



U.S. CITES Implementation Report

(for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015)

PREPARED BY:

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

COMPLETED 23 SEPTEMBER 2015

U.S. CITES Implementation Report
(for the period 1 January 2013 through 30 June 2015)

Table of Contents

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| INTRODUCTION | 2 |
| REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES DURING 2013-2015 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 | 9 |
| D1. Management Authority (MA) | 9 |
| D2. Scientific Authority (SA) | 10 |
| D3. Enforcement Authorities | 12 |
| D4. Communication, information management and exchange | 13 |
| D5. Permitting and registration procedures | 16 |
| D6. Capacity building | 19 |
| D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives | 23 |
| D8. Areas for future work | 27 |
| E. General feedback | 29 |
| ANNEX 1 – HIGHLIGHTS OF LEGISLATIVE AND REGULATORY MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION B OF THIS REPORT | 30 |
| ANNEX 2 – HIGHLIGHTS OF COMPLIANCE AND ENFORCEMENT MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION C OF THIS REPORT | 36 |
| ANNEX 3 – HIGHLIGHTS OF ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO SECTION D OF THIS REPORT | 45 |
| D1 and D2. Management Authority (MA) and Scientific Authority (SA) | 45 |
| D4. Communication, information management and exchange | 51 |
| D5. Permitting and registration procedures | 52 |
| D6. Capacity building | 54 |
| D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives | 61 |

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.

However, at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP 16; March 2013), Resolution Conf. 11.17 was revised with respect to Parties' submissions of CITES biennial reports. The resolution now recommends that these reports be submitted "one year before each meeting of the Conference of the Parties." CoP17 is scheduled to begin on 24 September 2016. Therefore, the deadline for submission to the CITES Secretariat of the first "implementation report" is 24 September 2015. This U.S. report covers the time period from 1 January 2013 (the date immediately following the time period covered in the 2011-2012 biennial report), through 30 June 2015.

Work is underway to revise the reporting format under Decision 16.44, but until the new format is adopted, Parties are requested to submit their reports in accordance with the *Biennial Report Format* adopted by the Parties at CoP13 (October 2004) and distributed by the Secretariat in CITES Notification to the Parties No. 2005/035. Therefore, the United States submits this 2013-2015 report in accordance with that recommended format.

The original regulations implementing CITES in the United States were issued on 22 February 1977. 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 reflected measures adopted by the Parties at their regular meetings through CoP13. In 2008, USFWS published revisions to the regulations to include provisions related to international trade in sturgeon and paddlefish caviar adopted by the Parties at CoP14. In 2014, we published revisions that incorporated into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations relevant provisions from Resolutions adopted by the Parties at CoP14 and CoP15. We are currently at work on revisions to incorporate relevant changes adopted at CoP16. U.S. CITES implementing regulations are found in Part 23 of Title 50 in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations (50 CFR Part 23).

On the following pages, using the tabular *Biennial Report Format*, we report on the major legislative, regulatory, and administrative measures for implementation of the Convention taken during the reporting period (1 January 2013 – 30 June 2015). Attached to the tabular report are three Annexes providing narrative highlights of some of these measures with respect to Sections B, C, and D of the tabular report.

**REPORT IN TABULAR FORM OF ACTIVE MEASURES TAKEN BY
THE UNITED STATES 1 JANUARY 2013 THROUGH
30 JUNE 2015 IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION OF CITES**

A. General information

| | |
|--|--|
| Party | United States of America |
| Period covered in this report: | 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015 |
| Details of agency preparing this report | <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS:IA Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: + 1 (703) 358 2095 Fax: + 1 (703) 358 2280 Email: managementauthority@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/international</p> |
| Contributing agencies, organizations or individuals | <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS:IA Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: + 1 (703) 358 1708 Fax: + 1 (703) 358 2276 Email: scientificauthority@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/international</p> <p>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement 5275 Leesburg Pike, MS:LE Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: + 1 (703) 358 1949 Fax: + 1 (703) 358 2271 Email: lawenforcement@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/le</p> |

