

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



Joint sessions of the 26th meeting of the Animals Committee and
20th meeting of the Plants Committee
Dublin (Ireland), 22-24 March 2012

CAPACITY-BUILDING PROGRAMME FOR SCIENCE-BASED ESTABLISHMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION
OF VOLUNTARY NATIONAL EXPORT QUOTAS FOR APPENDIX-II SPECIES (DECISION 12.91)
REPORT OF THE JOINT WORKING GROUP

1. This document has been jointly prepared by Ms. Carolina Caceres (Representative of North America) and Ms. Madeleine Groves (UK) as co-chairs of the working group on Capacity-building programme for science-based establishment and implementation of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species (Decision 12.91) established at the 19th Plants Committee meeting (March 2010) and the 25th Animals Committee (July 2010)*.
2. The Working Group members are: Chair of the Plants Committee, representatives of Central and South America and the Caribbean (Ms Rivera - PC and Mr Álvarez - AC), Africa (Mr Kasiki - AC), Asia (Mr Soemorumekso - AC), Europe (Mr Sajeve - PC & Mr Fleming - AC) and Oceania (Mr Leach - PC & Mr Robertson - AC), Canada, People's Republic of China, Germany, Indonesia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Peru, Spain, the United States, UNEP-WCMC, American Herbal Products Association, SSN, TRAFFIC International and WWF, Conservation Force, Defenders of Wildlife and Pan African Sanctuary Alliance.
3. At its 12th meeting (CoP12, Santiago 2002), the Conference of the Parties adopted the following decision:

Decision 12.91

Directed to the Secretariat

The Secretariat is encouraged to continue to develop and refine its capacity-building programme dealing with the scientific basis for development, establishment, and implementation of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species, and shall, as appropriate, consult with the Animals Committee and Plants Committee on this programme. This consultation may include:

- a) *solicitation of input from the Committees regarding materials used in the capacity-building programme for voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species; and*
- b) *a request for new information from the Committees on methods used for establishing quotas and for relevant case studies on the establishment of quotas.*

* *The geographical designations employed in this document do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the CITES Secretariat or the United Nations Environment Programme concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The responsibility for the contents of the document rests exclusively with its author.*

4. At its 15th meeting (CoP15, Doha, 2010), the Conference of the Parties adopted the following decision:

Decision 15.24

Directed to the Animals and Plants Committees

The Animals and Plants Committees shall:

- c) *review the non-detriment finding training materials used by the CITES Secretariat when conducting regional capacity-building workshops and provide advice for their improvement;*

5. At the 19th meeting of the Plants Committee (Geneva, Switzerland, 18-21 April 2011) and the 25th Animals Committee (Geneva (Switzerland), 18-22 July 2011), the Committees agreed on the establishment of an Intersessional Working Group on capacity building.

6. According to the summary record of the 19th meeting of the Plants Committee, the mandate of the Working Group was:

to discuss input from the Committee to the Secretariat regarding materials that:

- a) May be used in its capacity-building work relating to voluntary national export quotas for Appendix II species, that go beyond the guidance provided in the Guidelines annexed to Resolution Conf. 14.7 (Rev. CoP15) and
- b) Relate to the making of non-detriment findings through the implementation of Decision 15.24 c). The Secretariat is particularly interested in case studies, examples of application and any methodologies that have been found to be effective in assisting Parties with establishing these quotas.

7. According to the summary record of the 25th meeting of the Animals Committee, the Working Group mandate was to:

assist in the implementation of Decision 15.24, paragraph c)

8. A first email was sent out to all PC and AC members by the WG Co-Chairs in September 2011 confirming the group's mandate and membership, noting the discrepancy between the mandate set for the WG between the Plants Committee and Animals Committee. The Co-Chairs decided to take an inclusive approach to the WG's mandate and combine both.

9. A second email was sent to the Working Group in early November 2011 reconfirming the mandate of the WG and inviting comments and feedback on the NDF and quota documents and training materials available on the CITES website (through the Virtual College) and those arising from the Cancun NDF Workshop (Mexico, November 2008) for submission by 30th December 2011. Members were encouraged to share examples of NDF and quota documents, examples and processes that could be shared with other Parties.

10. The Co-Chairs would like to thank those that replied which were Canada, Germany, the UK, the USA, Worldwide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the *Pan African Sanctuary Alliance* (PASA).

