



U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2007-2008

PREPARED BY:

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

COMPLETED 26 OCTOBER 2009

U.S. CITES BIENNIAL REPORT FOR 2007-2008

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	2
REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2007-2008 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	13
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	13
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	17
D6. Capacity building	20
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	23
D8. Areas for future work	27
E. General feedback	28
ANNEX 1 – HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION B OF THIS REPORT	29
ANNEX 2 – HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION C OF THIS REPORT	30
ANNEX 3 – HIGHLIGHTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT	39
D1 and D2. Management Authority (MA) and Scientific Authority (SA)	39
D4. Communication, information management and exchange	45
D5. Permitting and registration procedures	46
D6. Capacity building	47
D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives	49

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 2007-2008.

Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14) recommends that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at CoP13 and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submits this 2007-2008 report in accordance with the recommended format.

The original regulations implementing CITES in the United States were issued on 22 February 1977 (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23). To date, there have been 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). From 1977 through 2006, the United States implemented new CITES resolutions in the United States by modification of internal policy and administration, promulgation of special rules, and revision of specific regulations. On 23 August 2007, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a final rule in the *Federal Register* substantially updating the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. These updates reflect measures adopted by the Parties at their regular meetings through CoP13.

During 2007-2008, the United States took many legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures in its implementation of the Convention. On the following pages, using the tabular *Biennial Report Format*, the United States reports on the major measures taken during this biennial period. Attached to the tabular report are three Annexes providing narrative highlights of some of the major measures that the United States took during 2007-2008, 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 2007-2008 IN ITS
IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES**

A. General information

Party	United States of America
Period covered in this report:	1 January 2007 to 31 December 2008
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) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (partly) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information/unknown <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If any CITES-relevant legislation has been planned, drafted or enacted, please provide the following details: <hr/> Title and date: _____ Status: _____ <hr/> Brief description of contents: _____	
3	Is enacted legislation available in one of the working languages of the Convention?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If yes, please attach a copy of the full legislative text or key legislative provisions that were gazetted.	legislation attached <input type="checkbox"/> provided previously <input type="checkbox"/> not available, will send later <input type="checkbox"/>
5	Which of the following issues are addressed by any stricter domestic measures adopted for CITES-listed species (in accordance with Article XIV of the Convention)?	Tick all applicable
	The conditions for:	The complete prohibition of:
	Yes No No information	Yes No No information
	Trade <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Taking <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Possession <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Transport <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
	Additional comments: Major stricter domestic measures in the United States that in many instances affect CITES-listed species include the Endangered Species Act, the Lacey Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, the 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Clarity of legal obligations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Control over CITES trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Consistency with existing policy on wildlife management and use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Coverage of law for all types of offences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Coverage of law for all types of penalties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Implementing regulations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Coherence within legislation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Other (please specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Please provide details if available:						
<p>The USFWS published revised CITES-implementing regulations (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23) on 23 August 2007. The new regulations, which became effective on 24 September 2007, incorporate provisions from resolutions adopted by the Parties through CoP13. The USFWS engaged in active outreach to the import/export community and other CITES Management Authorities to make them aware of the new regulations and alert them to new U.S. requirements. The updated regulations help the United States 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.</p> <p>In July 2008, the USFWS published additional revisions to the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. The revisions became effective on 15 September 2008. The new revisions incorporate provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14. The USFWS has also prepared a proposed rule to incorporate other relevant provisions adopted at CoP14.</p>						
7	If no review or assessment has taken place, is one planned for the next reporting period?			Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
Please provide details if available:						
8	Has there been any review of legislation on the following subjects in relation to implementation of the Convention? Tick all applicable					
	Subject	Yes	No	No information		
	Access to or ownership of natural resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Harvesting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	Transporting of live specimens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Handling and housing of live specimens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>			

	<p>Please provide details if available:</p> <p>During the process of working on the revision of the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, the USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation on each of the above subjects related to CITES implementation.</p>
9	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 1 for highlights of some of the major legislative and regulatory measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008.</i></p>

C. Compliance and enforcement measures

		Yes	No	No information
1	<p>Have any of the following compliance monitoring operations been undertaken?</p> <p>Review of reports and other information provided by traders and producers:</p> <p>Inspections of traders, producers, markets</p> <p>Border controls</p> <p>Other (specify): USFWS wildlife inspectors and special agents have also conducted random or intelligence-based intensified inspection "blitzes" to check cargo, mail shipments, passengers, and vehicles at the border. USFWS has also undertaken increased monitoring of key internet sites utilized by those engaged in wildlife trade.</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	<p>Have any administrative measures (e.g. fines, bans, suspensions) been imposed for CITES-related violations?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	<p>If Yes, please indicate how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details.</p> <p>Fines were assessed and collected for CITES-related violations on numerous occasions. However, the structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES-related violations under different statutes make it impossible to compile totals for the number and type of violations for which the United States took administrative measures.</p> <p><i>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 2007 and 2008.</i></p>			
4	<p>Have any significant seizures, confiscations and forfeitures of CITES specimens been made?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5	<p>If information available:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Significant seizures/confiscations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Total seizures/confiscations</p> <p>If possible, please specify per group of species or attach</p>		<p>Number</p> <p>In 2007, the USFWS seized 261,987 CITES specimens (including live wildlife, parts, and products) as well as</p>	

	<p>details.</p> <p>Please note that seizure totals at right address the number or weight of CITES specimens seized, not the number of shipments seized for CITES violations. Some specimens included in this total may have been seized for violations of U.S. wildlife laws and regulations other than CITES. Each year, the United States submits detailed data on seizures as part of its CITES Annual Report.</p>	<p>39,936 kilograms of “commodities” representing CITES species.</p> <p>In 2008, the USFWS seized 725,323 CITES specimens and 78,661 kilograms of CITES “commodities.”</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2 under the category “CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES,” for details on representative seizures.</i></p>
6	Have there been any criminal prosecutions of significant CITES-related violations?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
7	<p>If Yes, how many and for what types of violations? If available, please attach details as Annex.</p> <p>USFWS inspections and investigations resulted in multiple criminal prosecutions involving the smuggling of CITES-listed species and other significant violations. However, the structure of U.S. enforcement databases and the latitude for citing CITES violations under other U.S. laws (laws that often authorize higher penalties) make it impossible to compile totals for the numbers and types of CITES violations that resulted in criminal prosecution.</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 2, under the category “CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES,” for summaries of some of the major criminal prosecutions of CITES-related violations in the United States during 2007 and 2008.</i></p>	
8	Have there been any other court actions of CITES-related violations?	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Public zoos or botanical gardens	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Designated rescue centres	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Approved, private facilities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Euthanasia	<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<p>Comments:</p> <p>Some confiscated specimens were also donated to educational facilities for use in conservation education to improve public understanding of wildlife conservation and trade issues.</p>	

11	Has detailed information been provided to the Secretariat on significant cases of illegal trade (e.g. through an ECOMESSAGE or other means), or information on convicted illegal traders and persistent offenders?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:		
12	Have there been any cooperative enforcement activities with other countries (e.g. exchange of intelligence, technical support, investigative assistance, joint operation, etc.)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
13	<p>If Yes, please give a brief description:</p> <p>The USFWS routinely shared law enforcement intelligence on potential CITES violations with the CITES Secretariat, appropriate enforcement authorities in other CITES Party nations, and Interpol.</p> <p>USFWS cooperative enforcement efforts included a joint investigation with Environment Canada that resulted in both U.S. and Canadian criminal charges against a network of smugglers and seafood businesses trafficking in Queen conch (<i>Strombus gigas</i>) from the Caribbean, cooperation with Canada to secure the arrest and extradition of a smuggler trafficking in African elephant (<i>Loxodonta africana</i>) ivory, and work with Mexico on the takedown of an undercover investigation that exposed the take of sea turtles for the skin trade. USFWS enforcement staff provided support and assistance to a number of global investigations. For example, these efforts helped the Lusaka Agreement Task Force and the Republic of the Congo secure the arrest of an ivory trafficker, collected evidence from the execution of search warrants in the United States to support a Brazilian investigation of rosewood smuggling, and yielded forensic evidence and expert testimony that helped secure the conviction in Thailand of a store owner who was importing and selling shahtoosh. In 2008, a USFWS special agent completed a 10-month detail as liaison to the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network, facilitating law enforcement intelligence exchange and providing assistance with investigative planning and operations in member nations.</p>	
14	Have any incentives been offered to local communities to assist in the enforcement of CITES legislation, e.g. leading to the arrest and conviction of offenders?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
15	<p>If Yes, please describe:</p> <p>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.</p>	
16	Has there been any review or assessment of CITES-related enforcement?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:		
17	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p>The USFWS worked proactively to improve CITES compliance by maintaining and</p>	

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 2007 and 2008 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 revisions in U.S. CITES regulations, labeling requirements and personal effects exemptions for caviar, implementation of new listings, lower personal effects exemption for caviar, and CITES trade restrictions and suspensions.
- Presentations on CITES and humane transport requirements at the 2007 international conference of the Animal Transport Association and a 2007 meeting of the Independent Pet and Animal Transportation Association International.
- Regular meetings and liaison with such groups as the Greater Miami Chamber of Commerce, the Port Authority of New York, the Los Angeles Customs Brokers and Freight Forwarders Association, and the New York City and Boston Custom House Brokers Associations.
- Presentations and training on CITES and U.S. wildlife import/export requirements for brokers associations in New York, Boston, Newark, Charlotte, Miami, Tampa, El Paso, Laredo, Los Angeles, and other locations.
- Outreach booths at the Baltimore/Washington International Airport Air Cargo Expo and the United Parcel Service’s trade compliance fair in Louisville; participation in a wildlife import/export training program in Memphis for FedEx Trade Network employees who act as brokers for Federal Express; compliance guidance and assistance to department store representatives in Newark, New Jersey; and outreach to retailers of international products (including medicinals) in Minneapolis and Dallas.
- A month-long compliance promotion effort aimed at vendors, delegates, and visitors to the 2008 Festival of Pacific Arts in American Samoa.
- One-on-one CITES compliance guidance to company representatives and individuals engaged in wildlife trade.
- Operation of an Email-based “contact” service to answer specific questions on wildlife 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here.			
3	If there is more than one MA in your country, has a lead MA been designated?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>

4	If Yes, please name that MA and indicate whether it is identified as the lead MA in the CITES Directory.		
5	How many staff work in each MA? The USFWS Division of Management Authority is the only CITES Management Authority in the United States. Currently, 30 staff work in the Division of Management Authority.		
6	Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters? If yes, please give estimation: About 75 percent.	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the MA(s)?	Tick if applicable	
	– Administration		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Biology		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Economics/trade		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Law/policy		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Have the MA(s) undertaken or supported any research activities in relation to CITES species or technical issues (e.g. labelling, tagging, species identification) not covered in D2(8) and D2(9)?	Yes No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
9	If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.		
10	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: <i>See ANNEX 3, Section “D1 and D2,” for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.</i>		

D2 Scientific Authority (SA)

1	Have there been any changes in the designation of or contact information for the SA(s) which are not yet reflected in the CITES Directory?	Yes No No information	<input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If Yes, please use the opportunity to provide those changes here.		
3	Is the designated Scientific Authority independent from the Management Authority?	Yes No No information	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
4	What is the structure of the SA(s)?	Tick if applicable	
	– Government institution		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Academic or research institution		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Permanent committee		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Pool of individuals with certain expertise		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)		<input type="checkbox"/>
5	How many staff work in each SA on CITES issues?		