B. Legislative and regulatory measures

| 1 | <p>Has information on CITES-relevant legislation already been provided under the CITES National Legislation Project? If yes, ignore questions 2, 3 and 4.</p> | <p>Yes (fully) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (partly) <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information/unknown <input type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|--|--|-----|----|----------------|-----|----|----------------|-------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2 | <p>If any CITES-relevant legislation has been planned, drafted or enacted, please provide the following details:</p> <p>Title and date: _____ Status: _____</p> <p>Brief description of contents: _____</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | <p>Is enacted legislation available in one of the working languages of the Convention?</p> | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | <p>If yes, please attach a copy of the full legislative text or key legislative provisions that were gazetted.</p> | <p>legislation attached <input type="checkbox"/> provided previously <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> not available, will send later <input type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | <p>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</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Issue</th> <th colspan="3">The conditions for:</th> <th colspan="3">The complete prohibition of:</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>No information</th> <th>Yes</th> <th>No</th> <th>No information</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Trade</td> <td align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Taking</td> <td align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Possession</td> <td align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Transport</td> <td align="center"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other (specify)</td> <td align="center"><input type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Issue | The conditions for: | | | The complete prohibition of: | | | Yes | No | No information | Yes | No | No information | Trade | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Taking | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Possession | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Transport | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Issue | 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"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>Major stricter domestic measures in the United States that in many instances affect CITES-listed species include the Endangered Species Act (ESA), the Lacey Act, the Wild Bird Conservation Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, the African Elephant Conservation Act, the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act, and State natural resource and wildlife laws, and State and Federal regulations associated with these laws.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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: | | | | | |
| During previous and current efforts to revise the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation with regard to each of the above subjects related to the effectiveness of CITES implementation. | | | | | |
| In May 2014, USFWS published a final rule incorporating into the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations relevant provisions adopted at CoP14 and CoP15. Revisions to incorporate relevant changes adopted at CoP16 are currently under development. | | | | | |
| 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"/> | |
| Please provide details if available: | | | | | |
| During previous and current efforts to revise the U.S. CITES-implementing regulations, USFWS reviewed U.S. legislation with regard to each of the above subjects related to CITES implementation. | | | | | |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 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. | “commodities.” See ANNEX 2 under the category “CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES,” for details on representative seizures. | | |
| 6 | Have there been any criminal prosecutions of significant CITES-related violations? | <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>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 from 1 January 2013 through 30 June 30 2015.</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>U.S. Ivory Crushes: On 14 November 2013, at the USFWS’ National Wildlife Property Repository on Rocky Mountain Arsenal National Wildlife Refuge near Denver, Colorado, USFWS destroyed its 6-ton stock of confiscated elephant ivory in the first U.S. ivory crush. USFWS took this action to send a clear message that the United States will not tolerate ivory trafficking and is committed to protecting elephants from extinction. A second ivory crush was held on 19 June 2015, in Times Square, New York City, to destroy ivory from seizures and cases that had been resolved since 2013. Approximately one ton of elephant ivory was destroyed including full tusks, carved tusks, hundreds of smaller carvings, and other objects. Both ivory crushes generated a significant amount of media coverage and ignited conversation on social media. On the day of the first U.S. ivory crush, #IvoryCrush was the top trending topic in the United States, Canada, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. In addition, some confiscated specimens were also donated to educational facilities for use in conservation education to improve public</p> | | | |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|--|
| | understanding of wildlife conservation and trade issues. | | |
| 11 | Has detailed information been provided to the Secretariat on significant cases of illegal trade (e.g. through an ECOMESSAGE or other means), or information on convicted illegal traders and persistent offenders? | Yes <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>USFWS routinely shared intelligence on potential CITES violations with the CITES Secretariat, appropriate enforcement authorities in other CITES Party nations, and Interpol.</p> <p>USFWS cooperative enforcement efforts during the reporting period included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducting cooperative inspection blitzes with Canadian wildlife and customs authorities at various ports of entry along the U.S.-Canada land border; • Conducting cooperative U.S., Canada, and Mexico investigations of illegal reptile trafficking and smuggling of totoaba and Asian arowanas; • Participating in wildlife trafficking workshop in Mexico focusing on totoaba, sea cucumber, and coral; • Stationing an international special agent attaché in Bangkok, Thailand, to build enforcement capacity; participating in multinational enforcement operations targeting illegal trade in wildlife; working to dismantle trafficking networks and prevent others from resuming their illegal activities; increasing coordination and cooperation across U.S. enforcement and intelligence agencies to detect, interdict, and investigate wildlife trafficking; enhancing information gathering and sharing; and providing support to regional Wildlife Enforcement Networks; and • Continuing the Trilateral meetings with Canada and Mexico to support the information exchange between international law enforcement officers, expand collaboration for measuring and sampling endangered wildlife, and develop joint operational plans. | | |
| 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 ESA (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>USFWS worked proactively to improve CITES compliance by maintaining and improving communication with the U.S. wildlife import/export community and working directly with key groups and individual companies involved in wildlife trade. Specific compliance assistance activities from 1 January 2013 through 30 June 2015 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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; • One-on-one CITES compliance guidance to company representatives and individuals engaged in wildlife trade; • Operation of an e-mail-based “contact” service to answer specific questions on wildlife import/export requirements and other enforcement issues; • Presentations and training on CITES and U.S. wildlife import/export requirements to other Federal agency officials, brokers, airlines, state game wardens, and international officials; and • Leveraged resources by combining a “Report Wildlife Trafficking” tip line (email address and toll free phone number) with USFWS’ Law Enforcement Office within the Refuge program. | |