11. With respect to the actions in Decision 12.91 a) and b), at time of drafting, no comments or case studies were presented. The WG Chairs recommend the Committee remind Parties of this request from the Secretariat as part of their representational duties.

12. With respect to Decision 15.24 paragraph c), five WG members provided comment on the form of transmission, design of materials, and content of the Secretariat NDF training materials available on the CITES Virtual College. A summary of comments can be found in the Annex to this report. In addition, the UK indicated a user friendly manual on geophytes is being developed for use in training and application on making NDFs for this plant group. This manual is arising from the work carried out by project partners including Georgia, Turkey, the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, UK and Microsoft Research. Also Germany indicated that together with TRAFFIC International it was designing a practical NDF training, all based on the Cancun draft results and experiences all of which could be fed back into any e-learning or paper training materials including the Virtual College.

Recommendations

13. With respect to Decision 12.91 a) and b), the Plants and Animals Committee is invited to note the following recommendation:
 - a) Request each Committee member seek further examples/case studies from their region to provide to the Secretariat, in particular focusing attention on those countries with existing quotas who may have experiences or case studies to share.
14. With respect to Decision 15.24 c) the Plants and Animals Committee is invited to note the comments within the Annex to this report and transmit these to the Secretariat in fulfilment of Decision 15.24 c) with the following recommendations:
 - a) Request the Secretariat consider the suggestions for improvement as outlined in Annex to this document
 - b) Request the Secretariat make available the contents of the VC in CD form for those without easy access to the VC via the Internet
 - c) Discuss the possibility of a standalone NDF course within the VC
 - d) Request a report from the UK and partners on the geophytes manual and also a report from Germany and TRAFFIC International on the NDF workshops they intend to run to the Plants Committee which could include consideration on how to incorporate material arising from this work into the VC or otherwise informing the Parties about access to this material.

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES REGARDING THE NDF TRAINING MATERIALS
IN THE CITES VIRTUAL COLLEGE (PART A) AND THE MATERIALS
FROM THE INTERNATIONAL EXPERT WORKSHOP ON NDFS (PART B)

<p>PART A</p>
<p>1. Review of the Secretariat's Introduction to CITES and Non-detriment Findings course found on the CITES Virtual College</p>
<p>1.1 The Working Group (WG) was positive about the Virtual College (VC) and the materials contained within it. Each section below outlines the WG's comments and suggestions for improvement.</p>
<p>1.2 Form of Transmission: <i>Are virtual courses effective? Accessible? Are face-to-face training sessions preferred? Are there ways of improving virtual courses?</i></p> <p>1.2.1 General comments from the Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) The WG noted the VC demonstrates the many benefits associated with e-learning tools such as it is readily available, links to other web pages are useful, it can be completed at the participants own pace, there was no course cost as such, it offered the ability to ask questions and self test . The language on the whole was considered easy to understand.b) It was recognised that the course may not suit everyone's training and should not completely replace face-to-face training but it can definitely be a good complement or alternative and valuable resource, depending on the nature of the individuals looking for training and if kept as practical as possible. Poor access to computers and the Internet is a serious limiting factor for some and self motivation to pursue a course online cannot replace meeting trainers and discussing concerns and experiences with other learners first hand. <p>1.2.3 Actions suggested by the Working Group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Overall the WG recognised the need to promote the VC and the resources contained within it or possibilities for containing more material on it further.b) It was suggested that the CITES Secretariat should ensure that copies of the virtual course are made available to Parties in a different format (on a CD/DVD or in a hard format) as an alternative to those with limited or no access to the course.
<p>1.3 Design of Materials: <i>Is the design of the document/course intuitive? Can you find the answer to your question in a straightforward fashion? Is the language easy to understand?</i></p> <p>1.3.1. General comments from the Working Group:</p> <p>In general the materials were considered visually pleasing and informative, and easy to use. The following were highlighted as very helpful:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) "Alert" information as there are the web links to relevant documents.b) Note, the word excellent ("excellent") is misspelled in 4.3(b).c) The course could be strengthened by including short instructional videos (assessed by a link in the green help box), which would elaborate on the various principles and concepts presented in the course. For example, a person could further expand on the biological principles and concepts used in making non-detriment findings and national quotas. An oral presentation might better elucidate certain subjects rather than written text, particularly as there are numerous references for each section. <p>1.3.2 Suggested changes to running order of course sections</p> <p>Several respondents made suggestions with respect to the order of the information in the course to be more</p>

logical, useful and improve understanding:

- a) The concept of exemptions should not be introduced as early as Section 3.3. The vast majority of specimens require permits and it is better for this fact to take root in the trainee's head.
- b) Section 4.3 puts the cart before the horse in dealing with the exceptional circumstances first. The order of the subsections should be d, b, c, a
- c) The sustainable use concept introduced in 4.10 perhaps should be moved to '4.1 Concepts and Terminology' instead for a better fit.
- d) Making an NDF should come first after concepts and terminology, followed by Non-Detriment Findings in CITES (the forms of an NDF, and this should be as fulsome as possible). Next should follow the suite of methods or resources (checklist, Cancun workshop resources, risk assessment, etc.). In this way, the IUCN checklist will have been introduced before delving into the checklist exercise in 4.8.
- e) After the Making an NDF slide, the course delves immediately into risk assessment methodology. There needs to be discussion on all NDF methodologies, written advice, verbal advice, quota, the IUCN checklist, and the Cancun resources, etc., before introducing the concept of risk assessment as an additional method or complimentary method.
- f) Sections 4.3b, 4.3c, and 4.3.d, should come after Section 4.4 Making a Non-Detriment Finding as the message conveyed is that an export quota agreed by the CoP represents the Non-detriment finding (CoP export quotas are one of the forms of an NDF). For a Scientific Authority tasked with making an NDF, in these cases, it is already done through the CoP process. In this regard, 4.3b is a useful reference list of resolutions for species where CoP approved quotas have been established.
- g) The section on *Non-Detriment Findings and Sustainable Use* (4.10) be presented earlier in the course rather than its present location towards the end of the course; move the three sections (4.3(b), 4.3(c), and 4.3(d)) on quotas after the information about making NDFs, and place section 4.3(d) before the other two sections; and move the section on the *Disposal of Illegally Traded, Confiscated and Accumulated Specimens* (4.3(a) near the end of the course. Because the same or similar information is used to develop quotas as the assessment for making a NDFs, it seems practical to place the quota sections after that information and not before as a stand-alone.

The suggested changes to the course outline are in italics, as follows:

- 4.1 Concepts and Terminology
- 4.2 The NDF in CITES
- 4.3 Conference of the Parties (CoP) Advice on NDF
- 4.4 *Non-Detriment Findings and Sustainable Use*
- 4.5 Making a Non-Detriment Finding
- 4.6 Introduction to Risk Assessment Methodology
- 4.7 NDF = Science-Based Risk Assessment
- 4.8 Fundamentals of Risk Assessment Methodology
- 4.9 Checklist to Assist in Making Non-Detriment Findings for Appendix II Exports
- 4.10 *Quotas, NDF and the Role of the Scientific Authority*
 - a) *Acceptance of an NDF Based on Quotas Adopted by CoP*
 - b) *Proposals to Amend such Quotas*
- 4.11 *Disposal of Illegally Traded, Confiscated and Accumulated Specimens*
- 4.12 Similar Processes in Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)
- 4.13 Lesson Summary

1.3.3 Specific changes, additions or issues to highlight in the course

One respondent provided additional specific details regarding design as follows:

- a) For Section 1: It could be clearly stated at the beginning that when you click on a word in green, you have access to more information. This would avoid repeating "click on this to obtain more information" and would be more consistent. It would be helpful to notify the user when the link is going out of the virtual college, and avoid doing so if possible. The content in this section requires updating after each CoP.
- b) For Section 2: In Section 2.2, add information about the Scientific Authority because the training is also about non-detriment findings. In section 2.3, a link should be added to display the CITES Appendices as is done in Section 3. In section 2.4, in the pop-up it would be better not to have another pop-up (i.e., a pop-up in a pop-up - there are too many levels). In section 2.4, for clarity, the title could be changed to "Useful Biological Definitions". In section 2.5, the link would best be

internal to the virtual campus. In section 2.5, we suggest deletion of the last sentence regarding other types of legislation because it applies only in certain cases. The questions in the lessons are good; however, it is difficult to go back to the main menu after a lesson is completed. In the lesson summary, it would be good to add information about the role of the Scientific Authority to make the link with non-detriment findings.