	The USFWS Division of Scientific Authority is the only CITES Scientific Authority in the United States. Currently, eight 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
				No information	<input type="checkbox"/>		
7	What are the skills/expertise of staff within the SA(s)?						Tick if applicable
	– Botany						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Ecology						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Fisheries						<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Forestry						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Welfare						<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Zoology						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)						<input type="checkbox"/>
	– No information						<input type="checkbox"/>
8	Have any research activities been undertaken by the SA(s) in relation to CITES species?			Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
				No information	<input type="checkbox"/>		
9	If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved.						
	Species name	Populations	Distribution	Off take	Legal trade	Illegal trade	Other (specify)
	<i>Panax quinquefolius</i>	United States	United States and Canada	ca. 18,500 kg. annually	ca. 18,500 kg. wild roots exported annually; also export ca. 206,500 kg. of artificially propagated roots annually	Not quantified	Research conducted on status (abundance, distribution) and genetic variation of the species (2007-2008).
							No information <input type="checkbox"/>
10	Have any project proposals for scientific research been submitted to the Secretariat under Resolution Conf. 12.2?			Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
				No information	<input type="checkbox"/>		
11	Please provide details of any additional measures taken: <i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts.</i>						

D3 Enforcement Authorities

1	Has the Secretariat been informed of any enforcement authorities that have been designated for the receipt of confidential enforcement information related to CITES?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
2	If No, please designate them here (with address, phone, fax and email).	
3	Is there a specialized unit responsible for CITES-related enforcement (e.g. within the wildlife department, Customs, the police, public prosecutor's office)?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Under consideration <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	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: <i>See ANNEX 2, under the category "CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES," for summaries of CITES enforcement activities, including criminal prosecutions, seizures, and administrative penalties.</i>	

D4 Communication, information management and exchange

1	To what extent is CITES information computerized?	Tick if applicable
	- Monitoring and reporting of data on legal trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Monitoring and reporting of data on illegal trade	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Permit issuance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Not at all	<input type="checkbox"/>
	- Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>

2	Do the following authorities have access to the Internet?						Tick if applicable
	Authority	Yes, continuous and unrestricted access	Yes, but only through a dial-up connection	Yes, but only through a different office	Some offices only	Not at all	Please provide details where appropriate
	Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Scientific Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Enforcement Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	The central office of the Enforcement Authority has unrestricted access, but most of the field offices only have access through a dial-up connection.
3	Is there an electronic information system providing information on CITES species?						Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
4	If Yes, does it provide information on:						Tick if applicable
	– Legislation (national, regional or international)?						<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Conservation status (national, regional, international)?						<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (please specify)? The U.S. Combined Species database provides the CITES listing status of CITES-listed species, as well as their protected status under U.S. stricter domestic measures, such as the Endangered Species Act, Wild Bird Conservation Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Marine Mammal Protection Act.						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
5	Is it available through the Internet:						Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/>
	Please provide URL:						

6	Do the authorities indicated have access to the following publications?		Tick if applicable
	Publication	Management Authority	Scientific Authority Enforcement Authority
	<i>2005 Checklist of CITES Species (book)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>2008 Checklist of CITES Species and Annotated Appendices (CD-ROM)</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Identification Manual</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	<i>CITES Handbook</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
7	If not, what problems have been encountered to access this information?		
8	Have enforcement authorities reported to the Management Authority on:		Tick if applicable
	– Mortality in transport?		<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Seizures and confiscations?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Discrepancies in number of items in permits and number of items actually traded?		<input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:			
9	Is there a government website with information on CITES and its requirements?		Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			No <input type="checkbox"/>
			No information <input type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, please give the URL:			
http://www.fws.gov/international.html;			
http://www.le.fws.gov; and			
http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/cites_endangered_plants.shtml			

10	<p>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?</p>	Tick if applicable
	– Press releases/conferences	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Newspaper articles, radio/television appearances	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Brochures, leaflets	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Presentations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Displays	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Information at border crossing points	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	– Telephone hotline	<input type="checkbox"/>
	– Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Please attach copies of any items.	
	<i>Note:</i> These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.	
11	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 2007 and 2008. 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. • USFWS Law Enforcement worked with the city of Atlanta, Georgia, to develop and install an educational outreach display on wildlife trade at Hartsfield International Airport. • 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 Kentucky State Fair, Red River Valley Trade Show in Fargo, North Dakota, the annual "open house" at the Raleigh Durham International Airport in North Carolina, the Baltimore Port Festival, the New Mexico Outdoor Expo, and Earth Day celebrations in Long Beach, San Diego, and other cities. Materials distributed included the agency's "Buyer Beware" brochure, which cautions U.S. travellers about buying and importing souvenirs made from protected species. • USFWS Law Enforcement staff provided presentations on U.S. efforts to address illegal wildlife trade to groups representing the U.S. legal community. Outreach audiences included the Washington, D.C. Bar Association, Marshall Law School in Cleveland, Chicago Bar Association, DePaul University Law School, and Vermont Law School. • USFWS Law Enforcement staff contributed to print and broadcast news reports, web publications, and magazine articles focused on illegal wildlife trafficking. Media outlets included the New York Times, Washington Post, CNN/Anderson Cooper/Planet in Peril, Inside Edition, Baltimore Sun, U.S. News and World Report, New Yorker, National Public Radio/South Florida, National Geographic On-Line, Calgary Herald, San Mateo Daily News, South Florida Sun Sentinel, and Miami New Times among others. • A Law Enforcement manager represented the USFWS on a discussion panel about 	

wildlife trafficking at the 18th Annual Conference of the Society of Environmental Journalists in Roanoke, Virginia, which drew environmental reporters and writers from throughout the United States and Canada.

- With USFWS assistance, the U.S. Department of State and WildAid developed and produced three public service announcements (PSAs) featuring actor Harrison Ford. The PSAs, which were distributed via U.S. embassies worldwide, urge consumers to stop contributing to illegal wildlife trade through their purchases.

See ANNEX 3, Section "D4," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008, 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
		No	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		Not applicable	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		No information	<input type="checkbox"/>		
If no, please provide details of any:					
Changes in permit format:					
Changes in designation or signatures of relevant officials:					
2	To date, has your country developed written permit procedures for any of the following?	Tick if applicable			
		Yes	No	No information	
		Permit issuance/acceptance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
		Registration of traders	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Registration of producers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

Year 1 (2007)	Import or introduction from the sea	Export	Re-export	Other	Comments
How many documents were issued?	895	8,928	8,795	1,865	A total of 19,223 CITES documents were issued during 2007. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 1,865 "other" documents, 1,224 were for either export or re-export, 211 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificates of ownership, etc.), and 7 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 254 applications were denied or abandoned during 2007. 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 (2008) How many documents were issued?	962	9,505	10,188	1,904	A total of 22,656 CITES documents were issued during 2008. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 1,904 "other" documents, 1,088 were for either export or re-export, 255 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificate of ownership, etc.), and 11 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 247 applications were denied or abandoned during 2008. 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
5	If Yes, please give the reasons for this.			
6	Please give the reasons for rejection of CITES documents from other countries.	Tick if applicable		
	Reason	Yes	No	No information
	Technical violations	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Suspected fraud	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient basis for finding of non-detriment	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Insufficient basis for finding of legal acquisition	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7	Are harvest and/or export quotas used as a management tool in the procedure for issuance of permits?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>	No information <input type="checkbox"/>
	Comments			
8	How many times has the Scientific Authority been requested to provide opinions?			
	During 2007-2008, the U.S. Scientific Authority was asked to provide opinions on more than 560 specific findings. Additionally, the Scientific Authority has produced a number of non-detriment findings (i.e., "general advices") that are used when a particular application meets certain established criteria. For example, for applications requesting the exports of pet birds of commonly bred species, the Scientific Authority has made a non-detriment finding that can be used provided that the applicant meets certain requirements.			
9	Has the MA charged fees for permit issuance, registration or related CITES activities?	Tick if applicable		
	– Issuance of CITES documents:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	– Licensing or registration of operations that produce CITES species:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	– Harvesting of CITES-listed species :	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	– Use of CITES-listed species:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	– Assignment of quotas for CITES-listed species:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	– Importing of CITES-listed species:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	– Other (specify):	<input type="checkbox"/>		
10	If Yes, please provide the amounts of such fees.			
	U.S. permit fees vary depending on the activity requested. The fees are listed in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 13, Section 13.11.			
11	Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation?	Tick if applicable		
	– Entirely:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	– Partly:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	– Not at all:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	– Not relevant:	<input type="checkbox"/>		
	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 2007-2008, 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Improvement of national networks			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Hiring of more staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	Purchase of technical equipment for monitoring/enforcement			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Development of implementation tools	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Computerization			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	- Other (specify)					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p>The USFWS is participating in the development of the Automated Customs Environment/International Trade Data System (ITDS) – a U.S. Government-wide project to centralize the policing and processing of all international trade entering or exiting the United States. The system, which is being designed and deployed over a multi-year period, will improve U.S. CITES enforcement and USFWS efforts to detect and interdict illegal wildlife trade by providing access to integrated trade and law enforcement intelligence information, as well as selectivity and targeting mechanisms.</p>						
2	Have the CITES authorities received or benefited from any of the following capacity building activities provided by external sources?					
	Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity.	Oral or written advice/guidance	Technical assistance	Financial assistance	Training	Other (specify)
		What were the external sources?				
	Target group					
	Staff of Management Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Staff of Scientific Authority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Staff of enforcement authorities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

4

Please provide details of any additional measures taken:

- 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. More than 1,000 new U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) inspectors were trained each year as well as several hundred new CBP agriculture specialists and 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 inspectors provided import/export training to military customs inspectors at the Camp Pendleton Marine Corps Base in California, the San Diego Naval Station, and via remote broadcast to naval stations in Everett, Washington, and Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. Import/export and CITES training was also provided to U.S. Air Force staff at the Grand Forks Air Force Base in North Dakota and at Carswell Air Force Base in Texas.
- The USFWS National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory expanded its ability to support U.S. and international investigations of wildlife crime with the completion of a 17,000-square-foot addition at its facility in Ashland, Oregon in 2007. The addition includes an expanded state-of-the-art genetics lab and a biological containment area that meets U.S. requirements for handling potentially bio-hazardous materials from other nations.
- In 2007 and 2008, 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: development of a method for identifying and characterizing sea turtle keratin using Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy; a genetics-based protocol for determining whether an ivory tusk comes from an African or Asian elephant; a new protocol that allows scientists to extract DNA from tanned sea turtle leather and hides for use in identifying source species; a cross-section method for differentiating elephant and giraffe tail hairs, making it easier to identify the species used in bracelets, earrings, and other items; capabilities for using mitochondrial DNA sequence analysis to identify South American freshwater turtle species, *Oreochromis* species, and impala (*Aepyceros* species) as well as African primates and other species occurring in the bush meat trade; and improved techniques for extracting trace amounts of DNA from such items as shed feathers, cooked meat and tanned hides.