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 (DMA) is the only CITES Management Authority in the United States. Currently, 33 staff work in the Division of Management Authority. | |

| | | | |
|----|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 6 | Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters? If yes, please give estimation: About 75 percent. | Yes No No information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7 | What are the skills/expertise of staff within the MA(s)? | Tick if applicable | |
| | - Administration | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | - Biology | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | - Economics/trade | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | - Law/policy | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | - Other (Outreach/Education) | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | - No information | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8 | Have the MA(s) undertaken or supported any research activities in relation to CITES species or technical issues (e.g. labelling, tagging, species identification) not covered in D2(8) and D2(9)? | Yes No No information | <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9 | If Yes, please give the species name and provide details of the kind of research involved. | | |
| 10 | Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See ANNEX 3, Section "D1 and D2," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts. | | |

D2 Scientific Authority (SA)

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

| | | | | | | | |
|---|--|-------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|---|
| | the United States. Currently, 10 staff in the Division of Scientific Authority work on CITES issues. | | | | | | |
| 6 | Can you estimate the percentage of time they spend on CITES-related matters | | | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | If yes, please give estimation: About 80 percent. | | | 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | – Forestry | | | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | – Welfare | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | – Zoology | | | | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | – Other (specify) | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | – No information | | | | | | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8 | Have any research activities been undertaken by the SA(s) in relation to CITES species? | | | Yes | <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) |
| | Polyodon spathula | Rangewide | United States | | X | | In partnership with the Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) and the U.S. States, the U.S. Scientific Authority is examining the sustainable management practice for this species and has recently undertaken research into age structure. |
| | Hydrastis Canadensis | Rangewide | United States and Canada | | | | Updated the NatureServe Global and State rankings for this species, including economic uses, IUCN Red List assessment, and Climate Change Vulnerability Index ranking (2012-2013). The IUCN Red List assessment pending review and publication by IUCN. |
| | 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: See ANNEX 3, Section “D1 and D2,” for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015, for which the U.S. Management and/or Scientific Authorities were integral parts. | |

D3 Enforcement Authorities

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Has the Secretariat been informed of any enforcement authorities that have been designated for the receipt of confidential enforcement information related to CITES? | Yes <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 5275 Leesburg Pike MS: LE Falls Church, Virginia 22041 United States of America Tel: + 1 (703) 3581949 Fax: + 1 (703) 3582271 Email: lawenforcement@fws.gov Web: http://www.fws.gov/le | |
| 5 | Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See ANNEX 2, under the category “CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES,” for information on criminal prosecutions and seizures of specimens of CITES-listed species. | |

