development Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection		

3	If No, please indicate the frequency of meetings or consultancies used by the Management Authority to ensure co-ordination among CITES authorities (e.g. other MAs, SAs, Customs, police, others):							
		Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Annually	None	No information	Other (specify)
	Meetings	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	
	Consultations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	

4	At the national level have there been any efforts to collaborate with:	Tick if applicable	Details if available
	Agencies for development and trade	☒	
	Provincial, state or territorial authorities	☒	
	Local authorities or communities	☒	
	Indigenous peoples	☒	
	Trade or other private sector associations	☒	
	NGOs	☒	
	Other (specify)	☐	

5	To date, have any Memoranda of Understanding or other formal arrangements for institutional cooperation related to CITES been agreed between the Management Authority and the following agencies?	Tick if applicable
	Scientific Authority	☒
	Customs	☒
	Police	☐
	Other border authorities (specify): USFWS Law Enforcement; U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; and U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection	☒
	Other government agencies	☒
	Private sector bodies	☒
	NGOs	☒
	Other (specify)	☐

6	Have Government staff participated in any regional activities related to CITES?	Tick if applicable
	Workshops	☒
	Meetings	☒
	Other (specify)	☐

7	Has there been any effort to encourage any non-Party to accede to the Convention?	Yes	☐
		No	☒
		No information	☐
8	If Yes, which one(s) and in what way?		

9	Has technical or financial assistance been provided to another country in relation to CITES?	Yes ☒ No ☐ No information ☐
10	If Yes, which country(ies) and what kind of assistance was provided? USFWS enforcement personnel conducted the following international training programs in 2005: • Senior officials from the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement and the U.S. Department of Justice participated in a three-day inaugural Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) Workshop conducted by the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) at KhaoYai National Park in Thailand. U.S. representatives provided overview presentations on legislative, investigative, and prosecutorial strategies for combating wildlife trafficking. • A USFWS Office of Law Enforcement training team conducted a two-week wildlife crime investigators course in Brasilia for 27 officers with the Brazilian Federal Police. The training, which was organized and funded by the U.S. Embassy, covered case management, intelligence gathering, forensics and crime scene processing, surveillance techniques, interviewing skills, raid planning, and court preparation. • USFWS Law Enforcement staff conducted a two-week course for wildlife crime investigators at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Botswana. The 2005 training, which was completed by 32 officers representing six sub-Saharan African nations (Uganda, Kenya, Tanzania, Namibia, Zambia, and Botswana), placed greater emphasis on CITES enforcement. Instructors included a USFWS wildlife inspector who presented course segments on CITES and smuggling techniques and reviewed data on U.S. seizures from the students' home countries. • USFWS Law Enforcement helped conduct a three-week in-country assessment of CITES and other wildlife enforcement needs in the Philippines. Recommendations addressed measures needed to improve enforcement capacity and enhance protections for both marine and terrestrial resources. Training programs provided by USFWS Law Enforcement in 2006 included the following: • Two USFWS special agents conducted a two-week criminal investigators course for 30 members of the Philippine National Anti-Environment Crime Task Force. The training, which covered CITES enforcement and skills needed to conduct wildlife crime investigations, was sponsored by WildAid and ASEAN-WEN with funding from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). • A USFWS Law Enforcement team provided training on wildlife trade to customs and inspection officers in Mongolia. The training, which was sponsored by TRAFFIC East Asia, reviewed tools and techniques for use in combating illegal wildlife trade. Topics included common smuggling techniques and ways to foil them; conducting undercover investigations and surveillance; and vehicle and cargo inspections. • USFWS Law Enforcement again presented a wildlife crime investigators course to members of the Brazilian Federal Police Environmental Crimes Division. The course,	

	which was completed by 37 participants, covered such topics as Internet investigations, surveillance, raid planning, and CITES. The training has now been completed by approximately half of the officers assigned to the division. • The USFWS National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory helped plan and teach "CSI for Coral Reefs: Investigative and Enforcement Forensics Field Training Workshop," a four-day course conducted in conjunction with the International Tropical Marine Ecosystems Management Symposium in Cozumel, Mexico. The course, which was completed by 21 students from 13 countries, presented newly developed protocols for conducting crime scene analysis on damaged coral reefs and included underwater exercises. • Two USFWS special agents provided basic wildlife investigations training to 30 Thai trainees and two observers from the Philippine National Bureau of Investigation in Hua Hin, Thailand. Thai students completing the course included officers from the Royal Thai Police, Thai Customs, and the Thai Department of National Parks, Wildlife, and Plant Conservation. The training was organized and sponsored by WildAid, the Royal Thai Police, and ASEAN-WEN and funded by USAID. • A USFWS special agent participated as a technical expert representing the U.S. Department of the Interior's International Technical Assistance Program and USAID at the Philippines' First National Environmental Law Enforcement Summit. Highlights included the framing of a "Declaration of Commitment" pledging participating agencies to working together and identification of mechanisms for achieving better coordination in the enforcement arena. • For the fifth consecutive year, the USFWS conducted a two-week wildlife investigative training course as part of the core curriculum at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Botswana. Twenty-nine game wardens and customs officials from eight sub-Saharan African nations completed the program, which covered the basics of conducting a wildlife crime investigation. Countries represented included Botswana, Kenya, Lesotho, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia. • Nearly 100 investigators from wildlife agencies in Mexico, Canada, and the United States participated in a joint videoconference seminar on using the Internet in combating wildlife trafficking. The seminar, which was sponsored by the North American Wildlife Enforcement Group, included presentations by the head of the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement's Intelligence Unit and the Special Agent in Charge, Branch of Special Operations; these officials also played a major role in working with Canadian counterparts to organize the seminar.		
11	Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?	Yes No No information	☐ ☒ ☐
12	If Yes, please give a brief description.		
13	Have measures been taken to achieve co-ordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national authorities for CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the biodiversity-related Conventions)?	Yes No No information	☒ ☐ ☐

14	If Yes, please give a brief description. *For an example, see ANNEX 3, Section "D7," under "Expanded cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)."*
15	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: *See ANNEX 3, Section "D7," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006, with respect to collaboration and cooperative initiatives.*

D8 Areas for future work

1	Are any of the following activities needed to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level and what is the respective level of priority?			
	Activity	High	Medium	Low
	Increased budget for activities	☒	☐	☐
	Hiring of more staff	☒	☐	☐
	Development of implementation tools	☐	☐	☒
	Improvement of national networks	☐	☐	☒
	Purchase of new technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement	☐	☐	☒
	Computerization	☐	☐	☒
	Other (specify)	☐	☐	☐
2	Were any difficulties encountered in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties?	Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐		
3	If Yes, which one(s) and what is the main difficulty?			
4	Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance?	Yes ☐ No ☒ No information ☐		
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 ☐ No ☒ No information ☐		
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 NOTE: Already provided.	Enclosed Not available Not relevant	☐ ☐ ☒
C3	Details of violations and administrative measures imposed *NOTE: See attached ANNEX 2.*	Enclosed Not available Not relevant	☒ ☐ ☐
C5	Details of specimens seized, confiscated or forfeited *NOTE: See ANNEX 2.*	Enclosed Not available Not relevant	☒ ☐ ☐
C7	Details of violations and results of prosecutions *NOTE: See ANNEX 2.*	Enclosed Not available Not relevant	☒ ☐ ☐
C9	Details of violations and results of court actions *NOTE: See ANNEX 2.*	Enclosed Not available Not relevant	☒ ☐ ☐
D4(10)	Details of nationally produced brochures or leaflets on CITES produced for educational or public awareness purposes *NOTE: These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.* Comments	Enclosed Not available Not relevant	☐ ☐ ☒

ANNEX 1

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: On April 19, 2006, the USFWS published a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* to update the regulations (50 CFR Part 23) that implement CITES in the United States. The proposed rule included consideration of more than 200 public comments received by the USFWS on a similar package that was proposed in 2000 but never finalized. The 2006 proposal incorporated recommendations from resolutions adopted by CITES Parties through the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP13). Revised regulations will help the USFWS more effectively promote species conservation, fulfill its responsibilities as a CITES Party, and help those affected by CITES to understand how to conduct international trade in CITES-listed species.

[*Note:* The USFWS published the final rule updating the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations on 23 August 2007 (after the reporting period of this biennial report). The new regulations became effective on 24 September 2007.]

Alligator snapping turtle and all species of map turtles listed in CITES Appendix III: The USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* on 16 December 2005, listing the alligator snapping turtle (*Macroclemys* [=*Macrochelys*] *temminckii*) and all 12 species of map turtle (*Graptemys* spp.) in CITES Appendix III. These listings became effective on 14 June 2006.

Map turtles are popular in the pet trade while the alligator snapping turtle is utilized in the pet trade and its meat is used for human consumption. Both map turtles and alligator snapping turtles are harvested from the wild and bred in captivity in the United States. The USFWS worked closely with the U.S. States to develop the listing package for these species, as well as the novel procedures to issue CITES export permits.