- c) For Section 3: The index in the CITES Appendices section was not found. It would be helpful to provide a link, or an address, to be able to see and search in the checklist.
- d) In Section 4 some may not find the course intuitive enough or straightforward, although it tells the NDF story well. It is thorough and brings in substantial and perhaps all the information relevant to the history of this issue in CITES. However, from the scientific authority perspective, one may be less interested in the issues related to non-detriment findings that have been discussed and more interested in what a non-detriment finding is and what is required and recommended to do in making one. As another example, in 4.3, with respect to the Strategic Vision, it is important for a scientific authority to know that one of the objectives is for NDFs to be based on the best available scientific information. Beyond that, the indicators simply show that NDFs have implications for the measure of CITES' performance. This slide does not provide a scientific authority with additional guidance.

1.4 Content: *Is there too much detail? Not enough detail? Does the course/material give you a comfortable foundation on the topic or are you left with more questions? Does the content reflect the learning objective of the course (did you learn what you expected to learn)?*

1.4.1 Comments on target audiences included:

- a) As scientific authorities were the target audience there were suggestions that the NDF sections and methodology were getting lost in amongst the CITES introductory 'bureaucratic' material (relegate to an annex?) and that a section dealing purely with NDFs, the role of the scientific authority and local and national obligations would work better. It was suggested that an NDF section should focus more on processes on the making of an NDF and of less interest were the number of terms and concepts in the text of the Convention (although good to know) that relate to impacts of trade on species ('4.1 Concepts and Terminology' provides the key information in the first two paragraphs).
- b) Primarily, as a scientific authority taking a course on making NDFs, it may prefer to know that there is no adopted standard for making NDFs, rather there are i) recommended elements to consider, ii) a variety of methods or processes ranging from professional scientific judgement to memos to internal review to documents to export quotas agreed to by the Conference of the Parties; and iii) resources to assist.

1.4.2 Comments on which species lists to use:

Some debate occurred as to the preferred species lists to promote throughout the course:

- a) Appendices – some preferred the Appendices as the preferred primary source and main reference tool although it was recognised by others that they are not always easy to read contrary to the impression given in Section 3.2 because so many are listed at the higher taxon level.
- b) UNEP-WCMC species database – some preferred this database as the primary source and main reference tool
- c) CITES Checklist – recognised by some as easier to read although not always updated in a timely fashion after the Conference of the Parties (CoP). The Species database on the CITES Secretariat website should also be referred to in this section as it is a very useful tool and always updated.

1.4.3 Comments on the three sections of the course concerning quotas (4.3b, c, and d.):

- a) Section 4.3(b), *Acceptance of an NDF Based on Quotas Adopted by the Conference of the Parties*, it would be helpful to add emphasis that Parties should also be tracking existing quotas to insure that they are not exceeded. Because the trade data in the CITES Trade Database is one-two years behind real-time, NDFs can be written based on old trade data. Therefore, Parties need to continually monitor reported trade vs. allowed quotas. Also, it should be stated that a Party's quota for an Appendix I species does not preclude the importing Party from making an NDF with a different decision based on the best available science. It should be recognized that an import finding is to determine whether the "purpose" of the import is not detrimental to the species of concern. That said the course provides little information on the distinction between non-detriment

- findings for Appendix-I and Appendix-II listed taxa.
- b) With regards to 4.3(c), *Proposals to establish or amend such quotas*, are there additional examples of NDFs and quotas that could be provided? The link to the quotas for Africa is for 2009. Has this information been updated? The tropical timber link provided in the “Additional Reading” box is not appropriate for this section. It might be more pertinent to replace it with the link provided in 4.3(c) for the quotas for Africa.
 - c) With regards to 4.3(d), *Quotas, NDF and the Role of the Scientific Authority*, again it would be helpful to emphasize that Parties need to track existing quotas to insure that they are not exceeded.
 - d) Should the course wish to assist Scientific Authorities in evaluating or making their own export quotas, it could provide information necessary to evaluate an established quota and the basic information used to develop an export quota. The ‘Leopard export quotas for Mozambique’ in the Additional Readings is useful in this regard. Slide 4.3c could go beyond listing the categories of supporting information by also providing the typical information that a scientific authority should have in order to establish or support a quota for different types of wildlife. The information in 4.3.d and Resolution 14.7 is general, providing the rules around the use and communication of a quota but there is no direct guidance on how quotas are evaluated by Parties or established by Parties. This part of the course could be improved by providing brief background on the types of information available and some of the resources available for establishing quotas for different types of species, by using a CoP proposal for an export quota to show how to evaluate the wildlife management in place and the information provided to establish the quota, and by providing several examples.