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 | Yes, but only through a dial-up connection | Yes, but only through a different office | Some offices only | Not at all | Please provide details where appropriate |
| | Management Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Scientific Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Enforcement Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3 | Is there an electronic information system providing information on CITES species? | | | | | | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | | | | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | | | | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | | | | | | information <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| 4 | <p>If Yes, does it provide information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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 ESA, Wild Bird Conservation Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and Marine Mammal Protection Act. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <p>Tick if applicable</p> | | |
| 5 | <p>Is it available through the Internet: Note: USFWS is currently working on reprogramming the U.S. Combined Species database to make it available via the Internet. Please provide URL:</p> | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> | | |
| 6 | <p>Do the authorities indicated have access to the following publications? Tick if applicable</p> | | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;">Publication</p> | | <p style="text-align: center;">Management Authority</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Scientific Authority</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Enforcement Authority</p> |
| <p>2005 Checklist of CITES Species (book)</p> | | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>2008 Checklist of CITES Species and Annotated Appendices (CD-ROM)</p> | | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>Identification Manual</p> | | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| <p>CITES Handbook</p> | | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> |
| 7 | <p>If not, what problems have been encountered to access this information?</p> | | | |
| 8 | <p>Have enforcement authorities reported to the Management Authority on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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"/> <p>Comments:</p> | <p>Tick if applicable</p> | | |
| 9 | <p>Is there a government website with information on CITES and its requirements?</p> <p>If Yes, please give the URL: http://www.fws.gov/international; http://www.fws.gov/le; and</p> | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> | | |

http://www.aphis.usda.gov/import_export/plants/plant_imports/cites_endangered_plants.shtml
http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?c=ecfr&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title50/50cfr23_main_02.tpl

| | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|
| 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | – Other (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | <p>Please attach copies of any items.</p> | |
| | <p>Note: These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report.</p> | |
| 11 | <p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USFWS Law Enforcement and DMA representatives staffed a compliance outreach booth at the national convention of Safari Club International in Nevada in 2013. USFWS also attended the Dallas, Texas, Safari Club Convention in January, 2015. USFWS participation at these events raises hunter awareness about CITES import/export permit requirements and helps improve compliance with the Convention by global big game hunters. • In November 2013 (Denver, Colorado) and June 2015 (Times Square, New York City), USFWS Law Enforcement crushed over 7 tons of confiscated ivory to send a message to ivory traffickers and their customers that the United States will not tolerate this illegal trade. It is hoped these crushes will also educate consumers in the United States and around the world, and encourage them not to buy products made with ivory that could be contributing to the poaching crisis. The events were viewed over social media, and other Internet technologies, by tens of thousands around the world. • In partnership with the Association of Zoos and Aquariums (AZA), USFWS issued a global design challenge seeking creative ideas on how best to use the crushed ivory from the U.S. Ivory Crushes to raise public awareness of wildlife trafficking and help reduce demand for elephant ivory and other illegal wildlife products. The art produced by the global design challenge will be part of a Demand Reduction Campaign. The Demand Reduction Campaign outreach displays will be updated and modernized. | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Suitcase for Survival program (collaboration between USFWS and TRAFFIC) is being restructured with newer technologies and an updated curriculum that will be circulated throughout the U.S. educational system. The program supplies materials, including confiscated specimens, to build awareness of the illegal wildlife trade. • USFWS law enforcement officers, forensic laboratory scientists, and the wildlife repository personnel are regularly interviewed by U.S. and international print, television, and online journalists and production companies and the final articles and shows are circulated worldwide. • USFWS law enforcement officers present educational outreach programs to elementary, middle, and high school students; environmental, conservation, and law enforcement university students; law school students; Federal agency staff; and private industry professionals highlighting wildlife conservation and ways the public can help reduce wildlife crime, trafficking, and take. <p>See ANNEX 3, Section “D4,” for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015, with respect to communication, information management, and information exchange.</p> |
|--|---|

D5 Permitting and registration procedures

| | | | | | |
|----------|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | Have any changes in permit format or the designation and signatures of officials empowered to sign CITES permits/certificates been reported previously to the Secretariat? If no, please provide details of any: Changes in permit format: Changes in designation or signatures of relevant officials: | Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | | |
| | | No | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| | | Not applicable | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| | | No information | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |
| 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"/> | |