In 2006, the USFWS approved thirty annual "master files" for exporters of the newly listed turtle species. Fourteen permittees were approved for captive-bred alligator snapping turtles and 23 permittees were approved for eight different species of map turtles (some permittees were approved for both taxa). "Master files" are established annually for these turtle species by the USFWS to facilitate the issuance of permits over the course of the calendar year at a reduced cost for permittees.

STRICTER DOMESTIC REGULATORY MEASURES

Beluga sturgeon: On 4 March 2005, the USFWS published a Special Rule to control trade of beluga sturgeon (*Huso huso*), listed as "Threatened" under the U.S. Endangered Species Act in 2004. Under the Special Rule, for trade with the United States to continue, Caspian and Black Sea littoral States were to provide certain information to the U.S. Scientific Authority, including copies of basin-wide management plans for beluga sturgeon and copies of their national laws implementing the management plans. This information was to be provided within 6 months of the date of publication of the Special Rule.

After Caspian Sea littoral States failed to provide any of the information required under the Special Rule, the United States suspended import of and foreign commerce in beluga sturgeon caviar and meat originating in the Caspian Sea basin on 30 September 2005. On 28 October 2005, the United States suspended import of and foreign commerce in beluga sturgeon caviar and meat originating in the Black Sea basin after Black Sea littoral States failed to provide information required under the Special Rule. These trade suspensions remain in place. However, they may be lifted at any time if the necessary information is submitted.

Scimitar-horned oryx, dama gazelle, addax listed as Endangered: The USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* on 2 September 2005, listing the scimitar-horned oryx (*Oryx dammah*), addax (*Addax nasomaculatus*), and dama gazelle (*Gazella dama*) as "Endangered" under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. These are CITES Appendix-I species.

Tibetan antelope listed as Endangered: The USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* on 26 March 2006, listing the Tibetan antelope (*Pantholops hodgsonii*) as "Endangered" under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This is a CITES Appendix-I species.

ANNEX 2

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

CITES COMPLIANCE MEASURES

Sturgeon: Representatives from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Division of Management Authority and Office of Law Enforcement, and the U.S. Department of Justice participated in the International Sturgeon Enforcement Workshop to Combat Illegal Trade in Caviar held in Brussels in June 2006. The Office of Law Enforcement contributed a presentation on lessons learned from caviar investigations.

In August 2006, representatives from the USFWS Bozeman Fish Technology Center participated in a workshop in Khabarovsk, Russia, to facilitate planning of joint U.S.-Russia research and education projects to improve management and conservation of kaluga and Amur sturgeon. During the workshop a plan was developed to undertake a 5- to 10-year joint research project on the Amur River.

Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group: At the 15th meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC15) in May 2005, the Plants Committee re-established the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group (MWG) and tasked it with taking specific steps to promote full implementation of the CITES Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*) in the range countries and importing countries. The MWG was made up of: the Plants Committee members from Central and South America and Europe; the countries of Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and Peru (as major mahogany range countries); the Dominican Republic, the European Union, and the United States (as major mahogany importers); the CITES Secretariat; and representatives from Fauna and Flora International, TRAFFIC, and WWF International. The Plants Committee requested the MWG to start working as soon as possible after PC15, work intersessionally, and report on its progress at PC16. Marco Romero Pastor, of the CITES Management Authority of Peru, was named Chair of the MWG. Peter Thomas, of the CITES Management Authority of the United States, was named Vice-Chair. During the reporting period, the Chair and Vice-Chair of the MWG worked closely together via Email and collected information from a number of countries on steps they have taken to manage mahogany, conduct forest inventories, and determine and monitor the distribution, population size, and conservation status of mahogany.

The MWG held a meeting 29 June through 1 July 2006, in Lima, Peru, immediately preceeding PC16. The United States provided funding for this meeting through the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) and Peter Thomas, as Vice-Chair of the MWG, helped ensure that the meeting took place and was effective. At the meeting, the mahogany range countries reported on what steps they have taken to manage mahogany, conduct forest inventories, and determine and monitor the distribution, population size, and conservation status of mahogany. The major importing countries, including the United States, reported on steps they have taken in implementing the mahogany Appendix-II listing.

At PC16 (3-6 July 2006 – Lima, Peru), a working group was formed to discuss the results of the meeting of the MWG, analyze information on the actions taken by mahogany range States in accordance with CITES Decision 13.58, advise on the possible inclusion of bigleaf mahogany in the Review of Significant Trade, and if appropriate, propose draft decisions for the Plants Committee to

submit for adoption at CoP14. The United States actively participated in this Plants Committee working group.

U.S. efforts related to Peruvian mahogany: During the reporting period, the USFWS continued to remain in close contact with Peru regarding its implementation of the mahogany Appendix-II listing. During 2005, Peru established a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota of 23,621 cubic meters. The USFWS closely monitored the volume of bigleaf mahogany being imported into the United States from Peru during 2005, in relation to the quota, and provided Peru with periodic reports on 2005 U.S. imports of Peruvian mahogany. In 2005, the United States imported 22,156 cubic meters of bigleaf mahogany wood from Peru. During 2006, Peru established a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota of 23,239.57 cubic meters. The USFWS continued to closely monitor the volume of bigleaf mahogany being imported into the United States from Peru during 2006, in relation to the quota, and provided Peru with periodic reports on 2006 U.S. imports of Peruvian mahogany. In 2006, the United States imported 17,264 cubic meters of bigleaf mahogany wood from Peru. Providing this information to Peru on a regular basis has assisted Peru in monitoring the total volume of mahogany wood they are exporting to the United States and allows them the opportunity to stop issuing additional permits if the volumes exported approach the quota they have set.

Through the Tropical Forest Conservation Fund, the United States supported increased inspections in forest concessions that have mahogany (in the Madre de Dios and Ucayali regions of Peru) to verify compliance with sustainable forest management as mandated by Peruvian Law. A number of inspections were undertaken and preliminary results indicate that some concessions will be cancelled for not complying with the law.

The United States provided support to strengthen Peru's CITES Management Authority (INRENA) for implementation of the Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany. This multi-year effort is part of the U.S.-funded CEDEFOR Project that is implemented by the World Wildlife Fund. Specific activities include strengthening INRENA's capacity to review forest management and harvest plans submitted by the forest concessions, with an emphasis on the mahogany regions (Madre de Dios and Ucayali). The United States also assisted in the development of an ITTO-funded project whose primary objective is to strengthen Peru's CITES Scientific Authority for forest species (the National Agrarian University - La Molina). Along with other ITTO donors, the United States also provided financial support for this effort.

The United States supported and continues to support training in sustainable forest management for forest concessionaires in Peru. Working through Fundação Floresta Tropical (FFT) and others, a training program has been developed focused on reduced-impact logging activities such as forest harvest inventory, planning, directional felling, and safety. After successful demonstration of training courses, FFT and other partners are developing a more extensive program that will deliver additional training in sustainable forest management activities, including strategic planning for forest roads.

Ramin implementation activities: Ramin (*Gonystylus* spp.) was listed in CITES Appendix II at CoP13. The listing became effective on 12 January 2005. During the reporting period, the USFWS continued to work with its partners in the U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection (CBP) to ensure that the United States is fully and appropriately implementing the ramin Appendix-II listing. The United States also worked with ramin range countries in implementing the CITES listing. The CITES Management Authority in Sarawak, Malaysia, has instituted a process whereby it informs USFWS whenever it issues a CITES export permit for a shipment of ramin from

Sarawak. The USFWS distributes this information to the appropriate agencies in the United States to ensure that those ramin shipments are properly inspected and cleared upon arrival at U.S. ports of entry.

ITTO Expert Meeting on Ramin: In May 2006, an expert from the U.S. Forest Service and an expert from the U.S. Department of State participated in an ITTO-funded Expert Meeting on the Effective Implementation of the Inclusion of Ramin in Appendix II of CITES in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. In this meeting, the U.S. delegation presented a report that provided an overview of the interagency process that the United States uses with regard to CITES-listed timber species, the experiences of U.S. port inspection officials and wood identification experts in dealing with imports of ramin wood and wood products into the United States, and descriptions of the international efforts that the U.S. Government is making to support the ramin listing. In addition to presenting the U.S. report, the U.S. Forest Service expert facilitated the meeting's working group on international cooperation supporting the ramin listing, and presented the results of that working group on the last day of the meeting.

CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES

Administrative measures for CITES violations: U.S. CITES enforcement resulted in the imposition of administrative measures (specifically, monetary assessments called "civil penalties") on numerous occasions in 2005 and 2006. The work of USFWS wildlife inspectors in New York City alone, for example, secured the following penalty assessments:

- An upscale women's clothing company paid $11,000 in civil penalties for importing 19 shipments of blue coral jewelry in violation of CITES; the company also forfeited 18,800 pieces of jewelry valued at $21,763.
- A company that unlawfully imported 21 pieces of African elephant ivory paid a $7,000 civil penalty.
- A watch company that imported tegu lizard watchstraps in violation of CITES paid an $8,000 civil penalty.
- The unlawful import of three caiman leather products resulted in an $8,000 penalty for a company that had a history of CITES violations.
- Another watch and jewelry importer paid $13,000 in civil penalties for three shipments of alligator leather products imported in violation of CITES.
- The illegal importation of 80 alligator and lizard products resulted in a $5,500 penalty for the company involved.
- A company specializing in the sale of high-priced leather goods paid a $5,000 civil penalty for CITES violations connected with the importation of 12 crocodile and alligator handbags valued at $22,450.
- A commercial antiques dealer who imported an undeclared shipment of 60 elephant ivory and sea turtle shell antiques without the required CITES pre-Convention certificate paid a $20,000 civil penalty.
- A New York wildlife importer paid a $4,000 civil penalty for CITES violations, including humane transport, associated with a shipment from Madagascar containing 307 mantella frogs, 304 geckos, 17 day geckos, and 34 chameleons (all Appendix-II species).
- A courier service whose employee transported 205 sea turtle eggs from El Salvador to New York paid $2,900 for CITES violations.