See ANNEX 3, Section “D6,” for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008, with respect to capacity building.

D7 Collaboration/co-operative initiatives

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

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	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
	Consultations	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>					
4	At the national level have there been any efforts to collaborate with:					Tick if applicable		Details if available
	Agencies for development and trade					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Provincial, state or territorial authorities					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Local authorities or communities					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Indigenous peoples					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	Trade or other private sector associations					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
	NGOs					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Other (specify)					<input type="checkbox"/>			
5	To date, have any Memoranda of Understanding or other formal arrangements for institutional cooperation related to CITES been agreed between the Management Authority and the following agencies?						Tick if applicable	
	Scientific Authority						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Customs						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Police						<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Other border authorities (specify): 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						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Other government agencies						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Private sector bodies						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	NGOs						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Other (specify)						<input type="checkbox"/>		
6	Have Government staff participated in any regional activities related to CITES?						Tick if applicable	
	Workshops						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Meetings						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
	Other (specify)						<input type="checkbox"/>	
7	Has there been any effort to encourage any non-Party to accede to the Convention?					Yes		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
						No		<input type="checkbox"/>
						No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
8	If Yes, which one(s) and in what way?							
	-Oman: Under the auspices of Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI),							

	<p>leading up to Oman's accession to CITES in March 2008, U.S. Government officials encouraged Oman to accede to CITES through telephone conferences, correspondence, and electronic communications. This was followed by the U.S. Government conducting a CITES capacity-building workshop in Oman in April 2008.</p> <p>-Bahrain: Again under the auspices of the MEPI, U.S. Government officials encouraged Bahrain to accede to CITES through telephone conferences, correspondence, and electronic communications. The U.S. Government also conducted a CITES capacity-building workshop in Bahrain in June 2008. However, to date, Bahrain has not acceded to CITES.</p>
9	<p>Has technical or financial assistance been provided to another country in relation to CITES?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
10	<p>If Yes, which country(ies) and what kind of assistance was provided?</p> <p>USFWS enforcement personnel conducted the following international training programs in 2007:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USFWS special agents completed validation studies of wildlife crime investigation courses that had been conducted by the USFWS in the Philippines and Thailand in 2006. The validation assessments, which included reviews of casework and meetings with enforcement officials in both countries, were completed at the request of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to further support the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN). • USFWS enforcement officers presented a two-week course on investigating wildlife crime as part of the core curriculum at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Gabarone, Botswana. Thirty-two officers from nine sub-Saharan African nations completed the course, which included segments on CITES enforcement, crime scene analysis, surveillance, and interviewing and interrogation. Countries represented included Botswana, Cameroon, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, and Uganda. • USFWS special agents provided criminal investigative training to 30 officers from Indonesian police, customs, and forestry agencies. The training was sponsored by ASEAN-WEN and USAID as part of an ongoing effort to address illegal wildlife trade in Southeast Asia. <p>USFWS provided the following training and technical assistance in 2008:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USFWS again presented a two-week wildlife crime investigations course at the International Law Enforcement Academy in Gabarone, Botswana. The course focused on skills that enforcement personnel need to combat the illegal take and trade of wildlife in sub-Saharan Africa. Participants included 29 officers from eight countries (Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, and Zambia). • A USFWS special agent with broad expertise in the development, management, and execution of investigative training programs, as well as significant experience in conducting investigations of illegal wildlife trafficking, completed a 10-month assignment as an on-site technical advisor to ASEAN-WEN. Efforts included training development, investigative consultation, and law enforcement intelligence liaison, as well as the presentation of multiple in-country training programs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USFWS Law Enforcement teamed with Environment Canada to provide presentations on CITES enforcement strategies and queen conch meat trafficking at a Marine Environmental Security Conference in Colombia. The workshop, which was sponsored by the U.S. Embassy, the Colombia Ministry of Environment, and Conservation International, was attended by enforcement personnel from South American and Caribbean nations. • A USFWS special agent also participated in a separate queen conch workshop held in Colombia, where he worked with conservation and enforcement officials to develop collaborative strategies for improving queen conch management in the southwestern Caribbean. • A USFWS Law Enforcement manager attended the 17th Meeting of the European Union Enforcement Group on Trade in Wildlife, which was held in Brussels, Belgium. The USFWS provided a presentation on the North American Wildlife Enforcement Group, spotlighting past accomplishments and ongoing regional cooperation in CITES enforcement as a regional model for collaborative enforcement efforts and capacity building.
11	<p>Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?</p> <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
12	If Yes, please give a brief description.
13	<p>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)?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p>
14	<p>If Yes, please give a brief description.</p> <p><i>For an example, see ANNEX 3, Section "D7," under "Expanded cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)."</i></p>
15	<p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p><i>See ANNEX 3, Section "D7," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States during 2007-2008, with respect to collaboration and cooperative initiatives.</i></p>

D8 Areas for future work

1	Are any of the following activities needed to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level and what is the respective level of priority?			
	Activity	High	Medium	Low
	Increased budget for activities	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Hiring of more staff	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Development of implementation tools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Improvement of national networks	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Purchase of new technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	Computerization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (specify)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
2	Were any difficulties encountered in implementing specific Resolutions or Decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties?	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>
		No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
3	If Yes, which one(s) and what is the main difficulty?			
4	Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance?	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>
		No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
5	If Yes, please describe the constraint and the type of attention or assistance that is required.			
6	Have any measures, procedures or mechanisms been identified within the Convention that would benefit from review and/or simplification?	Yes		<input type="checkbox"/>
		No		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
		No information		<input type="checkbox"/>
7	If Yes, please give a brief description.			
8	Please provide details of any additional measures taken:			

E. General feedback

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

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

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

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

CITES-RELATED REGULATORY MEASURES

Revision to U.S. regulations implementing CITES: The USFWS published revised CITES-implementing regulations (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23) on 23 August 2007. The new regulations, which became effective on 24 September 2007, incorporate provisions from appropriate resolutions adopted by the Parties through CoP13. The USFWS engaged in active outreach to the import/export community and other CITES Management Authorities to make them aware of the new regulations and alert them to new U.S. requirements. The updated regulations help the United States more effectively promote species conservation, fulfill its responsibilities as a CITES Party, and help those affected by CITES to understand how to conduct international trade in CITES-listed species.

In July 2008, the USFWS published revisions to the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations. These revisions became effective on 15 September 2008. The new revisions incorporate provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14. The USFWS has also prepared a proposed rule to incorporate other relevant provisions adopted at CoP14.

STRICTER DOMESTIC LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Amendments to the U.S. Lacey Act regarding plants: The Lacey Act, first enacted in 1900, is the United States' oldest wildlife protection statute. It has made and continues to make it illegal to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce any wildlife specimen taken or traded in violation of U.S. or foreign law. However, until 2008, the Act only applied to plants that were U.S. native species, and its application to those plants was limited. On 22 May 2008, the U.S. Congress adopted significant amendments to the Lacey Act expanding its protection to a broader range of plants, including foreign plant and timber species. Now, in addition to its application to wildlife, the Act makes it unlawful to import, export, transport, sell, receive, acquire, or purchase in interstate or foreign commerce any plant specimen (with some limited exceptions) taken or traded in violation of foreign law or the laws or regulations of a U.S. State. The Act also now makes it unlawful to submit any false record of any covered plant and to import any covered plant or plant product without a declaration indicating the genus and species, quantity, value, and country of origin of the covered plant material. The U.S. Government is currently in the process of implementing the new Lacey Act amendments, has developed a phased-in approach to the declaration requirement, and is providing national and international outreach.

STRICTER DOMESTIC REGULATORY MEASURES

Guerney's pitta: On 16 January 2008, the USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing Gurney's pitta (*Pitta gurneyi*) as "Endangered" under the U.S. Endangered Species Act. This species is also listed in CITES Appendix I.

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

CITES COMPLIANCE MEASURES

U.S. efforts related to Peruvian mahogany: During the reporting period, the USFWS continued to work closely with Peru regarding Peru's implementation of the mahogany Appendix-II listing. For 2007, Peru established a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota of 4,983 cubic meters of wood. The USFWS closely monitored the volume of bigleaf mahogany being imported into the United States from Peru during 2007, and provided Peru with periodic reports on those imports, which totalled 3,754 cubic meters. For 2008, Peru's export quota for bigleaf mahogany was 3,475.5483 cubic meters of wood. U.S. imports, which we again reported to Peru, totalled 2,959 cubic meters. The USFWS continues to monitor the volume of bigleaf mahogany imported into the United States from Peru and provides this information to Peru, as well as the CITES Secretariat and other major mahogany importing countries, on a regular basis to assist Peru in monitoring its exports of mahogany to the United States and in managing its export quota.

In 2006, the United States and Peru signed the U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement (PTPA), which entered into force in February 2009. The PTPA commits both Parties to effectively enforce their domestic environmental laws and adopt, maintain, and implement laws, regulations, and all other measures to fulfil obligations under seven Multilateral Environmental Agreements, one of which is CITES. The Environment Chapter of the PTPA includes an Annex on Forest Sector Governance, which seeks to address the environmental and economic consequences of illegal logging and associated trade. The United States continues to work very closely with Peru under the terms of the Agreement.

Ramin implementation activities: 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 implementing the ramin (*Gonystylus* spp.) Appendix-II listing. The CITES Management Authority in Sarawak, Malaysia, continued its process of notifying the USFWS whenever it issues a CITES export permit for a shipment of ramin from Sarawak destined for the United States. 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.

United States – Indonesia MOU: In November 2006, the United States and Indonesia signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Combating Illegal Logging and Associated Trade. Through the MOU the two Parties agree to exchange information related to trade in timber and other forest products, and cooperate for the purpose of enforcing or assisting in the enforcement of their respective laws and regulations affecting trade in timber and other forest products. The MOU establishes a Working Group on Combating Illegal Logging and Associated Trade under the United States – Indonesia Trade and Investment Framework Agreement (TIFA). Information exchange and enhanced cooperation related to ramin is an important element of the activities under the MOU.