| Please indicate how many CITES documents were issued and denied in the two year period? (Note that actual trade is reported in the Annual Report by some Parties. This question refers to issued documents). | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------|------------------|--------------|---|
| Year 1 (2013) | Import or introduction from the sea | Export | Re-export | Other | Comments |
| How many documents were issued? | 549 | 11,515 | 7,439 | 833 | A total of 20,336 CITES documents were issued during 2013. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 833 “other” documents, 307 were for either export or re-export (cannot differentiate for these) and 526 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificates of ownership). |
| How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation? | 0 | 9 | 3 | 1 | A total of 14 applications were denied, either in whole or partially, during 2013. |
| Year 2 (2014) How many documents were issued? | 562 | 11,638 | 7,865 | 441 | A total of 20,506 CITES documents were issued during 2014. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 441 “other” documents, 34 were for either export or re-export (cannot differentiate for these) and 407 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificate of ownership). |
| How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation? | 0 | 7 | 0 | 2 | A total of 3 applications were denied, either in whole or partially, during 2014. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-------|-------|-----|---|
| <p>Year 3 (1st 6 months of 2015) How many documents were issued?</p> | 254 | 6,176 | 3,248 | 234 | <p>A total of 9,912 CITES documents were issued during the first 6 months of 2015. Of the import permits issued, the vast majority were for sport-hunted trophies. Of the 234 "other" documents, 31 were for either export or re-export (cannot differentiate for these) and 203 were certificates (e.g., travelling exhibition, certificate of ownership).</p> |
| <p>How many applications were denied because of serious omissions or misinformation?</p> | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | <p>A total of 4 applications were denied, either in whole or partially, during the first 6 months of 2015.</p> |
| 4 | <p>Were any CITES documents that were issued later cancelled and replaced because of serious omissions or misinformation?</p> | | | | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| 5 | <p>If Yes, please give the reasons for this.</p> | | | | |
| 6 | <p>Please give the reasons for rejection of CITES documents from other countries.</p> | | | | <p>Tick if applicable</p> |
| 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 | <p>Are harvest and/or export quotas used as a management tool in the procedure for issuance of permits?</p> <p>Comments</p> | | | | <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| 8 | <p>How many times has the Scientific Authority been requested to provide opinions?</p> <p>Between 1 January 2013 and 30 June 2015, the U.S. Scientific Authority provided individual findings in response to 460 CITES permit applications. During this time frame, the U.S. Scientific Authority also issued 22 programmatic findings that are valid for at least one year and authorize or deny import or export of specimens. The programmatic findings eliminate the need for individual findings, provided documentation requirements are met. Permit applications covered a wide range of activities including import and export of biological specimens, import of sport-hunted trophies, import of live animals, export of wild-sourced native species, certificates of artificially propagated plants, export of non-native captive-born animals, and bred-in-captivity certificates.</p> | | | | |

| | | |
|----|---|---------------------------|
| 9 | <p>Has the MA charged fees for permit issuance, registration or related CITES activities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 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"/> | <p>Tick if applicable</p> |
| 10 | <p>If Yes, please provide the amounts of such fees.</p> <p>U.S. permit fees vary depending on the activity requested. The fees are listed in the U.S. Code of Federal Regulations Title 50, Part 13, Section 13.11.</p> | |
| 11 | <p>Have revenues from fees been used for the implementation of CITES or wildlife conservation?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Entirely: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> - Partly: <input type="checkbox"/> - Not at all: <input type="checkbox"/> - Not relevant: <input type="checkbox"/> <p>Comments:</p> | <p>Tick if applicable</p> |
| 12 | <p>Please provide details of any additional measures taken:</p> <p>See ANNEX 3, Section "D5," for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015, with respect to permitting and registration procedures.</p> | |

D6 Capacity building

| | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1 | <p>Have any of the following activities been undertaken to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level?</p> | | <p>Tick if applicable</p> |
| Increased budget for activities | | <input type="checkbox"/> | Improvement of national networks <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Hiring of more staff | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Purchase of technical equipment for monitoring/enforcement <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Development of implementation tools | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Computerization <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Other (specify): | | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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.

- On 15 March 2014, the U.S. Food and Drug Administration, USFWS, and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) joined the Commercial Targeting and Analysis Center (CTAC) in Washington, D.C., to partner with U.S. Customs and Border Protection (CBP) and seven other participating Federal agencies to enhance targeting efforts on commercial imports posing a threat to the health and safety of the American public or other border management goals such as conservation of species.
- In 2013, USFWS launched its first ever professional wildlife detector dog program, stationing professionally trained wildlife inspector/canine teams at the ports of Miami, Florida, Louisville, Kentucky, Chicago, Illinois, and Los Angeles, California. The dogs and their handlers reported for duty in April 2013 after completing a rigorous training program at a U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) training center near Atlanta, Georgia.
- In early 2015, USFWS Law Enforcement hired 24 additional special agents and several of the open positions, frozen by the Federal Government's hiring freeze, have been or will be filled.