Selected examples of administrative penalties collected at other U.S. ports of entry include:

- A commercial fish importer in Portland, Oregon, paid $6,275 for unlawfully importing three CITES Appendix-I Asian arowanas in a shipment of tropical fish from Malaysia.
- Inspectors in Dallas, Texas, intercepted an illegal shipment of CITES-listed birdwing butterflies from China; the importer paid a $10,000 civil penalty.
- A South African big game outfitter using the port of Dallas paid $3,000 for the illegal importation of an endangered bontebok while his client forfeited the trophy (valued at $1,200).
- The unlawful importation of four CITES Appendix-II black buck antelope trophies via Laredo, Texas, saw the importer abandon the wildlife and pay $2,025.
- Big game outfitters in Phoenix, Arizona, paid more than $1,200 in penalties for import violations involving bighorn sheep trophies.
- A Canadian woman who tried to smuggle commercial quantities of antiques made from elephant ivory and other wildlife materials at the border crossing in Buffalo, New York, paid a $1,950 penalty.
- A Boston, Massachusetts, museum paid a $1,000 penalty after it tried to export a CITES Appendix-I Japanese giant salamander skeleton without the proper permits.
- In Memphis, Tennessee, the importer of two hawksbill sea turtle shells was fined $1,100, as was an individual who imported seven bald eagle feathers.
- A San Francisco, California, man who unlawfully imported a large snow leopard skin was fined $500.
- Inspectors in Anchorage, Alaska, seized a shipment invoiced as "blue adventurine" that actually contained 1,235 necklaces made of blue coral that were being imported from China without a CITES permit; the importer was fined $5,000.

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 2005 and 2006 include:

- Inspectors in Boston, Massachusetts, seized 75 eagle feathers (including 69 Appendix-I white-tailed eagle feathers) from a researcher arriving from the United Kingdom without a CITES permit.
- Other seizures at this port included python and lizard leather goods; 1,600 grams of whale meat; sturgeon caviar; elephant tusks and ivory bracelets and carvings; and sea turtle eggs.
- Staff in New York seized 21 live lesser flamingos that had been wild-caught in Tanzania and shipped to the United States under inhumane conditions.
- Airline crew members on a flight from Moscow to New York were caught smuggling $5,100 worth of beluga caviar.
- Seizures in Newark, New Jersey, included a shipment of 1,152 *Tridacna* shells imported from China without a CITES permit and a shipment of Asian medicinals valued at $6,000 that contained products made from seal, seahorse, antelope, and tortoise.
- Officers in Newark, New Jersey, also intercepted a shipment of 72 monitor lizard shoes imported from Italy without a CITES permit and two shipments of *Varanus* and python shoes from Switzerland that did not match the quantities cited on the CITES export permit.
- USFWS officers in Atlanta, Georgia, seized over 400 vials of traditional Chinese medicines being smuggled in a passenger's baggage; the seized items were made from CITES-listed plants, such as ginseng and orchids, as well as protected wildlife, including tiger, leopard, bear, musk deer, Saiga antelope, and pangolin.
- Seizures in Atlanta also included a shipment containing 163 pieces of CITES-listed coral and queen conch shells; live and dead corals from the Bahamas; a shipment containing 350 pieces of coral imported from Viet Nam with an invalid CITES permit; 25 pounds of freshly killed sea turtle meat; 16 Pekin robins imported without a CITES permit; 44 vials of Appendix-I rhino serum; a full mount brown hyena; whole elephant tusks and commercial shipments of high-end ivory-handled knives; a

hunting trophy shipment that included baboon and monkey trophies lacking permits; and an undeclared, unpermitted commercial shipment of over 1,200 reptile skins and products, including many representing CITES species.

- A four-day blitz of passenger flights arriving in Atlanta from Central and South America resulted in seizures of smuggled sea turtle meat, eggs, and shell products; endangered harpy eagle feathers; and a commercial shipment of unlawfully imported caiman skin purses, belts and wallets.
- An individual arriving in Miami, Florida, from Honduras was caught with a live red-lored Amazon parrot and eight protected orchids hidden in his bags.
- Inspectors in Miami discovered 20 live Appendix-II arapaimas concealed in a shipment of tropical fish from Peru.
- Enforcement officers in Miami also intercepted multiple illegal shipments of sea turtle eggs, meat and shell; unlawfully imported black coral and queen conch; shipments of sperm whale teeth mailed from Chile and Ireland without permits; 320 dried seahorses smuggled in personal baggage from Peru; live endangered South American river turtles; a commercial shipment of stuffed reptiles, mammals and amphibians from Nicaragua that contained CITES species; 10 live endangered catfish hidden in a tropical fish shipment from Thailand; and live CITES-listed caimans imported without permits from Trinidad and Tobago.
- In Tampa, Florida, the USFWS inspector seized two containers of queen conch meat valued at $660,000 that had been imported from Honduras without a CITES permit.
- Other seizures in Tampa included commercial shipments of coral, queen conch shells, and *Tridacna* clam shells imported without CITES permits.
- Common seizures in San Juan, Puerto Rico, included queen conch meat and products and sea turtle eggs and products.
- USFWS staff in Charleston, South Carolina, seized 4,791 pieces of coral and shells being imported without CITES permits; the collection was transferred to the new Georgia Aquarium in Atlanta for educational use.
- Another interception at the port of Charleston involved an antique shipment that contained seven 60-pound giant clam shells imported without CITES permits.
- Inspectors in Memphis, Tennessee, seized a shipment of 80 elephant hair bracelets. Other interceptions at this port included unlawful importations of leopard claws, seal skin, caiman skins and watchstraps, elephant leather goods, and caviar extract.
- Seizures in Louisville, Kentucky, included shipments of reticulated python shoes and handbags imported without CITES permits from China and Japan. Other seizures at this port included macaw feathers, African elephant leather products and ivory carvings, sperm whale teeth, and a shipment of monkey skulls, lizards, insects, and bats from Indonesia.
- African handicraft shipments seized in Houston included a 20-item group of items made from CITES species and a shipment in which primate skulls were concealed in wooden carvings.
- A live baby pangolin being imported from the Congo was seized in Los Angeles, California.
- Los Angeles inspectors intercepted a tropical fish shipment in which the importer had hidden five Asian arowanas. They also stopped illegal importations of Asian medicinals made from CITES species, live corals, and sea turtle eggs.
- A border blitz at the San Ysidro border crossing in California intercepted CITES-protected cacti.
- Inspectors in San Diego, California, seized two kilos of dried seahorses being smuggled into the United States; they also stopped smugglers bringing in iguana carcasses and iguana meat.
- A seizure in Anchorage, Alaska, involved a shipment of live fish from Malaysia that contained Asian arowanas; nine pool cues made from elephant ivory; and black bear and wolf rugs and hides unlawfully imported from Canada.

Mahogany and ramin seizures in 2005-2006: During 2005-2006, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized two shipments of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*) wood entering the United States. One of these shipments was imported from Peru in 2005 and contained 700 kilograms of sawn wood; the other shipment was Honduran origin mahogany imported from Belgium in 2006 and contained 1,826 cubic meters of plywood.

Also during 2005-2006, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized three shipments of ramin (*Gonystylus* spp.) wood products entering the United States. One of these shipments was Malaysian origin ramin imported from China in 2005 and contained one cubic meter of wood products; one was imported from Indonesia in 2006 and contained 68 cubic meters of wood products; and one was Malaysian origin ramin imported from China in 2006 and contained one cubic meter of wood products.

Hoodia seizures in 2005-2006: During 2005-2006, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized five shipments of hoodia (*Hoodia* spp.) entering the United States. Two of these shipments were imported from China in 2005 and contained 1,250 kilograms of extract; one was imported from South Africa in 2005 and contained one kilogram of stems; one was imported from France in 2006 and contained 25 kilograms of extract; and one was South African origin hoodia imported from the United Kingdom in 2006 and contained 10,800 kilograms of powder.

Criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations: USFWS investigations of CITES violations resulted in criminal prosecutions for illegal trafficking in CITES-listed species. Key cases from 2005 and 2006 are summarized below:

- A Miami-based gourmet company was sentenced to pay a $1 million criminal fine and serve five years probation for wildlife and smuggling violations; the firm was also ordered to forfeit some $800,000 worth of caviar to the government in addition to the $258,000 of roe that had already been seized by USFWS inspectors. The company, one of the largest U.S. importers of sturgeon caviar, admitted that it purchased approximately 5.9 tons of smuggled caviar from five separate smuggling rings. The USFWS investigation documented criminal activity dating back as far as late 1999 and continuing through the opening years of this decade.