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 2007 and 2008. The work of USFWS wildlife inspectors, for example, secured the following penalty assessments:

- In New York, a company acting as broker for a major fashion retailer paid 68,000 USD in civil penalties for four unlawfully imported shipments of blue coral jewelry.
- In final court action in New York, a company that illegally imported 410 kilograms of caviar in violation of CITES in 2000 was ordered to forfeit 223,288 USD to the U.S. Government. This amount represents monies derived from the interlocutory sale of the caviar plus over 40,000 USD in interest earned during the resolution of civil forfeiture proceedings.
- Penalties of 4,000 USD and 2,000 USD were collected from two companies for the import of alligator watchstraps and Chinese weasel fur products via New York without CITES permits.
- Two companies involved in the import of coral from Viet Nam to New York without required permits paid 10,000 USD in penalties.
- A U.S. airline paid an 8,000 USD penalty for the inhumane transport of a shipment of CITES-protected tropical fish and marine invertebrates from Belize; all wildlife died before reaching New York.
- A New York resident paid 1,625 USD in penalties for violations related to the import of CITES-protected finches.
- A company paid a 5,000 USD civil penalty for importing a shipment of caiman belts with an altered CITES permit at the border crossing in Champlain, New York.
- A 49,400 USD civil penalty was assessed against a Miami, Florida, importer in connection with the unlawful importation of seven commercial shipments of live CITES-listed corals from Indonesia. The shipments, containing hundreds of specimens, were imported in violation of CITES, U.S. laws, and Indonesian export quotas.
- An individual in North Carolina who unlawfully imported a leopard skin from Ghana paid a 500 USD penalty.
- In Louisville, Kentucky, a leather goods company paid a 1,025 USD civil penalty for importing a shipment of caiman shoes from Brazil without a CITES permit.
- In Memphis, Tennessee, a student from Kazakhstan, whose family runs a Caspian Sea caviar processing plant, was fined 2,150 USD for unlawfully importing a commercial quantity of sturgeon caviar (including beluga caviar) in his baggage.
- A Missouri company that unlawfully imported seal skin sporrans paid a 5,000 USD penalty.
- Defendants in Dallas, Texas, who smuggled a walrus trophy into the United States from Canada paid 10,050 USD in fines.
- An individual in Dallas who unlawfully imported a black-faced impala shoulder mount was fined 3,525 USD.
- A Houston, Texas, businessman who illegally imported commercial quantities of coral merchandise from China without a CITES permit paid a 10,000 USD penalty and forfeited 1,383 strands of coral beads.
- An individual who imported a leopard trophy that had actually been taken by his adult son paid a 15,000 USD civil penalty.
- An individual was caught with two live conures hidden in his vehicle at the border crossing in Nogales, Arizona; the man was fined 1,000 USD.

- An outfitter from Mexico paid a 5,000 USD penalty for importing a CITES Appendix-I oryx trophy without the required U.S. CITES permit; that trophy and another non-CITES trophy that had been mislabelled were both forfeited.
- In Anchorage, Alaska, a watch company that racked up 16 violations in a six-month period paid 10,750 USD in penalties and forfeited 19,000 USD worth of merchandise.
- Inspectors in Anchorage intercepted a falsely declared shipment from Bali that actually contained walrus bones and whalebone carvings; the importer paid 5,025 USD in penalties.
- A U.S. scientist who unlawfully imported a walrus oosik via Anchorage paid 5,000 USD and forfeited the item.

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 2007 and 2008 are provided below:

- Officers in New York seized two large suitcases containing CITES-protected wildlife from a traveller from Zimbabwe; the contents included 15 African elephant ivory carvings, one leopard rug, two bushbuck skulls with horns, antelope wall hangings, five zebra rugs, three tanned crocodile skins, two tanned monitor skins, and an anoa horn.
- An inspection blitz of mail shipments from Africa to New York led to the seizure of a parcel containing 24 elephant ivory bracelets.
- Seizures in New York also included 12 live beluga sturgeon concealed in a shipment of tropical fish from Taiwan.
- USFWS officers at the border in Buffalo, New York, caught a Pennsylvania resident smuggling 11 Asian arowanas hidden in the housing of a stereo speaker in his vehicle.
- Staff in Baltimore, Maryland, seized two full-mount leopard trophies imported without valid permits.
- Inspectors in Chicago, Illinois, intercepted a shipment of live tropical fish from Indonesia that included four boxes of undeclared, un-permitted live seahorses; 42 of the animals were seized.
- Wildlife inspectors in Detroit, Michigan, stopped an individual who tried to import sea turtle specimens from Indonesia using a U.S. CITES permit issued to a government science center.
- A weekend inspection blitz of passengers arriving in Charlotte, North Carolina, resulted in the seizure of 109 pieces of CITES-protected coral as well as queen conch shells and meat.
- Staff in Atlanta, Georgia, foiled the illegal importation of a leopard skin using a false CITES permit. Inspectors at this port also seized five other leopard trophies in 2007.
- An inspection blitz of passenger flights arriving in Atlanta from the Caribbean and Central America during peak sea turtle nesting season resulted in the seizure of 69 sea turtle eggs, two pounds of sea turtle meat, two shells, and nine pieces of sea turtle jewelry.
- Wildlife inspectors in Atlanta seized over 400 dead seahorses in personal baggage destined for a California restaurant, baggage containing over 40 boxes of Asian medicinal products made from CITES species, and baggage filled with CITES leather products imported for trade shows and resale.
- Atlanta inspection staff found 10 Asian arowanas hidden in boxes with false bottoms, as well as 43 pieces of smuggled CITES-protected stony coral in a shipment of tropical fish and corals imported by a business based in Charlotte, North Carolina.
- Other seizures in Atlanta included beluga caviar, elephant ivory jewelry and tusks, and 75 pieces of CITES-listed black coral products declared as “seaweed.”
- An inspection blitz in Miami, Florida, in 2007 resulted in the seizure of over 200 sea turtle eggs and the interception of a commercial shipment of queen conch shells and caiman products that

lacked CITES permits. In 2008, Miami inspectors foiled 8 smuggling attempts involving close to 300 sea turtle eggs and some 20 pounds of sea turtle meat during a one-month period.

- Inspectors at the port of Miami stopped a passenger on two occasions trying to bring in commercial quantities of iguana eggs and products from Honduras without CITES permits; 168 eggs and 16 iguana bodies were seized along with 10 pounds of queen conch meat.
- A proactive inspection effort in Miami targeting commercial watch shipments resulted in the seizure of 259 illegally imported watches with bands made from CITES-protected species such as alligator, crocodile and tegu; the watches were worth an estimated 77,700 USD.
- Miami inspectors intercepted a shipment of 83 live royal pythons that had been collected in Benin and Togo and shipped via Ghana without CITES permits.
- Seizures in Miami included 67 crocodile teeth illegally imported from Peru in violation of CITES; 101 live CITES-protected *Mantella* frogs from Madagascar; 2,350 pairs of arapaima earrings with no CITES permit in a commercial shipment of Peruvian handicrafts; a commercial shipment of saltwater crocodile boots that originated in Indonesia; three coolers packed with 229 pounds of queen conch meat arriving with an air passenger from the Bahamas; live CITES-listed reptiles from Central and South America; multiple shipments of reptilian leather products from Italy; and a shipment from the Marshall Islands containing 1,227 pieces of giant clam and 435 pieces of *Acropora* coral that lacked CITES documents.
- USFWS inspectors intercepted an ocean cargo shipment containing 100 pounds of CITES-listed staghorn coral that entered the country at Fort Lauderdale, Florida.
- The USFWS inspector in Tampa, Florida, stopped a commercial shipment from Viet Nam declared as shell products that contained CITES-protected giant clams. This inspector also discovered five stuffed hawksbill sea turtles smuggled in another Vietnamese shipment that had been invoiced as ceramic vases.
- Seizures in Tampa also included sea turtle meat, CITES coral and queen conch shells, and reptile leather goods made from CITES species; 54 pieces of assorted coral from the Cayman Islands; and a shipment of CITES-listed *Tridacna* clams from the Marshall Islands.
- Seizures in Puerto Rico included shipments of sea turtle meat, sea turtle products, pilot whale meat, and queen conch meat.
- Commercial shipments seized in Louisville included one from Thailand containing jewelry made from Appendix-II seahorses; a shipment containing six python-trimmed pool cues, 46 crocodile belts, 10 crocodile wallets, and other products; two commercial shipments from an Italian company that falsely declared jackets trimmed with crocodilian leather as having calf leather trim; and a shipment containing 140 leopard cat skins.
- Inspectors in Louisville also seized unlawful imports of pool cues made from elephant ivory, seal skin sporrans, red coral jewelry, and Appendix-II reptilian leather goods.
- An art gallery importing via Louisville forfeited items made from elephant ivory and sea turtle shell while another importer using this port forfeited a shipment containing wildlife skulls, including 67 monkey skulls, and dried bats and lizards.
- Seizures in Memphis included crab-eating macaques, leather goods made from CITES species, and caviar.
- Inspectors in Dallas stopped a passenger bringing in commercial quantities of Asian medicinals; items seized included 58 dried seahorses.
- In Dallas, inspectors seized three leopard trophies from Tanzania, Mozambique, and Botswana; violations involved CITES tagging irregularities and expired U.S. CITES import permits.
- Seizures of sea turtle eggs being smuggled into the United States from El Salvador launched three investigations in Dallas, including one involving the owner of a Salvadoran restaurant.
- Other seizures in Dallas included a commercial shipment of household decorations made with CITES coral and seahorses that lacked permits and had not been declared, live coral shipments, a

shipment of 150 mirror frames and 250 picture frames made from coral imported from China without a CITES permit, a black-faced impala trophy from Namibia, a Hartmann's mountain zebra skin from Namibia that had no CITES permit, a stuffed green sea turtle and 16 bottles of tonic made from seahorses smuggled in by a passenger arriving from Viet Nam, and a mail shipment of 3,600 Canadian harp seal oil pills.