1.4.4 Respondents made comments on other aspects as follows:

- a) Making an NDF is the key slide. It is the most helpful and directed to a scientific authority. It lists the elements that an NDF should be based on, from Resolution 10.3. This is really the main guidance provided by the Convention. However, the Additional Readings section leads to resources from the CBD that may assist the Scientific Authority in establishing procedures for making NDFs. These may be very useful resources but they are introduced before direct mention or summary of the IUCN checklist or Cancun resources which were developed within the context of CITES.
- b) It would be helpful to include an example of a NDF for CITES-listed animal species.
- c) Some found the section on risk assessment approaches valuable for addressing how to deal with uncertainty – although implicit, this section could be expanded to address more overtly how risk assessment contributes to addressing the precautionary approach (the greater the uncertainty and the greater the risk then the need for greater caution). However it was recognised by others that this method is not the only valid one available to Parties and might not be practical for all Parties, particularly when species information is lacking or there is high degree of uncertainty. Valid non-detriment findings can be made by applying scientific judgment that is based on the best available scientific information. It is of critical importance to state that there are many valid ways a Party can make a NDF besides the risk assessment approach.
- d) It is good that the course links to the Cancun workshop. Beyond merely posting a link to the proceedings, it might be more useful to have a few lines on the taxonomic groupings considered and why they were split that way so that the trainee could use the taxonomic guidelines and the case studies more intelligently in their own local context.
- e) Section 4.5 is good but it would be more useful to include the Secretariat's powerpoint presentation to the workshop rather than the subsequent paper. Section 4.6 is a bit out of context, when the IUCN guidelines haven't been introduced
- f) In general, Section 4.7 is excellent. It may work better if the "principles" came last; and the concept of "confidence" or "robustness" of an NDF, as discussed in Cancun, could be incorporated. A 3D version of the graph may be useful.
- g) Sections 4.8 onwards could do more to integrate the IUCN checklist with the thinking coming from Cancun.
- h) The course needs to put more explicit emphasis on the precautionary principle to guide Scientific Authorities in cases of uncertainty as to the impact of trade on a species. This could be done by adding a section titled “Non-detriment findings and the Precautionary Principle” which would be devoted to guiding Scientific Authorities on the use of the precautionary principle in cases of uncertainty. This section should provide information about the significance of the precautionary principle within CITES, and concrete examples showing the use of this principle within CITES. Guidance on the precautionary approach for this section could also be added based on the work emanating from the Cancun workshop. At present, the content of the course does not put enough explicit emphasis on the precautionary principle and that such emphasis is needed to counterbalance the emphasis on sustainable use in Section 4.10 of the course.
- i) Although the virtual course is an “Introduction to CITES and Non-Detriment Findings,” it requires a

good background in CITES and conservation biology to fully understand and appreciate the information provided about making non-detriment findings. As such, the course is best suited for someone familiar with CITES and has a good foundation in conservation biology or wildlife/plant management.

- j) The CITES materials referenced in the course should include all of the same references as what is presented on the Secretariat's web page on making of non-detriment findings, also included under 'Special topics' (<http://www.cites.org/eng/prog/ndf/index.php>)
- k) The inclusion of the IUCN *Guidance for CITES Scientific Authorities: Checklist to assist in making non-detriment findings for Appendix II exports* (Rosser *et al.* 2002) is a useful tool and the exercise on the NDF Checklist use of tables and visual interpretation is informative.
- l) There are many other terms and concepts that could be included in an analysis for making NDFs that are not fully referenced in the virtual course. For example, it is important to include information about how to make a NDF when there is insufficient data. Also, the concept of applying a precautionary approach when there is uncertainty regarding the status of a species or the impact of trade on a species, which might lead to implementing measures that are proportionate to the anticipated risks to the species.
- m) In section 4.6(a), the link to the United States Environmental Protection Agency's risk assessment web page is not pertinent to the course content and the making of NDFs. Therefore, it is suggested that it be removed.
- n) Slide 4.9. In relation to guidance available from other MEAs, the guidance on the ecosystem approach - <http://www.cbd.int/doc/publications/ea-text-en.pdf> - is relevant here.
- o) Much of the focus on the course is, rightly, directed on meeting non-detriment findings as the fundamental requirement of the Convention. However, although some reference is made to Article IV.3 (for Appendix II species) there is little guidance to Parties on how to fulfil those provisions (other than reference in slide 4.d to Res Conf 14.7 that export quotas are one means of ensuring that species are maintained at a level consistent with their role in the ecosystem etc) or, indeed, whether this requires any other activity over and above the making of an NDF. Guidance on meeting the requirements of this Article may be desirable. There should also be some guidance given on maintaining NDF data once it has been analysed to ensure it is easily available for updating and reappraisal.