- The president of three New York caviar companies, who pleaded guilty in 2004 to charges that included caviar smuggling, was sentenced to serve 71 months in Federal prison. USFWS officers had discovered smuggled beluga hidden inside an ocean container shipment of frozen fish that entered the country at Newark, New Jersey. Other charges in the case included securities, mail and wire fraud.

- USFWS investigators teamed with agents from the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to uncover large-scale smuggling and unlawful interstate commerce in teeth from the Appendix-I sperm whale. Plea agreements with three subjects (including the owner of a scrimshaw business in Hawaii) netted $270,000 in fines and the forfeiture of assets valued at $540,000.

- A three-year undercover USFWS investigation culminated in the arrest of a Japanese butterfly dealer when he arrived in Los Angeles, California. The defendant sold nearly $30,000 worth of CITES-listed butterflies during the investigation and offered another $300,000 worth to undercover agents. Species involved in the transactions, which were conducted via the Internet, included endangered Queen Alexandra's birdwing butterflies.

- An investigation that began when a USFWS inspector in Miami, Florida, was tipped off about an undeclared container of coral arriving from Haiti revealed that a Florida company had been illegally importing large quantities of dried coral from that country over a three-year period. The company and its president pleaded guilty to Federal charges; the company paid $25,000 in restitution while the president was fined $25,000. They were also held liable for more than $10,000 in storage costs.

- A Miami man was sentenced to serve 24 months in Federal prison for conspiring to smuggle CITES-listed wildlife into the United States from southeast Asia. The defendant and a co-conspirator from Singapore smuggled more than 500 animals (reptiles and primates) with a market value of between $200,000 and $400,000. The co-conspirator received a 37-month sentence in December 2003.

- Two other individuals involved in smuggling protected reptiles from southeast Asia pleaded guilty to felony violations. One was fined $1,000 and ordered to spend three years on probation, while the other must pay a $2,500 fine.

- The former treasurer of the Orange County, California, chapter of the California Turtle and Tortoise Society was sentenced to one year probation and fined $5,000 for smuggling 10 CITES Appendix-II Indian star tortoises into the United States. The tortoises were shipped from Singapore in a mail package labelled as containing toy cars.

- A San Francisco, California, man who smuggled 36 rare tortoises into the United States via express mail was sentenced to serve five months in Federal prison followed by five months home detention. CITES species involved included Appendix-I Madagascar radiated tortoises and Appendix-II Indian star tortoises and Burmese star tortoises.

- A Virginia man who pleaded guilty to illegally importing and possessing CITES-listed tortoises, including Appendix-I Madagascar radiated tortoises and Appendix-II Indian star tortoises, was fined $15,000 and was placed on probation for four years. The USFWS investigation showed that the man, who was offering the reptiles for sale via the Internet, brought in three shipments of tortoises from Singapore in violation of CITES.

- A reptile smuggler based in Washington State was sent to prison for two years for the unlawful importation of more than 230 reptiles from Thailand; the shipments, valued at over $30,000, entered the United States in falsely labeled express mail packages.

- A couple in southern California pleaded guilty to Federal felony charges in connection with their roles in a scheme that smuggled hundreds of CITES-listed parrots from Mexico, Central America, and South America into the United States. The pair, whose smuggling activities date back to the late 1990s, orchestrated more than 30 trips across the U.S. border to buy and smuggle parrots.

- Three other Californians were ordered to spend five years on probation and pay a total of $4,750 in restitution for selling Amazon parrots illegally imported from Mexico.

- A smuggler who was caught with 95 live conures in his vehicle after crossing the U.S.-Mexico border pleaded guilty to smuggling charges and was sentenced to six months in prison followed by three years probation.

- A California man who was arrested for smuggling live eggs of the Appendix-II eagle owl from Austria into the United States on two occasions in the spring of 2005 pleaded guilty to smuggling and false statement charges. The eggs had been partially painted to resemble Easter eggs and were transported in an Easter basket with plastic grass and hand warmers for temporary incubation.

- A master falconer in New York was found guilty of wildlife violations and making false statements in connection with the unlawful importation of two CITES Appendix-II black sparrow hawks. False documents had represented the birds as personally owned pets being imported by another individual, concealing their purchase overseas and real ownership. The man was sent to prison for four months and fined $1,000.

- A Wisconsin man who pleaded guilty to conspiracy in connection with the smuggling of mounted CITES-listed hawks and parrots from the United Kingdom was fined $2,500 and placed on two years probation. The mounts were sent through the mail without CITES permits and were falsely declared as non-wildlife items.

- A U.S. citizen who operates a carving business in Bali, Indonesia, was successfully prosecuted for smuggling protected species, including elephant ivory; bear, sperm whale, and clouded leopard teeth; and casque material from endangered helmeted hornbills. The man forfeited 11,000 wildlife items valued at over $250,000 and was sentenced to spend one year in prison and pay more than $26,500 in fines and restitution.

- Two Alaska storeowners who pleaded guilty to Federal wildlife charges were fined $10,100 for unlawfully importing Brazilian tribal handicrafts made from the skins, feathers, teeth and bones of CITES-listed big cats (including jaguars and margays), psittacine birds, crocodilians, snakes, and fish. They will also spend six months in home confinement and three years on probation and forfeit $10,000 worth of tribal handicrafts.

- The owners of a Chicago, Illinois, art gallery who were indicted for smuggling and selling more than $250,000 in elephant ivory carvings and other items made from protected species pleaded guilty to Federal felony charges.

- Two Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, women who operated a business and website selling African artifacts and decorative items were indicted by a Federal grand jury for smuggling, possessing, and selling products made from endangered and threatened species. Both entered plea agreements.

- Two brothers involved in smuggling the parts of such CITES-protected species as orangutans, helmeted hornbills, clouded leopards, tigers, and sun bears from Malaysia to the United States were fined $5,000 for wildlife violations. Both men will also spend six months in home confinement and either three or two years on probation.

- A man who dubbed himself "Mike the smuggler" was sent to Federal prison for six months after pleading guilty to smuggling two black rhino horns and a leopard skin from Mozambique. The USFWS investigation of this individual began when agents saw an Internet advertisement that he placed offering an aye-aye skull for sale for $12,000.

- A 17-month undercover investigation by USFWS special agents and investigators with the Canadian Wildlife Service resulted in the arrest and arraignment of an Ontario man on multiple felony charges

related to illegal international Internet-based trafficking in the parts of CITES-protected wildlife. Charges were also filed in Canada.

- A St. Petersburg, Florida, man pleaded guilty to Federal charges for possessing 48 Appendix-I cycads that he knew had been imported in violation of CITES. Species involved included *Encephalartos schmitzii* and *Chigua restrepoi*.

- A California man was indicted on multiple felony charges related to the unlawful importation of CITES-listed cycads. The indictment alleges that the defendant arranged to buy 51 protected plants from a co-conspirator for approximately $26,000; the permit that accompanied the shipment from Zimbabwe did not authorize export of any of the species actually in the shipment. The USFWS investigation also showed that the man attempted to illegally import and sell some 800 cycad seeds.

- An Arizona man was charged with Federal violations after being linked to the smuggling of CITES Appendix-I lady slipper orchids from Indonesia. The plants were intercepted in San Francisco, California, before they could be delivered by mail to the man's residence in Arizona. He pleaded guilty and was sentenced to spend two years on probation and pay $10,000 in fines and restitution.

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 CoP14: The 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP14) was held 3-15 June 2007, in The Hague, Netherlands. On 20 January 2006, the USFWS published a notice in the *Federal Register*, as part of the process designed to allow non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the public to participate in the preparations of the U.S. Government for CoP14. This notice solicited recommendations from NGOs and the public on possible species proposals, resolutions, and other issues for the U.S. Government to consider submitting for the agenda at CoP14. On 7 November 2006, the USFWS published another notice describing the species proposals, resolutions, and other issues that the U.S. Government was at that time considering submitting for CoP14; providing the public with an opportunity to comment on these potential submissions; and announcing a public meeting, which was held on 11 December 2006, to discuss the potential submissions. This notice also provided information on the process for attendance of observers at CoP14.

[*Note: The remainder of the U.S. activities involving the public in preparation for CoP14 occurred after the reporting period.* On 4 January 2007, the United States submitted to the Secretariat its species proposals, resolutions, and other issues for inclusion in the agenda at CoP14, and subsequently posted these U.S. submissions on its website. On 21 February 2007, the USFWS published another notice in the *Federal Register* announcing the provisional agenda for CoP14; soliciting comments from the NGOS and the public about what negotiating positions the United States should consider taking on species proposals, resolutions, and other issues submitted by other Parties for consideration at CoP14; and announcing another public meeting, which was held on 9 April 2007, to receive public input on the U.S. negotiating positions regarding CoP14 issues. On 1 June 2007, the USFWS published a final notice announcing the tentative negotiating positions the United States is taking on species proposals, resolutions, and other issues submitted by other Parties for CoP14.]