- Inspectors in Houston seized 185,000 USD worth of elephant ivory carvings and jewelry found hidden inside musical drums in a shipment imported from Ethiopia.
- Multiple wildlife items, including an endangered mandrill skull and CITES-protected bird feathers, were seized in Houston from a container shipment imported from Gabon by the producers of the CBS TV reality show "Survivor" declared as "U.S. Goods Returned/ Production Supplies and Props."
- Other seizures in Houston included 58 pounds of queen conch meat imported without a CITES permit, bald eagle feathers, sea turtle eggs smuggled by air passengers, a commercial shipment containing 156 pieces of jewelry and handicrafts made from Nile crocodile and other CITES species unlawfully imported from Zimbabwe, 40 smuggled iguana eggs, a leopard trophy imported without a CITES permit, Hartmann's zebra trophies from Namibia that arrived with CITES permits authorizing export to Mexico, and a large older sea turtle mount imported without CITES pre-Convention documentation.
- Seizures along the U.S./Mexico border included interceptions of live parrots (including one hidden in the importer's pants and another in a woman's purse), a shipment of 19 iguana skins imported without CITES permits via Nogales, and a foiled smuggling attempt in Laredo involving seven skinned iguanas.
- Illegal wildlife products intercepted at Denver International Airport included caviar, elephant skins, a leopard skull from Zimbabwe, 2,500 butterflies unlawfully imported from China, and an 18,000 USD shipment of alligator watch bands imported in violation of CITES.
- Seizures at the U.S./Canada border in Pembina and Dunseith, North Dakota, and Sweetgrass, Montana, included a barbary sheep trophy; black bear, wolf and lynx hides and parts; black bear meat; 84 freshly plucked eagle feathers; bobcat hides; whale baleen; Asian medicinals made from such CITES species as seahorse; and a shipment of 274 CITES reptilian watchbands.
- USFWS officers at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX) caught a traveller smuggling 14 live box turtles (CITES-listed U.S.-origin wildlife) to Japan only to stop him again the next week, when he was illegally importing two turtles and two snakes.
- USFWS staff at LAX recovered 18 smuggled Asian songbirds from baggage arriving from Viet Nam that was left unclaimed. Other CITES wildlife retrieved from air travellers entering LAX included six live Asian arowanas being smuggled from Indonesia.
- A major league baseball player surrendered an unlawfully imported guitar adorned with sea turtle shell that he had bought in Japan when he returned to Oakland, California.

Seizures of CITES plant parts and products in 2007 and 2008: During 2007 and 2008, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized the following specimens of CITES-listed non-living plant parts and products upon import into the United States:

2007

- 1 shipment of *Swietenia macrophylla*, imported from Ecuador, containing 32 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 2 shipments of *Gonystylus* spp.: 1 shipment of Malaysian origin wood, imported from the United Kingdom, containing 1,823 wood products; and 1 shipment imported from an unknown country, containing 1 wood product.

- 2 shipments of *Aquilaria* spp.: 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from China, containing 60 medicinal products; and 1 shipment imported from an unknown country, containing 4 vials of powder.
- 2 shipments of *Dalbergia nigra*: 1 shipment imported from Brazil, containing 20 kilograms of sawn wood; and 1 shipment imported from an unknown country, containing 4 wood products.
- 1 shipment of *Dipteryx panamensis*, imported from Nicaragua, containing 4 cubic meters of wood products.
- 10 shipments of *Hoodia* spp.: 2 shipments imported from South Africa, containing 100 kilograms of extract and an unknown quantity of medicinal products; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from France, containing 133 grams of extract; 2 shipments from unknown countries of origin, imported from Germany, containing 1 kilogram of extract and 20 unspecified products; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from the United Kingdom, containing 1 kilogram of derivatives; and 4 shipments imported from unknown countries, containing 13 derivatives, 242 grams of derivatives, and an additional unknown quantity of derivatives, as well as an unknown quantity of unspecified products.
- 4 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*: 2 shipments imported from Canada, containing 120 kilograms of root; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Canada, containing 200 grams of root; and 1 shipment imported from the Netherlands, containing 940 kilograms of root.
- 6 shipments of *Saussurea costus*: 3 shipments from unknown countries of origin, imported from China, containing 89 medicinal products; and 3 shipments imported from unknown countries, containing 40 medicinal products and 24 kilograms of derivatives.
- 3 shipments of *Aloe* spp.: 1 shipment of South African origin specimens, imported from Germany, containing 125 kilograms of powder; and 2 shipments imported from unknown countries, containing unknown quantities of derivatives.
- 1 shipment of *Cibotium barometz*, from an unknown country of origin, imported from Hong Kong, containing 8 medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Cistanche deserticola*, imported from an unknown country, containing 1 kilogram of powder.
- 6 shipments of orchid specimens: 1 shipment of *Dendrobium* spp., imported from an unknown country, containing an unknown quantity of derivatives; 3 shipments of *Gastrodia* spp., imported from unknown countries, containing 1 kilogram of powder, 1 kilogram of derivatives, and an additional unknown quantity of derivatives; and 2 shipments of orchids of unknown species, from unknown countries of origin, imported from China, containing 57 medicinal products.

2008

- 1 shipment of *Swietenia macrophylla*, imported from Mexico, containing 6 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 1 shipment of *Gonystylus* spp. of wood from an unknown country of origin, imported from Italy, containing 215 cubic meters of wood products.
- 1 shipment of *Aquilaria sinensis*, imported from China, containing 94 kilograms of derivatives.
- 1 shipment of *Pericopsis elata*, of wood from an unknown country of origin, imported from Germany, containing 3,247 square meters of veneer.
- 1 shipment of *Dipteryx panamensis*, imported from Panama, containing 22,746 kilograms of sawn wood.

- 3 shipments of *Prunus Africana*: 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Canada, containing 60 grams of derivatives; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from France, containing 312 kilograms of extract; and 1 shipment imported from an unknown country, containing 192 kilograms of derivatives.
- 22 shipments of *Hoodia* spp.: 1 shipment imported from Brazil, containing 60 derivatives; 2 shipments imported from Canada, containing 6,300 grams of extract; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from France, containing 142 grams of powder; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from Lebanon, containing an unknown quantity of extract; 8 shipments from unknown countries of origin, imported from Malaysia, containing 656 extracts; 2 shipments from unknown countries of origin, imported from Mexico, containing 309 grams of extract and an additional unknown quantity of extract; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from the United Kingdom, containing an unknown quantity of extract; and 6 shipments imported from unknown countries, containing 184 grams of derivatives and 33 kilograms of extract, plus and additional unknown quantity of extract.
- 4 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*: 1 shipment imported from Hong Kong, containing 2 kilograms of root; 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from China, containing 207 kilograms of root; and 2 shipments imported from unknown countries, containing 4 kilograms of root.
- 3 shipments of *Saussurea costus*: 1 shipment imported from China, containing 656 kilograms of medicinal products; and 2 shipments from unknown countries of origin, imported from China, containing unknown quantities of medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Aloe ferox*, imported from the Republic of Korea, containing an unknown quantity of derivatives.
- 3 shipments of *Cibotium barometz*: 2 shipments imported from China, containing 1,106 kilograms of medicinal products; and 1 shipment from an unknown country of origin, imported from China, containing 26 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 2 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*, imported from China, 656.234 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 6 shipments of orchid specimens: 1 shipment of *Bletilla* spp., imported from Taiwan, containing 1 kilogram of extract; 2 shipments of *Dendrobium* spp., 1 imported from China and 1 imported from India, containing 1,881 kilograms of derivatives and 656 kilograms of medicinal products; and 3 shipments of *Gastrodia* spp., 2 imported from the Republic of Korea and 1 imported from Taiwan, containing 2,161 kilograms of extract and an additional unknown quantity of derivatives.

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 2007 and 2008 are summarized below:

- A Canadian citizen with ties to Cameroon was sent to prison for five years and fined 100,000 USD for smuggling African elephant ivory from that country to the United States. This woman ran a sophisticated smuggling operation that utilized local artists and craftsmen in Cameroon, operatives within international shipping companies, contacts in the illegal ivory trade, her business in Canada, and partners in three countries.
- Six subjects were arrested for conspiring to smuggle large quantities of African elephant ivory from the Ivory Coast, Cameroon, and Uganda into the United States via New York. These individuals shipped ivory that was declared as, and had been coated to look like, wooden statues, wooden

musical instruments, and wooden snake handicrafts. Seized ivory from just one shipment alone was appraised at a market value of 165,000 USD.

- A Cameroon national arrested for smuggling 36 elephant ivory carvings in his baggage pleaded guilty to felony charges. He was sentenced to 16 months in prison (after which he will be deported) and fined 5,000 USD.
- A three-year undercover USFWS investigation of large-scale trafficking in sea turtle skin, shell, and products from Mexico and China resulted in multiple arrests and searches in the United States and Mexico in September 2007. Seven individuals arrested in the United States included three Mexican skin dealers and two shell traffickers from China; cooperation with Mexican authorities resulted in five arrests in that country. Prosecutions in the United States secured guilty pleas from all seven defendants arrested here. Prison sentences, which ranged from time served to two years, totalled nine years. Prosecutions are pending for more than a dozen additional defendants. The “skin trade” portion of the investigation, which snared suppliers, manufacturers, wholesalers, retailers, and smugglers, documented 25 separate smuggling transactions involving more than 700 tanned skins of sea turtle, caiman, python, and other protected species, and well over 100 boots and other manufactured items.
- USFWS and Environment Canada investigators broke up a major smuggling organization trafficking in CITES Appendix-II queen conch meat. The individuals and companies involved illegally imported the equivalent of nearly seven semi-trailers of conch meat from several Caribbean and South American countries to the United States and Canada. Multiple prosecutions have occurred in the United States and Canada in connection with this case, which involved nine companies in the United States, Canada, Haiti, Honduras, and Colombia. More than 158,000 USD in fines have been assessed, with several prosecutions still pending.
- An ongoing investigation into the large-scale illegal trafficking of over half a million dollars worth of sperm whale teeth has resulted in U.S. charges against seven individuals. Five guilty pleas have been secured through the reporting period. One of these traffickers was fined 100,000 USD while another must pay a 150,000 USD fine.
- A Japanese butterfly smuggler who tried to sell a USFWS undercover agent nearly 300,000 USD worth of rare and endangered butterflies (including Queen Alexandra’s birdwing butterflies) was sent to prison for 21 months and fined 30,000 USD.
- An Ontario resident charged in both the United States and Canada for wildlife smuggling via the internet was fined 10,000 USD on this side of the border after pleading guilty to one felony count; his transactions involved items made from CITES-protected species.
- A California man who smuggled live Appendix-II eagle owl eggs from Austria pleaded guilty to two counts of smuggling and two counts of making false statements. He was sentenced to 21 months in prison and ordered to pay a 5,000 USD fine.
- A West Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, storeowner charged for smuggling and selling items made from CITES species (including ivory tusks and a gorilla skull) pleaded guilty to all counts of a 10-count indictment; she was sent to prison for five months followed by three years supervised release and was fined 1,000 USD.
- Two South African big game guides involved in an illegal leopard hunting and smuggling scheme both pleaded guilty to Federal charges after being arrested at a sports show in Pennsylvania where both were advertising their businesses. The men tried to import five hides and three skulls of leopards illegally killed in South Africa, smuggled to Zimbabwe, then shipped to the United States with false CITES permits; one was sent to prison for 18 months while the other was fined 5,000 USD. Additional prosecutions in this case to date secured some 60,000 USD in fines and restitution from a taxidermist and four hunters.