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"/> | Other U.S. Government agencies, traders, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), scientific experts, and the public. |
| Staff of Scientific Authority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Staff of enforcement authorities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Other (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | |

3

Have the CITES authorities been the providers of any of the following capacity building activities?

| Please tick boxes to indicate which target group and which activity. | 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 checked="" 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:

- USFWS wildlife inspectors nationwide conducted wildlife import/export training sessions for CBP Protection enforcement officers at U.S. ports of entry and border crossings.
- In 2013, USFWS Law Enforcement placed four wildlife detector dogs at four U.S. ports of entry.
- In response to the wildlife poaching crisis in Africa and Southeast Asia, USFWS presented comprehensive criminal investigations training programs in 2013, 2014, and 2015 at the U.S. State Department's International Law Enforcement Academy in Botswana and Thailand. Officers from sub-Saharan African nations (Botswana, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Republic of the Congo, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, and Zambia) and from Southeast Asia (China, Thailand, Brunei, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor-Leste, Hong Kong, Macau, Singapore, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, and Viet Nam) completed the intensive two-week course, which included both classroom studies and a mock investigation.
- In January 2014, the first international special agent attaché was stationed in Bangkok, Thailand. Three additional attachés have been selected for Peru, Botswana, Tanzania, and one additional attaché for Asia has been approved.
- USFWS Law enforcement staff completed a 3-month detail in Bangkok, Thailand, focused on investigative coordination; spent three weeks in Togo providing investigative assistance to authorities on ivory trafficking; and made multiple trips to the Philippines to help develop a wildlife law enforcement database.
- USFWS Law enforcement staff represented the United States at conferences on timber trafficking in Brussels, Belgium, and London, the United Kingdom; a global meeting on corruption and wildlife trafficking in Thailand; the 12th African Wildlife Consultative Forum in Zambia; and, in Kenya, the CITES Rhinoceros Enforcement Task Force meeting, the INTERPOL Wildlife Crime Working Group, and TRAFFIC's workshop addressing wildlife trafficking.
- The USFWS National Fish and Wildlife Forensics Laboratory in Ashland, Oregon, hosted a one-week training program for forensic experts from Southeast Asia in August 2013. During the reporting period, Laboratory scientists also provided forensics training and consultation in Vietnam and Australia.
- In June 2013, the USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and USFWS conducted a CITES training workshop in Brownsville, Texas, for APHIS and CBP inspectors of the Southwestern region of the United States.
- In June 2014, APHIS and USFWS conducted a CITES training workshop in Seattle, Washington, for APHIS and CBP inspectors of the Western region of the United States. In addition, several inspectors from Canada's Food inspection Agency were attendance.
- In June 2015, APHIS and USFWS conducted a CITES training workshop in Linden, New Jersey, for APHIS and CBP inspectors of the Northeastern region of the United States.

See ANNEX 3, Section “D6,” for highlights of some of the other major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015, with respect to capacity building.

D7 Collaboration/co-operative initiatives

| | |
|----------|--|
| 1 | <p>Is there an interagency or inter-sectoral committee on CITES?</p> <p style="text-align: right;"> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> No information <input type="checkbox"/> </p> |
| 2 | <p>If Yes, which agencies are represented and how often does it meet?</p> <p>The U.S. interagency CITES Coordination Committee (CCC) meets 3-4 times a year. The following agencies are represented in the CCC:</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Management Authority</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Division of Scientific Authority</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Office of Law Enforcement</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior Office of the Solicitor</p> <p>U.S. Department of the Interior International Technical Assistance Program</p> <p>U.S. Department of Commerce National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service</p> <p>U.S. Department of Agriculture Foreign Agriculture Service</p> |