STANDING COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

53rd meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent a 7-person delegation to the 53rd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC53), which was held 27 June – 1 July 2005, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, one from the Department of State, one from NMFS, one U.S. Congressional representative, and one representative of the U.S. States. On behalf of the North American Region, the United States prepared a document on illegal trade in tigers for consideration at SC53.

54th meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent an 11-person delegation to the 54th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC54), which was held 2-6 October 2006, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, three from the Department of State, one from NMFS, one from the office of the U.S. Trade Representative, one representative of the U.S. States, and two from the Economic and Scientific Affairs Section of the

U.S. Mission in Geneva. The United States submitted a document on illegal trade in tigers for consideration at SC54.

Illegal trade in tigers: For SC53 and SC54, the United States submitted discussion documents related to the illegal trade in tigers. The document for SC53 was submitted on behalf of the North American Region while the document for SC54 was a U.S. document. Both documents recognized the Standing Committee's historic leadership role in calling on Parties to strengthen their efforts to combat poaching and illegal trade in tigers. In light of the continuing decline in tiger populations and the apparent resurgence of trade in tiger parts in some regions of the world, the documents called on the Standing Committee to re-evaluate the situation and develop recommendations for immediate action. In the lead-up to SC54, the USFWS also prepared a fact sheet highlighting U.S. conservation efforts for tigers; the fact sheet can be viewed at http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/tiger.pdf.

CITES implementation clearing house: In accordance with Decision 12.23, the Standing Committee at its 49th meeting (SC49) established a joint working group comprising representatives of the Standing, Plants, and Animals Committees and the CITES Secretariat. The United States was named Chair of the working group. Terms of reference required the group to develop the following products: a list of outstanding implementation issues within CITES, functional categories of these issues, and a clearing-house process to refer these issues to the appropriate CITES body. The group submitted an interim report for SC50 transmitting these products and proposing that the Standing Committee send a revised or modified form of the group's products to CoP13 for further consideration and decision. In his Report to CoP13, the Standing Committee Chair reported on the progress made by the working group and that the Standing Committee agreed to the clearing-house process proposed by the working group. This process includes a small group of technical experts working with the Standing Committee Chair that refer outstanding implementation issues to the appropriate CITES body. The Parties adopted this process at CoP13.

During 2005-2006, Ms. Andrea Gaski, of the United States (USFWS), served as one of the two members of the clearing house (along with Dr. Colman O' Criodain of Ireland). At CoP13, the Parties adopted Decision 13.78 directing the Standing Committee through its clearing house to decide on the appropriate way to continue consideration of the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation in the context of CITES. At SC53, the Standing Committee instructed its clearing house to submit recommendations to SC54 to fulfill Decision 13.78. The United States provided regular and detailed input to Dr. O' Criodain on the draft document prepared by the clearing house ("Relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation") for consideration at SC54.

"MIKE": During 2005-2006, the United States was engaged in a number of ways in the MIKE (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants) Program, which was first established at CoP10 through Resolution Conf. 10.10. The United States is a member of the MIKE Subgroup of the Standing Committee. During the reporting period, the United States provided core funding to MIKE and also provided significant funding to a number of MIKE-related projects, in Africa through the African Elephant Conservation Act and in Asia through the Asian Elephant Conservation Act.

Export quotas: At CoP12 (November 2002), the Parties adopted Decision 12.72 tasking the Standing Committee with considering improving the management of annual CITES export quotas. In response, the Standing Committee established an Export Quota Working Group tasked with developing guidelines for Parties to establish, implement, monitor, and report voluntary national export quotas for CITES-listed species. At CoP13, the Parties agreed to extend the period of validity of Decision 12.72 until CoP14 in 2007, and also adopted Decision 13.66 tasking the Standing Committee Export Quota

Working Group with completing the quota guidelines and presenting them for consideration at CoP14 in 2007. The United States continued to serve as an active member of this working group leading up to CoP14.

Management of queen conch: During the reporting period, the United States continued to work toward fulfilling the recommendation of the Standing Committee that the Wider Caribbean Region give consideration to development of a regional management regime. The Western Central Atlantic Fishery Commission (WECAFC) of the Food and Agriculture Agency (FAO) convened an intersessional working group to study how strengthened regional management cooperation could be achieved. At WECAFC's 12th Session (Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago, 25–28 October 2005), the Commission approved the draft statutes for WECAFC, and agreed to submit the revised statutes to the next session of the FAO Council. It also took steps to strengthen the ad hoc working groups, including its ad hoc working group on queen conch (*Strombus gigas*). FAO developed a "Manual for the Monitoring and Management of Queen Conch" and, with the United Nations Environment Programme Caribbean Environment Programme (UNEP-CEP), Secretariat to the Protocol for Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW), and the United States' Caribbean Fishery Management Council (CFMC), hosted a Regional Workshop on the Monitoring and Management of Queen Conch in Kingston, Jamaica, 1-5 May 2006. The workshop addressed assessment of queen conch resources; management tools appropriate for queen conch fisheries, monitoring, and control; and formulation of effective management plans. It built on the recommendations of the CITES Review of Significant Trade.

In addition to FAO's work on this species, the United States, with the Gulf and Caribbean Fisheries Institute (GCFI), the Caribbean Fishery Management Council and the Darden Foundation, provided funding for and convened a workshop in November 2005 in San Andres, Colombia, with the goal of building a scientific consensus on regional queen conch management strategies, following GCFI's annual meeting. Also, in December 2005, the United States participated in and provided funding, through the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, for a technical working group of the CITES Animals Committee on the implementation

Introduction from the sea: At CoP13, the Parties adopted Decision 13.18, which directed the Standing Committee to convene a workshop on introduction from the sea to consider implementation and technical issues. The United States provided funding for the workshop, which was held during November-December 2005, and sent a representative from the Management Authority to participate as part of the North American delegation.

The United States continues to work toward improved understanding and implementation of the introduction from the sea provision. The United States chaired the electronic working group established at SC54 to refine the definition of the "marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State" contained in the 2005 workshop report. [*Note:* The definition put forward by the majority of the SC54 working group was adopted by consensus at CoP14.]

Working Group on Personal and Household Effects: During the reporting period, the United States served as a member of the Standing Committee's Working Group on Personal and Household Effects.

CITES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

United States continues as North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee: At CoP13 in October 2004, the Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, then Chief of the

U.S. Scientific Authority, as the Regional Representative on the Plants Committee for the intersessional period between CoP13 and CoP14. Mr. Gabel served in this role throughout the reporting period.

United States serving as Alternate North American Regional Representative on the Animals Committee: At CoP13 in October 2004, the Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, then Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, as the Alternate Regional Representative on the Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP13 and CoP14. Mr. Gabel served in this role throughout the reporting period.

15th meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a 2-person delegation from the USFWS to the 15th meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC15), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 17-21 May 2005. The U.S. delegation included one representative from the U.S. Scientific Authority and one representative from the U.S. Management Authority. The United States attended the meeting as an observer Party. The United States is currently the North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee, and Robert Gabel from the USFWS represented North America at the meeting. In preparation for the meeting, the United States prepared a document on annotations of plants listed in Appendices II and III. The United States also contributed to the preparation of a document on annotations for medicinal plants included in Appendix II. The U.S. delegation participated in several Working Groups at the meeting and also attended a meeting of the Nomenclature Committee.

21st meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent a 7-person delegation to the 21st meeting of the CITES Animals Committee (AC21), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 20-25 May 2005. The interagency U.S. delegation included four representatives from the USFWS, two from NMFS, and one U.S. Congressional representative. Representatives of the U.S. States participated as observers. The United States submitted a document on production systems to the Chairs of the Plants and Animals Committees and chaired a working group on the subject in the PC15/AC21 joint session. Results were reported to the Animals Committee. The United States also submitted a document on the review of the listing of all Felidae, and proceeded with the concurrence of the Chairman of the Animals Committee to facilitate the review agreed upon at CoP13, when the United States withdrew its bobcat delisting proposal. The United States participated in six working groups at AC21: a working group on periodic review of animal species included in CITES Appendices (including the aforementioned review of Felidae), and a working group on review of significant trade in selected Appendix-II species, for follow-up on previous recommendations and issuance of recommendations on recently selected species. The United States also participated in working groups on transport of live animals, shark management and conservation, and sea cucumbers, and also attended a meeting of the Nomenclature Committee.

16th meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a five-person delegation to the 16th meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC16), which was held in Lima, Peru, 3-8 July 2006. Three delegates were from the USFWS, one was from APHIS, and one was a U.S. Congressional staff member. The United States prepared and submitted three documents for the meeting: one on production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species; one on annotations of plant species listed in Appendices II and III (which included proposed draft amendments to Resolutions Conf. 9.25 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP13)); and an information document summarizing information on U.S. trade in bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*). The U.S. delegation was active on numerous issues and participated in working groups at PC16 on: Review of Significant Trade in Appendix-II plants;

Review of the Appendices; the Mahogany Working Group; medicinal plant annotations; and orchid annotations.