- A joint USFWS/Environment Canada investigation of the unlawful importation of walrus trophies taken in Canada resulted in the collection of more than 13,000 USD in fines and the recovery of walrus parts from hunters in California, Texas, and Montana.
- A man suspected of selling protected cats to U.S. breeders pleaded guilty to illegally importing a live Asian leopard cat via Miami. He was ordered to spend six months in home confinement, serve five years probation, pay a 1,500 USD fine, and forfeit the cat, which he had sold for more than 4,000 USD.
- Three individuals involved in the commercial smuggling and interstate sale of guitar picks made from hawksbill sea turtle shell pleaded guilty to wildlife charges. Fines ranged from 500 to 1,500 USD.
- A Florida caviar company and its owner were convicted on charges of conspiracy, false labelling of exports, and illegal export of CITES-protected American paddlefish roe. The caviar dealer, who failed to apply for or secure CITES export permits, falsely described the caviar on shipping invoices and documents as bowfin roe.
- A Russian immigrant in Minnesota, whose internet business acted as a go-between for caviar from former Soviet countries being smuggled through Asia and on to U.S. buyers, pleaded guilty to felony charges and agreed to pay a 30,000 USD fine.
- A Nigerian resident, who smuggled four leopard skins into San Francisco, California, by sewing them into three naugahyde bags and was later caught smuggling numerous large cat teeth concealed in his underwear, pleaded guilty to felony charges. He was sent to prison for six months and ordered to pay 10,000 USD in restitution.
- An Atlanta resident pleaded guilty and was fined 20,000 USD for importing a leopard skin and skull from South Africa with false CITES permits; he must also forfeit the trophy.
- A woman in Oregon was arrested for unlawfully importing three leopard skins.
- A married couple in El Paso, Texas, pleaded guilty to smuggling commercial quantities of exotic leather products into the United States from Mexico. They forfeited 8,700 USD worth of smuggled goods and were ordered to pay 1,500 USD in fines and spend six months in home confinement.
- A mother and daughter from St. Paul, Minnesota, pleaded guilty to smuggling CITES-protected wildlife parts and products (including Asian elephant and leopard cat) from Southeast Asia. The mother ran a retail sales booth at an international market where she sold smuggled wildlife for medicinal use while the daughter financed several of her mother's smuggling trips to Laos.
- A Florida orchid dealer pleaded guilty to illegally importing over 1,400 CITES-protected orchids taken from the wild in the Philippines using CITES documents and other materials that falsely identified them as artificially propagated.

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: CoP14 was held 3-15 June 2007, in The Hague, Netherlands. In 2007 leading up to CoP14, the USFWS published two notices in the U.S. *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. A notice published on 21 February 2007 announced the provisional agenda for CoP14; solicited comments from the public about what negotiating positions the United States should consider taking on species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and other issues submitted by other Parties for consideration at CoP14; and announced a public meeting held in April 2007 to discuss the items on the provisional agenda. A notice published on 1 June 2007 announced the tentative negotiating positions the United States took on species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and other issues submitted by other Parties for CoP14. Following CoP14, on 13 August 2007, the USFWS published a notice announcing the amendments to Appendices I and II adopted at CoP14 and inviting public input on whether the United States should take reservations on any of these amendments.

U.S. submissions for consideration at CoP14: On 4 January 2007, the USFWS submitted the United States' species listing proposals, proposed resolutions, proposed decisions, and discussion documents to the CITES Secretariat for consideration at CoP14. The United States submitted eight species listing proposals: four animal proposals and four plant proposals. The United States also submitted four discussion documents for inclusion in the agenda at CoP14. These discussion documents contained one proposed new resolution, two proposed revisions of existing resolutions, and one proposed decision.

U.S. approved 27 observers for CoP14: In accordance with CITES Article XI, paragraph 7, the USFWS approved 27 national NGOs to attend CoP14 as observers.

Results of CoP14: The United States participated fully in CoP14 in June 2007. Of the eight species listing proposals submitted by the United States at CoP14, four were adopted. The four discussion documents submitted by the United States for consideration at CoP14 resulted in the adoption by the Parties of one new Resolution, one revised Resolution, and two new Decisions. The Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. Management Authority, to continue as the North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee for the intersessional period between CoP14 and CoP15. In addition, Dr. Rosemarie Gnam, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, was selected as the alternate North American Regional Representative on the CITES Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP14 and CoP15.

Public participation in U.S. preparations for CoP15: The USFWS published a notice in the U.S. *Federal Register* on 29 September 2008, as part of the process designed to allow NGOs and the public to participate in the preparations of the U.S. Government for CoP15 (scheduled to be held in March 2010 in Doha, Qatar). This notice solicited recommendations from the public for proposals to amend

CITES Appendix I and II, as well as recommendations for proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items for the United States to consider submitting for CoP15. Additional notices scheduled for publication in the *Federal Register* in 2009 and 2010 leading up to CoP15 will announce those species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and agenda items that the U.S. Government is considering submitting for CoP15, and seek further information from the public to complete proposals for submission; announce the provisional agenda for CoP15, solicit comments from the public about what negotiating positions the United States should consider taking on species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and other issues submitted by other Parties for consideration at CoP15, and announce a public meeting to discuss the items on the provisional agenda; and announce the tentative negotiating positions the United States will take on species proposals and proposed resolutions, decisions, and other issues submitted by other Parties for CoP15.

STANDING COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

55th meeting of the Standing Committee: The 55th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC55) was held in The Hague, Netherlands, on 2 June 2007, immediately preceding CoP14. The United States participated fully in the meeting. Regarding the CITES Standing Committee's Clearing House, the Committee noted the untimely death of Andrea Gaski, with the U.S. Management Authority, who had been a representative to the Clearing House. The Committee elected Bruce Weissgold, also with the U.S. Management Authority, to replace Ms. Gaski as the Clearing House representative.

57th meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent a 9-person delegation to SC57, which was held 14-18 July 2008, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, three from the Department of State, one from the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), one representative of the U.S. States, and one from the U.S. Mission in Geneva. At the meeting, the Standing Committee appointed the United States as chairman of intersessional working groups on purpose codes on CITES permits and certificates, and on trade in crocodylian specimens.

Working group on personal and household effects: The United States is an active participant on this working group. The group submitted Document CoP14 Doc. 45 (*Personal and household effects*), which was considered in Committee II at CoP14 and resulted in the adoption of revisions to Resolution Conf. 13.7 (Rev. CoP14) (*Control of trade in personal and household effects*) and Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP14) (*Permits and certificates*), as well as the adoption of Decision 14.64, directing the Standing Committee to extend the mandate of the working group. The working group will continue through CoP15 to work on a number of technical issues, and the United States will remain active in the discussions of the group.

"MIKE": During 2007-2008, 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: Leading up to CoP14 in June 2007, the United States was an active participant in the Export Quota Working Group (EQWG), which was initially formed after CoP12 following document submissions by Germany and the United States. The EQWG convened at CoP13 and worked electronically intersessionally up to CoP14. The EQWG completed its work by preparing and

submitting Document CoP14 Doc. 36, which was considered in Committee II at CoP14, amended, and adopted, resulting in Resolution Conf. 14.7 (*Management of nationally established export quotas*).

Introduction from the sea: The United States strongly supports continuing efforts to achieve common understanding of the practical application of this CITES provision. The USFWS participated in the 2005 workshop and in the electronic working group following SC54 (October 2006) that refined the definition of the “marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State” based on issues raised at SC54 and comments on the 2005 workshop report. The USFWS actively supported adoption of the working group definition at CoP14 (Resolution Conf. 14.6) and the Decision (14.48) calling for the establishment of a working group on introduction from the sea, to work primarily through electronic means, to consider further clarification of terms and other issues identified in the 2005 workshop report. The United States remains an active participant in the working group.

Working group on review of the universal tagging system and trade in small crocodylian leather goods: Decision 14.62 directs the Standing Committee to establish a working group at SC57 to review the implementation and effectiveness of the CITES universal tagging system and the trade in small crocodylian leather goods. Decision 14.63 directs the Standing Committee to consider the report of this working group at SC58 and submit recommendations, as appropriate, at CoP15. In accordance Decision 14.62, the Standing Committee, at SC57 (July 2008), established an intersessional working group to carry out this review and report at SC58 on its progress. The United States is the chair of this working group, which has been carrying out its work primarily via email exchange.

Working group on purpose codes: Decision 14.54 directs the Standing Committee to establish an intersessional working group to review the use of purpose-of-transaction codes by Parties on CITES permits. In accordance with the decision, the Standing Committee, at SC57, established a working group to carry out this review, report at SC58 on its progress and also on any potential recommendations for CoP15 for amendments to the purpose-of-transaction codes and their definitions in Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP14). The United States is the chair of this working group, which has been carrying out its work electronically through a forum on the CITES website.

CITES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

United States continues as North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee: At CoP14 in June 2007, the Parties from North America selected Mr. Robert Gabel, Chief of the U.S. Management Authority, to continue as the North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee for the intersessional period between CoP14 and CoP15.

United States serving as alternate North American Regional Representative on the Animals Committee: At CoP14 in June 2007, the Parties from North America selected Dr. Rosemarie Gnam, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, as the alternate North American Regional Representative on the Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP14 and CoP15.

17th meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a 6-person delegation to the 17th meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC17), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 15-19 April 2008. The U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS, one from APHIS, one from the U.S. Forest Service, and one from USTR. The United States prepared and submitted two documents for the meeting: one on problems regarding population-specific Appendix-III timber listings; and one, submitted by Robert Gabel of the United States, as the Regional Representative for North America, on plant hybrids and cultivars listed under CITES. The U.S. delegation was

active on numerous issues and participated in a number of working groups at PC17, including those for The Review of Significant Trade in Appendix-II plants, The Periodic Review of the Appendices, orchid annotations, tree species annotations, timber issues, and hybrids and cultivars. Additionally, the United States chaired two intersessional working groups between PC17 and PC18, one on cacti and orchid annotations and one on tree species annotations.

23rd meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent a 6-person delegation to the 23rd meeting of the CITES Animals Committee (AC23), which was held in Geneva, Switzerland, 19-24 April 2008. The interagency U.S. delegation included three representatives from the USFWS and three from NMFS. The United States submitted three documents for the meeting: a working document regarding the U.S. review of the *Lynx* complex under the periodic review of Felidae; an information document providing the U.S. response to CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2007/033 on sharks; and an information document on recommendations on the refinement of the list of shark species of concern, providing an example using the requiem shark group. The United States also participated in a meeting convened by the Nomenclature Specialist, and was a member of six working groups at AC23 pertaining to: The Review of Significant Trade in specimens of Appendix-II species; the periodic review of animal taxa in the Appendices; the periodic review of the Felidae; transport of live specimens; the conservation and management of sharks; and sturgeon and paddlefish.