1.5 Your examples: *Other than the documents referenced here, have you used or developed materials for capacity building or that may improve existing capacity building materials on NDFs and quotas? If your country has established voluntary national export quotas, your specific comments on the available material for establishing quotas, gaps in the available materials and any examples of other guidance material would be welcome.*

1.5.1 Examples of capacity building materials for NDFs:

- a) The Federal Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN) has started a project with TRAFFIC International which will design practical NDF training, based on the Cancun draft results and others' experiences. This project will take into account the virtual college course as well as useful sources of information on how to design e-learning tools.
- b) The UK indicated that it would in association with partners produce a user friendly manual outlined the processes and practicalities of the work on assessing NDFs for geophytes arising from work carried out in Turkey and Georgia along with Microsoft Research.

1.6 Suggestions for additional materials:

- a) Include a Frequently Asked Questions section to the course. The FAQs could highlight pertinent information and situations, and key concepts of the various Resolutions and other relevant documents available through the "Additional Reading" web links.
- b) Provide a link to the International Standard for Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (ISSC-Map) document (available at <http://www.floraweb.de/map-pro/>).
- c) Include as appropriate, information (via web link) about the work carried out between Georgia and the United Kingdom on the harvest of *Galanthus* (snowdrops) and the making NDFs could be included.
- d) Consider a link to the current EU reference guide as some aspects of the guide, (e.g. the question-and-answer style), merit consideration.

PART B

2. Review and comment on the utility of material produced for or coming out of the Cancun Workshop, Mexico (2008) and follow up paper published in the journal Biological Conservation (Smith, et al., 2011) in developing or improving existing capacity building courses or materials.

2.1 General comments from the Working Group:

- a) The 60 case studies and the working group summary reports represent a significant useful resource for scientific authorities as examples to refer to for process as well as for species/taxa-specific information and challenges.
- b) The majority of the working groups emphasized that non-detriment findings are risk assessments. Working groups proposed various ways and presented ideas on how to make such assessments. Refinement of these ideas would be of further use to scientific authorities and would address the challenge of how to arrive at an NDF decision given a suite of scenarios from substantial detailed information to little or no information.
- c) The WG noted the challenges in making NDFs including the lack of capacity in many exporting countries, lack of current biological or trade information and the challenge of how to arrive at the decision.
- d) The WG noted the usefulness to scientific authorities of the IUCN ...Checklist tools (scoring method, associated radar plot) in dealing with the above problems but noted that there is still the need for a scientific authority to interpret the radar plot and weigh the factors, the information gaps, and risk areas, based on the nature of the species, the harvest regime, the management and so on, and come to a decision.

2.2 Suggestions by the Working Group:

- a) Case study leaders and participants could, where necessary, update, finalize and review for accuracy the case studies arising from the Cancun Workshop
- b) The Secretariat could include the case studies or the data from them in NDF/quota reference material, the development of NDF manuals, NDF workshops and for inclusion in the Virtual College along with processes on how to apply them.
- c) The Secretariat, Parties and other organizations could promote further the considerable amount of material on the Cancun workshop website and other NDF resources on the CITES website, including the IUCN Checklist.
- d) The Secretariat could promote the use of other materials/tools to fill information gaps and ensure links to them are made throughout the Virtual College and CITES website e.g. for plants, resource assessment guidance and management planning guidance is offered by the Fairwild Foundation (<http://www.fairwild.org/documents/>).
- e) The Secretariat could better promote and include on the CITES website or within the Virtual College the list of regional and species-specific workshops and exercises containing useful guidance which is found under the 'Background Information' section on the Cancun workshop website (http://www.conabio.gob.mx/institucion/cooperacion_internacional/TallerNDF/background.html#_Regional_and_species-specific).