22nd meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent an 8-person delegation to the 22nd meeting of the CITES Animals Committee (AC22), which was held in Lima, Peru, 7-13 July 2006. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, three from NMFS, a U.S. Congressional staff member, and a representative of the U.S. States. Additional representatives of the States participated as observers. The United States submitted three documents for the meeting: one on production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species, one on annotations of animal species listed in Appendix III (which included proposed draft amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.25 (Rev.)), and an information document summarizing information received from range countries on the status and management of *Lynx* species. The United States also participated in the meeting of the Nomenclature Committee, and was a member of seven working groups at AC22 pertaining to: Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species; periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices; transport of live specimens; fossil corals; application of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity to CITES non-detriment findings; conservation and management of sharks; and sea cucumbers.

Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species: At PC14 and AC20, the United States submitted Documents PC14 Inf. 17 and AC20 Inf. 18 respectively, each containing a list of plant and animal production systems and possible source codes. Based on the review of this U.S. document and the IUCN/SSC draft report, an AC20 Production Systems Working Group recommended, and the Animals Committee agreed, that a joint working group of the Animals and Plants Committees be formed to examine the documents that had been developed thus far on production systems, identify and define different production systems for animals and plants, and determine the appropriate source codes for each production system. To help move this issue forward, the United States submitted Document CoP13 Doc. 49 at CoP13, which included a draft decision adopted by Parties as Decision 13.68, tasking the Animals and Plants Committees with establishing the joint working group and setting forth Terms of Reference for the working group. At the PC15 and AC21 joint meeting, the United States submitted a document on production systems of CITES-listed species and chaired a working group charged with reviewing the document and reaching a consensus on the definitions of production system codes. At the PC16 and AC22 joint meeting, the United States submitted Documents PC16 Doc. 12.1 and AC22 Doc. 12.1, respectively, which presented the recommendations developed by an intersessional working group on production systems established at the joint meeting of PC15 and AC21. The working group, chaired by the United States, was charged with identifying various production systems, relating the production systems to current CITES source codes, developing clear definitions for the source codes, and making recommendations for creating or eliminating source codes, as needed. This work was based on a synthesis of several earlier documents produced for the Animals Committee. Although the working group reported progress in some areas, there were still several areas in which the group had not reached consensus, including: source codes for artificially propagated plants and animals bred in captivity; ranched specimens; and the inclusion of plants in the application of source code "F." The F code currently applies to animals that are produced in captivity (from captive parents), but that do not meet all of the criteria for "bred in captivity" established in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.), and Canada and the United States advocated the use of this code for plants. A working group chaired by the United States was established during the joint meeting of AC22 and PC16 to resolve the remaining differences, but was unable to do so. The United States agreed to continue to work with interested Parties and NGO representatives to try to resolve the outstanding areas of disagreement, since some basis for potential consensus was developed in the working group.

The United States consulted the committees before the deadline for submission of documents for CoP14 and prepared a document for CoP14 on behalf of the Animals and Plants Committees proposing a decision that the committees review CITES trade data for species traded under source code "R" and, based on this review, propose a definition of ranching and the use of source code "R" for CITES purposes. [*Note:* This decision was ultimately adopted at CoP14.]

Synergy between CITES and CBP – Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity: The United States participated in a working group during the PC15 and AC21 joint meeting in which it was agreed to conduct case studies to evaluate the applicability of the Addis Ababa Principles when making non-detriment findings for trade in CITES-listed species. The results of these case studies were presented at the PC16 and AC22 joint meeting. The United States contributed to this evaluation with two case studies, one for black coral (Antipatharia spp.) and one for American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*). The case studies helped the working group to come to the conclusion that the Addis Ababa Principles were not appropriate to the making of CITES non-detriment findings, but the committees ultimately agreed that Parties could use them as a voluntary tool for making non-detriment findings.

Transport Working Group: The United States remains active on the Animals Committee Transport Working Group and intends to continue in this capacity for the foreseeable future. At AC22 in July 2006, the United States participated in meetings of the Working Group, which proposed a number of changes to CITES Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Transport of live animals) to make it applicable to both animals and plants and also proposed several CITES decisions aimed at providing CITES guidelines for methods of animal transport other than by air. The Animals Committee adopted these proposals of the Working Group and they were subsequently submitted for consideration of the Parties at CoP14. The United States, in the course of assisting in the development of refined International Air Transport Association (IATA) air transport guidelines, has been compiling information on non-air transport methods that we plan to make available to the Parties through the Transport Working Group.

During 2005 and 2006, the United States helped determine guidelines for seahorse transport with other members of the Live Animals and Perishables Board (LAPB). Additionally the United States, with contributions from individuals with expertise in the particular species, coordinated, developed, and submitted proposals to the IATA Live Animals Board for the humane transport of sea turtles and koalas. Both proposals were accepted and published in the 33rd edition of the Live Animal Regulations. The United States has plans for additional submissions to update transport methods for species which are either not listed in the IATA Live Animal Regulations or require updating.

Annotations of species listed in Appendices II and III: At PC15, the United States was chosen to chair a working group to review and propose amendments to appropriate CITES resolutions to ensure consistent interpretation of unannotated listings in Appendix II and III. The working group suggested that Resolutions Conf. 9.25 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP13) should be amended for this purpose. The working group was asked to continue its work during the period between PC15 and PC16. Drafts of both resolutions were submitted for consideration during the joint meeting of AC22 and PC16, since it was determined that the amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.25 (Rev.) would also apply to listings of animal species in Appendix III. With some minor modifications, the Animals and Plants Committees endorsed the amendments proposed by the working group, and the United States agreed to submit a document containing the draft amendments to CoP14 on behalf of the committees. [*Note:* the draft amendments were subsequently adopted at CoP14.]

Other working groups: In the PC15 and AC21 joint meeting, the United States, as the alternate North American regional representative for the Animals Committee, participated in the review of the scientific committees, to determine if the current structure and terms of reference continue to serve the needs of the Convention for scientific and technical support. The United States also participated intersessionally on a working group reviewing the conditions under which scientific committee members and alternate members perform their duties. In the PC16 and AC22 joint meeting, the United States continued to participate in working groups on the review of scientific committees and transport of live specimens.

Marine issues: The United States funded the intersessional workshop of the Shark Working Group of the Animals Committee, which considered items of the Working Group mandated by CITES Resolution Conf. 12.6 (on conservation and management of sharks) and CITES decisions concerning sharks. At this workshop, the Working Group prepared documents for consideration at AC22. In addition, the United States funded the preparation of the document "Summary of FAO and CITES workshops on sea cucumbers: major findings and recommendations," used for discussions of this topic at AC22.

In December 2005, the United States participated in and provided funding, through the Caribbean Fishery Management Council, for a technical working group of the Animals Committee on the implementation by 16 range countries of queen conch (*Strombus gigas*) of recommendations under the auspices of the Review of Significant Trade for this species.

OTHER CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES

U.S. submits its 2004 and 2005 CITES annual reports: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare annual reports on its trade in CITES-listed species. On 28 October 2005, the USFWS submitted, directly to the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2004. The file (138,782 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2004. On 26 October 2005, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2005. The file (151,123 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2005. The data in these data files represent actual trade and not just numbers of CITES permits issued.

U.S. Submits a special single year report for 2004: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare periodic reports on its implementation of CITES and shall transmit to the Secretariat, in addition to an annual report, a biennial report on legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of CITES. CITES Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) recommended that all Parties submit biennial reports for the same two-year periods beginning with the period 2003-2004. The United States had been submitting its biennial reports in an *even year – odd year* cycle and had already submitted a biennial report for 2002-2003. In order to comply with the recommendation in Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) that Parties submit in an *odd year – even year* cycle beginning with 2003-2004, on 5 January 2006, the USFWS submitted to the CITES Secretariat a special single year report covering just the year 2004. This report summarized some of the major legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken by the United States during 2004 in its implementation of CITES. The United States will change its submission schedule to an *odd year – even year* cycle beginning with its 2005-2006 biennial report.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) also 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. This is the first time that the Parties have adopted a format for submission of biennial reports. Therefore, the United States submitted its 2004 special single year report in accordance with this new format. The USFWS has posted this report on its CITES website at http://www.fws.gov/international/cites/cites.html.

U.S. input into WCMC species database: In an effort to support the continued robustness and accuracy of the WCMC CITES-listed species database, the U.S. Scientific Authority regularly submits information to WCMC regarding entries for species native to the United States and its Territories, as well as non-natives, including updated distribution, status, and synonymy.

D4. Communication, information management and exchange

U.S. CITES website: The USFWS has continued to update and improve its CITES website (at http://www.fws.gov/international). Among other items, the site contains the CITES treaty, CITES Fact Sheets, lists of CITES Party countries and non-Parties, a directory of Management and Scientific Authorities in Party countries and of equivalent authorities in non-Parties, copies of recent U.S. CITES biennial reports, copies of recent CITES Updates, a current CoP page, and links to the CITES Secretariat's website. It also contains a web page on CITES timber, one on queen conch, one on American ginseng, and one on trade in Appendix-III species. The USFWS has also continued to update and improve its U.S. permits website (at http://www.fws.gov/permits), which includes information on permits issued under CITES and other U.S. domestic conservation laws. The USFWS is currently developing a web page addressing domestic ivory trade.