CITES Source Code 'R': Between the joint meeting of the Animals and Plants Committees at PC15-AC21 (May 2005) and the joint meeting at PC16-AC22 (July 2006), the United States chaired a working group tasked with examining the documents that had been developed on production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species, identifying and defining different production systems for animals and plants, and determining the appropriate source codes for each production system. At the PC16-AC22 joint meeting, although the working group reported progress in some areas, there were still several areas in which the group had not reached consensus. The United States agreed to continue to work with interested Parties and NGO representatives to try to resolve the outstanding areas of disagreement. 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.

As a result, the Parties adopted Decision 14.52, which directed the Animals and Plants Committees to review CITES trade data to determine which Parties utilize Source Code 'R,' and for which species, to evaluate whether the code was is used consistently and properly. In addition, the decision directed the Committees to determine what management programs are being used for the species to which Source Code 'R' is applied. The Committees were then directed to review the literature on wildlife management for current information on management systems that would resemble ranching and identify common elements in these systems. Based on the review of CITES trade data, information obtained from Parties that use the code, and literature on management systems that would resemble ranching, the Committees are to propose a definition for Source Code 'R' for CITES purposes at CoP15.

Documents PC17 Doc. 9 and AC23 Doc. 9 were submitted by the Secretariat for the PC17-AC23 joint meeting (April 2008), and included printouts from the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (WCMC) CITES Annual Report database showing all exports of CITES listed animal and plant specimens with the source code declared as 'R,' for the years 1991-2005. The United States participated in a working group at this joint meeting, which compiled a list of countries to be contacted

with regard to the management programs they are using for species to which they are applying the 'R' source code, and developed a questionnaire that was sent to those countries. The working group also reviewed literature on wildlife management for information on management systems for particular taxonomic groups that would resemble ranching and identify common elements in these systems. Based on the review of the information gathered, the working group will propose a definition for Source Code 'R' for CITES purposes at the next meetings of the Animals and Plants Committees. The United States was an active participant in this working group and carried out a review of literature on wildlife management systems that would resemble ranching for fish and mammals.

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 submitted a document for CoP14 on behalf of the committees containing the draft amendments. The draft amendments were subsequently adopted at CoP14.

Transport Working Group: The United States remains active on the Animals Committee Transport Working Group (TWG). At CoP14, Resolution Conf. 10.21 (Rev. CoP14), which prior to CoP14 was entitled "Transport of live animals," was amended to include transport of live plants, in addition to animals, and is now entitled "Transport of live specimens." The Resolution recommends the International Air Transport Association's (IATA) Perishable Cargo Regulation Manual (PCM) as a reference for air transport of CITES-listed plants. At AC23 a new chairman was named for the TWG and the United States has been working with the new chair in developing a course of action in response to instructions presented to the TWG by the Animals Committee.

The United States participated in the 19th IATA Live Animals and Perishables Board meeting (LAPB19) in Montreal in October 2007 and presented a summary of animal transport issues addressed in the revision of the regulations implementing CITES in the United States (U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 23). The United States also participated in the 21st IATA Live Animals and Perishables Board meeting (LAPB21) in Montreal in October 2008, where an informal meeting of the TWG was held to discuss items raised by IATA and follow up on issues from AC23.

Shark working group: The United States chaired an intersessional Animals Committee working group tasked with refining the list of shark species of concern (Decision 14.107) and prepared a report that was subsequently submitted for AC24 (April 2009).

Periodic review of Felidae: In the summer of 2008, in collaboration with its U.S. State partners and in consultation with Canada and Mexico, the U.S. Scientific Authority conducted a survey of U.S. State and Canadian provincial authorities in order to obtain updated bobcat (*Lynx rufus*) population estimates for the U.S. and Canadian populations. The results of this survey will be published in the scientific literature and available soon.

U.S. participation in the European Regional CITES plants meeting: At the invitation of the European Regional Representative to the Plants Committee, a representative of the U.S. Management Authority

attended the European Regional CITES Plants Meeting, held 7-9 October 2008, in Lampedusa, Italy. It provided an opportunity to present information on U.S. efforts to combat illegal logging, recent amendments to the U.S. Lacey Act to more broadly address illegal trade in plants and plant products to the United States, as well as provide an update on the status of implementation of the U.S.-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement.

Lynx species meeting in Brussels: The United States and the European Union jointly organized a meeting regarding *Lynx* species that was held in Brussels on 29 October 2008. A report on the discussions and outcome of this meeting was subsequently presented at AC24 (Doc. 10.3 Annex).

International Expert Workshop on Non-Detriment Findings: This Non-Detriment Finding Workshop was held in Cancun, Mexico, in November 2008. The United States, represented by the Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, served as a member of the Workshop's Steering Committee and prepared two case studies for the Workshop on American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) and black coral (*Antipatharia*).

OTHER CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES

U.S. submits its 2006 and 2007 CITES annual reports: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare annual reports on its trade in CITES-listed species. On 26 October 2007, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2006. The file (151,731 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2006. On 30 October 2008, the USFWS submitted, directly to WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2007. The file (152,033 data records) contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2007. The data in these data files represent actual trade and not just numbers of CITES permits issued.

U.S. submits its 2005-2006 CITES Biennial Report: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare periodic reports on its implementation of CITES and shall transmit to the Secretariat, in addition to an annual report, a biennial report on legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken to enforce the provisions of CITES. On 17 January 2008, the USFWS submitted to the CITES Secretariat its CITES biennial report for the years 2005 and 2006. This report summarized some of the major legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures taken by the United States during 2005-2006 in its implementation of CITES. Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14) recommends that Parties submit their biennial reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at CoP13 and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submitted its 2005-2006 biennial report in accordance with this new format. The USFWS has posted this report on its CITES website at http://www.fws.gov/international/DMA_DSA/CITES/CITES_home.html.

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

D4. Communication, information management and exchange

U.S. CITES website: In October 2008, the USFWS completed an extensive revision of its international affairs website (<http://www.fws.gov/international>) in an effort to achieve more comprehensive coverage of U.S.-related CITES activities. The new website features easier navigation and information for the general public, as well as USFWS partners, and combines the activities of the U.S. Management and Scientific Authorities. A general CITES page provides basic information on CITES, and a page is currently under development that will feature information on upcoming CITES meetings for participants and observers and link directly to the Secretariat's website. The revised website continues to post copies of U.S. CITES biennial reports and include pages on: CITES timber; queen conch; American ginseng and other medicinal plants; trade in Appendix-III species; furbearer and crocodylian tagging; and sturgeon and paddlefish. Other relevant subjects will be added as content becomes available. The permits section of the revised website is also undergoing changes to include information on permits issued under CITES and other U.S. domestic conservation laws.

Implementation of the Appendix-II listing of pernambuco: The USFWS prepared and disseminated outreach materials and worked closely with the U.S. bow-making industry and musicians to ensure that they were fully apprised of the international trade requirements associated with the Appendix-II listing of pernambuco (*Caesalpinia echinata*), adopted at CoP14. Although the United States will not keep a registration of pernambuco pre-Convention stockpiles held in this country, we have encouraged individuals involved in bow-making to maintain documentation related to the wood in their possession at the time of listing in the event they wish to re-export any wood or unfinished wood articles.

Artificially propagated American ginseng personal effects: In December 2007, the USFWS informed the U.S. American ginseng industry that the United States will no longer use CITES Personal Effects Ginseng Stickers for exports of up to 10 pounds of artificially propagated American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) as personal effects. The discontinuation of the Sticker program does not affect the export of artificially propagated ginseng purchased within the United States by individuals and hand-carried out of the United States. Such exports of personal effects continue to be considered exempt under CITES by the United States.

19th World Orchid Conference: The United States hosted the 19th World Orchid Conference in Miami, Florida, 23-27 January 2008. Staff from the USFWS and APHIS attended to provide information on CITES requirements for trade in orchids, to issue CITES re-export certificates and phytosanitary documents on site, and to give a presentation on the regulation of orchid trade under CITES.

Ivory Fact Sheet prepared: Recent Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS) reports suggest that many shipments of ivory have been exported to the United States for domestic trade. In response to a request from the CITES Secretariat directed to Parties with large amounts of ivory imports, the USFWS prepared a fact sheet summarizing ivory trade and the laws and measures in effect to monitor domestic ivory markets and seize illegally imported shipments. This fact sheet is posted on our website.

Bulletins alert traders to CITES requirements: The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement issued bulletins to the U.S. import-export community providing notification of changes in CITES requirements and U.S. CITES enforcement. Subjects addressed included implementation of the Appendix-II listing for European eel (*Anguilla anguilla*); ban on trade of CITES species from countries without competent Management and Scientific Authorities; lifting of the CITES trade

suspension for Guinea Bissau; U.S. implementation of the reduced amount of caviar allowed as a personal effects exemption; USFWS enforcement of CITES requirements for validation of documents; clarification of requirements for Appendix-III species; trade restrictions on certain CITES species from Equatorial Guinea, Comoros, and Mali; and implementation of Appendix-III red coral listings by China.

Workshop on animal transport safety: The United States participated in a workshop on Animal Transport Safety at the September 2008 Annual Conference of the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA) in Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The workshop brought zoo, airline, and government representatives together to discuss transport-related issues and best practices for the transport of live wild animals.

D5. Permitting and registration procedures

CITES permit applications handled during 2007 and 2008: 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 19,500 CITES applications were received during 2007. Likewise, in 2008, over 22,900 CITES applications were received. In each year, over 25,000 telephone calls, e-mails, and faxes relating to CITES permitting questions were handled by the Division of Management Authority, along with countless calls and e-mails sent directly Law Enforcement regional offices and ports. Along with work involving other permitting processes under additional domestic legislation, such as the U.S. Endangered Species Act and the Marine Mammal Protection Act, 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, applicants respond to specific questions related to the activities 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 applicants respond to the proper questions and minimizes the need to go back to an applicant for additional information during the review process carried out by 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 2007-2008, 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 Japan, the Division of Management Authority provides the Japanese Management Authority with a monthly report of all wildlife export permits and certificates that the United States issued during that month.

State coordination: As part of the requirement to determine legal acquisition of specimens, 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 mississippiensis*), 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'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 13–22 March 2007 and 2–7 June 2008, the Chief of the U.S. Management Authority, who is the North American Regional Representative on the Plants Committee, participated as an instructor in the module on “Scientific Aspects of the Conservation and Management of Plant Species Threatened by Trade” for the Sixth and Seventh Master’s Course, respectively, 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.

Bengal cat pedigree Fact Sheet developed for USFWS wildlife inspectors: CITES requires that any wild cat hybrids, such as the Bengal cat, in international trade must be accompanied by a CITES document except in cases where there are no purebred wild cats in any of the previous four generations of the hybrid cat’s ancestors. The USFWS developed an information sheet to help its wildlife

inspectors determine the pedigree of imported hybrids of wild cats, and to clarify the CITES requirements for CITES-listed species and hybrids as described in U.S. Federal regulations.

Free trade agreements: The United States continues to build capacity and strengthen efforts to implement CITES obligations through Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) and other international partnership programs. In addition to the many FTA provisions that are broadly supportive of effective implementation of CITES (such as the obligation to effectively enforce environmental laws, as well as provisions on transparency, customs cooperation, and rules of origin), U.S. FTAs are complemented by parallel agreements that provide for cooperation on environmental matters, where CITES implementation has been identified as a priority area of work. During the reporting period, capacity building, education and outreach, and training for CITES implementation and enforcement were provided in conjunction with the Dominican Republic – Central America – United States FTA (CAFTA-DR), and the U.S. Middle East Partnership Initiative (MEPI). The U.S. Department of State has funded a wide variety of workshops, training programs, and other activities, which have been implemented by the U.S. Department of the Interior's International Technical Assistance Program (ITAP), working with the USFWS, CITES Secretariat, Central American Commission for Environment and Development (CCAD), Arcenciel, Humane Society International, IUCN Iguana Specialist Group, Oman Environment Society, Texas A&M University, TRAFFIC, University of Tennessee, Zootropic, and others. Activities under the CAFTA-DR have involved government representatives from Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua. Activities under the MEPI have involved government representatives from Bahrain, Jordan, Morocco, and Oman. ITAP expects to continue managing similar activities at least through 2010. The U.S. Forest Service has conducted several wood identification trainings in Nicaragua and Honduras to facilitate the ability of customs and other officials to identify CITES and other timber species. The U.S. Forest Service is also currently writing and publishing an identification manual for 60 commonly traded tropical wood species from Central America and the Caribbean that will help facilitate law enforcement in forestry.

Timber identification training: In 2007, as part of cooperative efforts under the CAFTA-DR, the U.S. Forest Service trained 32 Nicaraguan and 28 Honduran customs officials in wood identification, focused on CITES species. In Nicaragua, training took place in Managua during 6-9 August 2007, and included officials from the Ministry of Natural Resources (MARENA), the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MAGFOR), the Institute of Forestry (INAFOR), Customs (Aduanas), and Fiscal and Legal Authorities Agency (Fiscalia and Procuradadia). Officials came from all over the country, including Bosawas, Puerto Cabezas, Bluefields, Peñas Blancas, and Ocotol. The workshop was organized through a collaborative effort between the U.S. Forest Service and the CITES Management Authority in Nicaragua. In Honduras, the U.S. Forest Service worked closely with the Honduran CITES Management and Scientific Authorities to carry out the training on 27-31 August 2007 at Zamorano University. Officials from around the country were trained, including from the Ministry of Agriculture (SAG), Ministry of Environment (SERNA), Forestry (AFE-COHDEFOR), Customs, Fiscal and Legal agencies (Aduanas, Fiscalia, Procuradadia), as well as the international customs authorities (OIRSA) and universities (Zamorano and ESNACIFOR).

A wood identification training workshop was held in Singapore in late 2007 on the practical techniques for identifying wood of CITES-listed ramin in manufactured products as well as sawn timber form. Supported by the U.S. State Department and the USAID, as well as the U.S. Forest Service, this workshop responded to technical assistance requests made during the ITTO-CITES meeting held in Kuala Lumpur in 2006 by Asian participants, including Singapore. Experts from the U.S. Forest Service Forest Products Laboratory and TRAFFIC International conducted the training

over 4 days for port and customs inspectors from Indonesia, Malaysia, and other Asian countries. TRAFFIC has also conducted follow-on training in the region.

Multinational Species Conservation Funds: The Multinational Species Conservation Funds consist of six programs created to fulfill direct congressional mandates to conserve populations of and habitats for neotropical migratory birds, African and Asian elephants, great apes, rhinoceroses, tigers, and marine turtles. Five of these programs involve CITES-listed species: the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1989, Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997, Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000, and Marine Turtles Conservation Act of 2004. These programs provide direct support to range countries through broad-based partnerships with national governments, NGOs, and other private entities for on-the-ground activities to conserve these species and their habitats. The USFWS administers the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. During the period from January 2007 through December 2008, the USFWS granted a total of 18,518,920 USD for various international projects focused on the conservation of African and Asian elephants, rhinoceroses, tigers, great apes, and marine turtles. Listed below is a breakdown of the funding by grant program:

African elephant:	54 projects totalling 2,559,376 USD in funding
Asian elephant:	57 projects totalling 2,749,001 USD in funding
Rhinoceros & tiger:	77 projects totalling 3,390,496 USD in funding
Great ape:	118 projects totalling 8,259,606 USD in funding
Marine turtles:	46 projects totalling 1,560,441 USD in funding

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 over 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 2007, the USFWS issued over 790,000 tags, and during 2008, the USFWS issued over 760,000 tags. Between January and December 2007, the USFWS approved into the program one State for exports of river otter, one State for exports of bobcat, and one State for exports of sport-hunted American alligators. During the reporting period, 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 reporting period, 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, 82 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 2007, APHIS confiscated 138 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 19,386 plants and 164 seeds, plus an additional 4,259 grams of seeds. Of these 138 shipments, 136 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 747 orchids, 280 cacti, 110 cycads, 52 euphorbias, 20 pachypodiums, and 74 plants of other taxa; plus 100 palm seeds, 64 araucaria seeds, 4,000 grams of palm seeds, and 250 grams of cacti seeds.

During 2008, APHIS confiscated 141 shipments of live plant material in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 1,845 plants and 26 seeds, plus an additional 35 grams of seeds. Of these 141 shipments, 136 were assigned to cooperating plant rescue centers. The assigned shipments contained 1,314 orchids, 247 cacti, 208 carnivorous plants, 25 araucarias, 3 cycads, 3 aloes, and 14 plants of other taxa; plus 22 cycad seeds, 4 cactus seeds, and 35 grams of cactus seeds.

Expanded cooperation between CITES and ITTO: The United States continues to support the expanded program of work of the ITTO to enhance the capacity of members to implement CITES listings for timber species. The current work includes support to enhance CITES implementation for listed taxa, including *Gonystylus* spp., *Aquilaria* spp., *Pericopsis elata*, *Swietenia macrophylla*, and *Cedrela odorata*.

Medicinal Plant Working Group: In 2007 and 2008, the Medicinal Plant Working Group (MPWG) continued to work with national and international organizations to provide outreach on CITES-listed medicinal plants and promote sustainable use and conservation of U.S. native plants. The MPWG continued to collaborate with the U.S. Forest Service to inventory and monitor two non-CITES medicinal plant species on public lands that are wild-harvested and traded internationally but for which there is insufficient information to indicate that such trade is a conservation concern. Additionally, American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) was surveyed on National Park lands. Information from these monitoring projects facilitates the long-term management of these resources on U.S. public lands.

HerbDay 2007: The Chair of the MPWG provided a presentation on the balance between sustainable use and conservation in the United States, including an overview of CITES and the role of the Scientific Authority in conservation of CITES-listed species. HerbDay is sponsored by U.S. herbal organizations and events are organized across the United States to provide an opportunity to inform a broad audience of the role of international trade in medicinal plant conservation.

2008 American Public Gardens Association meeting: The MPWG presented a display at this meeting on medicinal plant conservation issues. This annual meeting is attended by botanic gardens, herbaria, universities, and industry representatives that support these institutions.

North American regional cooperation on medicinal plants: The MPWG Chair continued collaborating with the IUCN-Medicinal Plant Specialist Group and Pollinator Partnership (formerly, the North American Pollinator Protection Campaign) to produce medicinal plant Fact Sheets for practitioners and the general public. This collaboration will provide information on sustainable use and conservation of medicinal plants and their pollinators. Three Fact Sheets were drafted during the reporting period.

Plants for Life: Medicinal Plant Conservation and Botanic Gardens: The MPWG Chair contributed to this international study, coordinated by Botanic Garden Conservation International (Kew, United Kingdom), to explore conservation priorities for medicinal plants. The study outlined key trade, livelihood, and conservation issues, and included a list of more than 400 medicinal plant species recommended for priority conservation work to be undertaken by botanic gardens around the world.

Trilateral: Canada hosted the XII annual meeting of the Canada/Mexico/U.S. Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management in May 2007 in Quebec City, Canada. The work of the CITES Table at the meeting focused primarily on North American regional preparations for CoP14 (June 2007). The meeting presented an opportunity to develop regional positions on species proposals, discussion documents, and other agenda items in advance of CoP14.

In May 2008, Mexico hosted the XIII annual meeting of the Trilateral Committee. The USFWS sent a delegation of four to the meeting in Veracruz, Mexico, to participate in the work of the CITES Table. The primary purpose of the CITES Table at the meeting was to initiate regional consultation in preparation for SC57 (July 2008). Priority issues at the meeting included CITES Finance and Budget Subcommittee, issues related to the listing of several species in the CITES Appendices, the Non-detriment Finding Workshop held in Mexico in the Fall of 2008, and bigleaf mahogany.

Technical workshop on Southeast Asian timber species: In September 2007, a botanist from the U.S. Scientific Authority attended the “Strategies for the Sustainable Use and Management of Timber Tree Species Subject to International Trade: South East Asia” workshop in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. The workshop focused on 115 Southeast Asian timber tree species, including CITES-listed species, which are in international trade and possibly of concern due to potential over-exploitation.

Chinese CITES delegation visit: As part of the U.S.–China Nature Conservation protocol, the United States hosted a delegation of Chinese CITES officials in June 2008, and travelled with them to the ports of entry and exit in New York and Miami, as well as the U.S. CITES offices in Washington, D.C. The official visit afforded an opportunity for the United States to demonstrate its CITES inspection procedures and facilities, and discuss training in CITES implementation, inspection, enforcement, and capacity building with its Chinese counterparts.

Visit from Singapore CITES representative: In September 2008, the United States hosted a representative from the Singapore Wildlife Regulatory Branch, which is responsible for implementation and enforcement of CITES regulations, issuance of CITES permits, inspections, and investigations of wildlife offences in Singapore. Activities included discussions of CITES issues with staff from the U.S. CITES Management and Scientific Authorities and a tour of the CITES inspection facilities at the port of entry and exit in Baltimore, Maryland. The representative from Singapore also presented a demonstration of the Singapore electronic certificate, license, and permits system.