USFWS promotes sustainable harvest of American ginseng: The USFWS worked collaboratively with the industry trade group American Herbal Products Association (AHPA), State ginseng coordinators, and two NGOs to design and develop a good stewardship harvest brochure for wild American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*). Nineteen State-specific brochures, one for each State approved by the USFWS for the export of wild American ginseng, were developed. The brochures provide information on the life history of wild American ginseng, stewardship practices to promote sustainable harvest, current State and Federal regulations that apply to harvesters and buyers of wild American ginseng, and contact information for each State regulatory office. All 19 brochures are posted on AHPA's website and are available for download. Information of the brochure and a link to AHPA's website is posted on the USFWS website (http://www.fws.gov/international/).

American ginseng meetings: From 31 January to 2 February 2006, the USFWS hosted a meeting with U.S. State ginseng program coordinators, other Federal agencies, ginseng researchers, industry representatives, and the general public. The first day of the meeting was open to the public and included a half-day symposium on recent research findings on American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) by Federal and academic researchers, and presentations by industry representatives. Following the presentations, the USFWS held a public meeting to hear from people involved in American ginseng harvest and trade, and to obtain current information on the status and conservation of American ginseng. The subsequent day-and-a-half was a closed meeting with State and Federal agency personnel. Issues discussed and the results of the meeting as well as the presentations from the symposium are posted on the USFWS website (http://www.fws.gov/international/).

The USFWS held three additional public meetings in three distinct geographical areas within the natural range of American ginseng. The purpose of the meetings was to discuss the U.S. obligations

under CITES and the U.S. Federal regulatory framework for the export of American ginseng, and to obtain any new information on the biological and trade status of the species. Over 200 people, primarily representing ginseng buyers, exporters, growers, and harvesters, from 15 States attended the public meetings. In addition, representatives of a medicinal plant trade association, other State and Federal agencies, and media representatives attended some of the meetings.

Information derived from the 2006 ginseng meetings with State and Federal agency personnel, and from the public meetings, contributed to the development of the U.S. CITES findings required for exports of American ginseng and for guiding future actions to ensure that exports are derived from sustainable harvest programs.

USFWS increases accessibility and understanding of CITES: The USFWS produced a ginseng coloring page as Medicinal Plant Working Group (MPWG) outreach material to teach children about conservation, medicinal plants, and CITES. The USFWS also contributed to published information to clarify *Hoodia* implementation after it was listed in CITES Appendix II. Through the MPWG, the USFWS utilizes a national network of three listserves to disseminate information about CITES issues (including listings and meetings). In 2005 and 2006, the USFWS participated in professional and regional meetings, in the United States and abroad, speaking about CITES and plant and animal regulatory issues.

U.S. promotes sustainable use and conservation of internationally traded medicinal plants native to the United States: The U.S. Scientific Authority continues to chair the Medicinal Plant Working Group (MPWG), part of the Plant Conservation Alliance, an interagency, federal/non-federal collaboration that also serves as the IUCN-North American Plant Specialist Group. The MPWG fosters communication among diverse stakeholders, examining issues particular to the sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants, providing information on medicinal plant regulations in the United States, and promoting non-regulatory approaches to sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants. The MPWG has several committees focusing on various sectors of the medicinal plant user spectrum, including Industry Committee and Native American Elder's Circle. The MPWG Chair is also working with industry, range countries, and the *Hoodia* Working Group to create outreach material on *Hoodia* spp.

U.S. Department of State launches global Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT): The U.S. Department of State, along with seven international conservation organizations, launched the Coalition Against Wildlife Trafficking (CAWT). The Coalition's goals are to reduce consumer demand by raising government and public awareness of the impacts of wildlife trafficking (the illegal trade of wildlife and wildlife products) on endangered species, biodiversity, human health, and sustainable livelihoods, and to stop illegal exports by improving wildlife enforcement.

D5. Permitting and registration procedures

CITES permit applications handled during 2005 and 2006: The USFWS Division of Management Authority (the U.S. Management Authority) is responsible for the review and arbitration of all permit applications involved in the international movement of CITES-listed species. Through the Division of Management Authority's Branch of Permits, along with some permitting responsibilities delegated to USFWS Law Enforcement regional offices and ports, over 10,450 CITES applications were received during 2005. Likewise, in 2006, approximately 13,600 CITES applications were received. In each year, over 25,000 telephone calls, e-mails, and faxes relating to CITES permitting questions were handled. Along with work involving other permitting processes under additional domestic legislation,

such as the U.S. Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Division of Management Authority is actively involved in disseminating outreach materials, producing fact sheets, holding public meetings, and fine tuning the permitting process within the United States.

The Division of Management Authority, in an effort to provide better customer service, continues to develop different applications specifically designed to address particular import/export activities. By establishing different applications, the questions that are presented to the applicant apply specifically to the activity for which they are requesting authorization. The responses to these questions allow the Division of Management Authority and the Division of Scientific Authority (the U.S. Scientific Authority) to make the required findings under the U.S. regulations that implement CITES. The establishment of these application types ensures that the proper questions are being answered by the applicant and minimizes the need to go back to the applicant for additional information during the review process carried out by the Division of Management Authority.

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

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

One type of coordination is the work the Division of Management Authority carried out during 2005-2006, and continues to carry out, with the Japanese Management Authority. Under current Japanese regulations, a domestic import permit must be issued for all imports of wildlife, and confirmation that a valid CITES export permit was issued must be made prior to issuing the domestic import permit. In an effort to assist the Japanese, the Division of Management Authority provides their Management Authority with a monthly report of all wildlife export permits and certificates that the United States issued during that month.

State coordination: One aspect of the permitting process is to determine legal acquisition of specimens. As part of its review, the Division of Management Authority consults with U.S. State wildlife management agencies regarding legal take of CITES-listed species. Such consultation also ensures that any permit issued will not conflict with State programs. For American alligator (*Alligator mississipiensis*), for example, the Division of Management Authority ensures that permit conditions on

U.S. Federal permits comply with State regulations for take, introduction, transportation, and management. The Division of Management Authority regularly consults with State agencies regarding the transport of any injurious species prior to the issuance of any injurious wildlife permit. The Division of Management Authority's coordination with the States also extends to providing State wildlife agencies copies of permits that the Division of Management Authority has issued to their residents. This allows the State wildlife agencies to better understand what wildlife trade is occurring within their States. Both the Division of Management Authority and the State wildlife agencies benefit from the maintenance of strong communication channels.

D6. Capacity building

United States participates in Masters Course module on plant trade: During the week of 21-25 November 2005, the Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority participated as an instructor in the module on "Scientific Aspects of the Conservation and Management of Plant Species Threatened by Trade" for the Fifth Master's Course on "Management, Access, Conservation and Trade of Species: The International Framework," conducted at the International University of Andalucía in Baeza, Spain. Information was presented on how the United States manages the high-volume trade of a medicinal plant – American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) – working with U.S. State governments, industry, and other stakeholders. A presentation was also given on projects of the U.S. Scientific Authority relative to native U.S. plants in trade.

Timber tree species workshop: In February 2005, a representative of the USFWS attended a workshop in Managua, Nicaragua, to develop strategies for the sustainable use and management of timber tree species subject to international trade. This workshop, which was organized by UNEP-WCMC, focused on 42 timber tree species native to the Central American region (eight of which are listed in the CITES Appendices). Range countries represented at the meeting included Belize, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, and Panama.

USFWS participates in regional pollinator meetings: A representative of the USFWS attended the 2005 and 2006 Annual Meetings of the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign (NAPPC). NAPPC is a public/private collaboration that focuses on the status of pollinators and with whom the USFWS has a Memorandum of Understanding. The annual meetings are attended by 50-75 experts from the United States, Mexico, and Canada, and provide opportunities for regional and interagency interaction and information sharing on the status of CITES-listed and non-listed pollinators.

CAFTA-DR grants: The U.S. Management Authority worked with TRAFFIC North America in 2005 and 2006 to secure two grants to conduct capacity building and training in those countries that signed the Dominican Republic - Central America - United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR). The countries include Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is providing the funds through the United States Department of State. TRAFFIC North America, through its Mexico office, is the direct recipient of the awarded funds and is actively working to execute the two-phase project, which is currently scheduled to run through the end of 2007.

The first phase of the project consisted of a wildlife trade control gap analysis of the CAFTA-DR countries to understand the existing gaps and limitations to effective implementation of wildlife laws, including CITES. Efforts to bridge the identified gaps constitute the second phase of the project, which uses capacity building and training to improve implementation of wildlife laws at local, national, and regional levels. Training workshops will be held in each of the CAFTA-DR

countries and a regional workshop to foster cross-border collaboration and cooperation will be held for those authorities responsible for wildlife trade control in their respective countries. The goal of the workshops is to improve capacity, technical skills and knowledge of authorities, enforcement staff, and other key stakeholders in wildlife trade management.

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, the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000, and the Marine Turtles Conservation Act of 2004. These programs provide direct support to range countries through broad-based partnerships with national governments, NGOs, and other private entities for on-the-ground activities to conserve these species and their habitats.

The USFWS administers the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. During the period from January 2005 through December 2006, the USFWS granted a total of $14,776,149 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:	60 projects totalling $2,893,576 in funding
Asian elephant:	53 projects totalling $2,755,197 in funding
Rhinoceros & tiger:	84 projects totalling $3,172,078 in funding
Great ape:	87 projects totalling $5,243,594 in funding
Marine turtles:	32 projects totalling $711,704 in funding

IUCN Grouper and Wrasse Specialist Group: In February 2006, the United States provided funding to the IUCN Grouper and Wrasse Specialist Group to conduct assessments of populations of humphead wrasse (*Cheilinus undulates*) and to develop a model for development of no-detriment findings for sustainable management.

D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives

U.S. CITES Export Tagging Program: The United States cooperates with its States and Indian Tribes and Nations in utilizing a tagging program for the export of skins of the following Appendix-II species: bobcat (*Lynx rufus*); river otter (*Lontra canadensis*); Alaskan lynx (*Lynx canadensis*); Alaskan wolf (*Canis lupus*); Alaskan brown bear (*Ursus arctos*); and American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*). The USFWS initiated this program 30 years ago to streamline the USFWS's CITES permit issuance process for the export of skins of these species. The USFWS currently cooperates with 47 States and 11 Indian Tribes/Nations that have instituted approved harvest programs. The USFWS approves a State or Indian Tribe/Nation for inclusion in the CITES Export Tagging Program when it can make the two CITES findings based on that State's or Tribe/Nation's harvest program and enforcement regime. Each approved State or Tribe/Nation applies CITES tags, provided by the USFWS, to new skins of approved species taken in that State or Tribe/Nation and intended for export from the United States. The tags serve as evidence that the skins were legally taken and that their export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species.

During 2005, the USFWS issued over 750,000 tags, and during 2006, the USFWS issued over 813,000 tags. Between January and December 2005, the USFWS approved into the program one State

for exports of river otter and two Indian Tribes/Nations for exports of bobcat. Between January and December 2006, the USFWS approved into the program one State for exports of river otter, two Indian Tribes/Nations for exports of bobcat, and one State for exports of sport-hunted American alligators.

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

CITES Plant Rescue Center Program: The USFWS established the CITES Plant Rescue Center Program in 1978 in response to the need to care for live CITES-listed plants legally abandoned (voluntary action by the importer) or forfeited (specimens taken from the U.S. importer after completion of judicial procedures) to the U.S. Government due to non-compliance with the import/export requirements of the Convention. The USFWS administers this program in cooperation with APHIS, the U.S. inspection agency for live CITES-listed plants entering the United States. Currently, 79 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 2005, APHIS confiscated 193 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 3,335 plants and 2,312 seeds, plus an additional 20 kilograms of seeds. Of these 193 shipments, 187 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 1,818 orchids, 425 cacti, 305 euphorbias, 161 cycads, 44 carnivorous plants, and 36 plants of other species; plus 1,952 cycad seeds, 20 kilograms of cactus seeds, and 360 seeds of other plant species.

During 2006, APHIS confiscated 170 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 6,343 plants and 3,720 seeds. Of these 170 shipments, 168 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 3,624 orchids, 1,766 cacti, 540 euphorbias, 175 cycads, 151 aloes, and 7 tillandsias; plus 3,720 cycad seeds.

Free Trade Agreement: In 2005 and 2006, the USFWS continued its work in support of environmental assessments for Free Trade Agreements by providing information and analyses related to negotiations with Korea, Malaysia, Oman, Thailand, and the United Arab Emirates. The USFWS also continued to provide support for implementation of the Dominican Republic - Central America - United States Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR). In cooperation with TRAFFIC North America, the USFWS participated in the grant process with the Department of State and USAID, in which approximately $250,000 was awarded by those agencies for wildlife trade legislation gap analyses and capacity building and training program in the CAFTA-DR countries. In

addition, the USFWS provided support to negotiations in the Environment Working Group concerning the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement between Egypt and the United States.

Expanded cooperation between CITES and ITTO: In November 2005, the United States and other ITTO members approved a new biennial program of work that includes a significant expansion of ITTO's CITES-related activities. Building on ITTO's work over the period 2003-2005, this will include activities in key range States throughout the tropics and will focus on tropical timber species currently listed in CITES Appendix II. The United States has provided financial support to launch this effort. Specific activities will be identified in consultation with relevant authorities in each country and are expected to include: developing inventory plans, management, and silvicultural prescriptions, as required, for CITES-listed species; implementing pilot log-tracking schemes for CITES-listed species; training Customs and other relevant officials, including CITES Management and Scientific Authorities; developing guidelines and handbooks on management, monitoring, and control procedures (including making non-detriment findings) for CITES-listed timber species; developing and conducting regional workshops to facilitate exchange of experiences among range States; and developing and making recommendations through existing CITES (*e.g.*, MWG) and ITTO processes and bodies.

Medicinal Plant Working Group: In 2005 and 2006, Medicinal Plant Working Group (MPWG) continued to work with national and international organizations to promote sustainable use and conservation of U.S. native plants. The MPWG Chair worked cross-programmatically within USFWS to meet with members of the National Network of Forest Practitioners (NNFP), a non-governmental organization, with members ranging from rural harvesters to federal public land managers. In 2005, at its 8th annual meeting in Washington, D.C., to discuss issues of importance with government officials, both elected and civil, NNFP requested to meet with the USFWS for the first time. The 2005 meeting included 21 USFWS employees from various programs, and was expanded in 2006, to include other Bureaus in the Department of Interior.

In 2005 and 2006, the MPWG continued to collaborate with the U.S. Forest Service and Garden Club of America volunteers to inventory and monitor medicinal plants, such as black cohosh (*Cimicifuga racemosa*), a species native to the United States that is harvested primarily from the wild, with a global consumer base for its use in relieving symptoms of menopause. This work examined the effect of varying levels of harvest on the species to facilitate long-term management of this resource on public land.

In May 2006, the MPWG co-sponsored a regional workshop in the U.S. Pacific Northwest, to focus on issues related to medicinal plants and other non-timber forest products in that region. The Forum brought together a diverse group of 55 participants from twelve states, including rural communities, non-profits, small businesses, state and federal government agencies, and tribes. Three fact sheets are being produced from this workshop that focus on the role and impact of invasives, harvest fees, and traditional gathering in the United States on the conservation of medicinals.

North American regional cooperation on medicinal plants: In 2005, the USFWS, through the Medicinal Plant Working Group (MPWG), began collaborating with the IUCN-Medicinal Plant Specialist Group and the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign to produce medicinal plant fact sheets for practitioners and the general public, which provide information on sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants and their pollinators. Fact sheets produced thus far include goldenseal (*Hydrastis canadensis* – CITES Appendix II) and black cohosh (*Cimicifuga racemosa* – considered for Appendix-II listing in 1999).

Trilateral 2005-2006: One representative from the USFWS participated in the CITES Table at the 2005 annual meeting of the Canada/Mexico/U.S. Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management, and two USFWS representatives participated in the 2006 CITES Table. Priority issues for the CITES Table during 2005-2006 included the Mexican Amazon parrot captive breeding project, to examine captive breeding of Mexican Appendix-I parrots as part of a conservation strategy, an evaluation of the listing status of the Morelet's crocodile (*Crocodylus moreletii*) under the U.S. Endangered Species Act and CITES, and a project to assess the status of wild bobcat populations in Mexico as part of the periodic review of the genus *Lynx* in CITES.

USFWS works with national and international organizations to conserve cycads: The USFWS facilitated efforts leading to significant conservation progress for the endemic CITES Appendix-II cycad, *Cycas micronesica.* In June 2005, the USFWS Guam National Wildlife Refuge botanist contacted the U.S. Scientific Authority seeking assistance to prevent further devastation of cycad populations from an introduced insect (*Aulocapsis yasumatsui*) causing 100% mortality in infested areas. The devastation of cycads taking place on Guam had the potential to spread to other Micronesian islands that are home to the indigenous cycad *Cycas micronesica.* Refuge managers were introduced to several cycad specialists, including Dr. Michael Maunder (Director, Fairchild Tropical Garden), Dr. John Donaldson (Chair IUCN/SSC Cycad Specialist Group), and Wendy Strahm (IUCN/SSC Plants Officer). By August 2006, these discussions resulted in significant efforts to conserve this species, including: A $5000 grant from the U.S. non-profit organization Association of Zoological Horticulture, approved to establish back-up *ex-situ* collection in Miami, Florida; an $80,000 U.S. Navy grant to develop a population-based *ex-situ* collection of *Cycas micronesica* on Tinian; and the re-categorization of the species by the IUCN from "least concern" to "endangered."

Marine mammal workshops: In 2005 and 2006, the United States participated in and provided funding for workshops in response to marine mammal strandings in the Wider Caribbean under the auspices of SPAW for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment in the Wider Caribbean Region (Cartagena Convention). The United States also participated in the development of the Marine Mammal Action Plan of the SPAW Protocol.

In 2006, the United States participated in and provided funding for stranding response workshops under the auspices of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), and has been active in development of the Whale and Dolphin Action Plan of SPREP.