| | <p>U.S. Department of Justice</p> <p>U.S. Department of State</p> <p>Office of the U.S. Trade Representative</p> <p>U.S. Department of Commerce</p> <p>U.S. Agency for International Development</p> <p>Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies</p> <p>U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection</p> <p>Smithsonian Institution National Museum of Natural History</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------|--------|---------|----------|------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| 3 | <p>If No, please indicate the frequency of meetings or consultancies used by the Management Authority to ensure co-ordination among CITES authorities (e.g. other MAs, SAs, Customs, police, others):</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Daily</th> <th>Weekly</th> <th>Monthly</th> <th>Annually</th> <th>None</th> <th>No information</th> <th>Other (specify)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Meetings</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Consultations</td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | | | | | | | Daily | Weekly | Monthly | Annually | None | No information | Other (specify) | Meetings | <input type="checkbox"/> | | Consultations | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| | Daily | Weekly | Monthly | Annually | None | No information | Other (specify) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Meetings | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Consultations | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | <p>At the national level have there been any efforts to collaborate with:</p> | | | | <p>Tick if applicable</p> | | <p>Details if available</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Agencies for development and trade</p> | | | | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Provincial, state or territorial authorities</p> | | | | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Local authorities or communities</p> | | | | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Indigenous peoples</p> | | | | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Trade or other private sector associations</p> | | | | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>NGOs</p> | | | | <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | <p>Other (specify)</p> | | | | <p><input type="checkbox"/></p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | |
|----|--|--|
| 5 | <p>To date, have any Memoranda of Understanding or other formal arrangements for institutional cooperation related to CITES been agreed between the Management Authority and the following agencies?</p> <p>Scientific Authority <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Customs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Police <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other border authorities (specify): USFWS Law Enforcement; U.S. Department of Agriculture Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA-APHIS); and U.S. Department of Homeland Security Customs and Border Protection (DHS-CBP) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other government agencies <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Private sector bodies <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>NGOs <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Tick if applicable</p> |
| 6 | <p>Has Government staff participated in any regional activities related to CITES?</p> <p>Workshops <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Meetings <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Other (specify) <input type="checkbox"/></p> | <p>Tick if applicable</p> |
| 7 | <p>Has there been any effort to encourage any non-Party to accede to the Convention?</p> | <p>Yes <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| 8 | <p>If Yes, which one(s) and in what way?</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>From 2 January 2013 – 30 June 2015: USFWS Law Enforcement personnel:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presented seven comprehensive criminal investigations training programs at the U.S. State Department's International Law Enforcement Academy in Botswana and Thailand. Officers from sub-Saharan African nations (Botswana, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa, Republic of the Congo, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Malawi, and Zambia) and from Southeast Asia (China, Thailand, Brunei, Malaysia, Indonesia, Philippines, Timor-Leste, Hong Kong, Macau, Singapore, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, and Vietnam) completed the intensive two-week course, which included both classroom studies and a mock investigation. Presented training for forensic specialists from Southeast Asia and Australia Participated in the conference of the Central American Dominican Republic | |

| | |
|----|--|
| | <p>Wildlife Enforcement Network in Costa Rica.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conducted an anti- smuggling training program hosted by the Department of Homeland Security in Bangkok, Thailand, providing courses on CITES, surveillance, controlled deliveries, and crime scene processing to 40 participants from Thailand, Laos, and Myanmar. • Met with United States Africa Command (AFRICOM) representatives in Stuttgart, Germany, to conduct in-person classified briefings on wildlife trafficking intelligence and establish protocols and persons which would disseminate and receive intelligence intercepts. • Completed a 3-month detail in Bangkok, Thailand, focused on investigative coordination; spent three weeks in Togo providing investigative assistance to authorities on ivory trafficking; and made multiple trips to the Philippines to help develop a wildlife law enforcement database. • Represented the United States at conferences on timber trafficking in Brussels, Belgium, and London, the United Kingdom; a global meeting on corruption and wildlife trafficking in Thailand; the 12th African Wildlife Consultative Forum in Zambia; and, in Kenya, the CITES Rhinoceros Enforcement Task Force meeting, the INTERPOL Wildlife Crime Working Group, and TRAFFIC's workshop addressing wildlife trafficking. • U.S. CITES delegation visit to China: As part of the U.S.-China Nature Conservation protocol, in June-July 2013, the U.S. CITES Management and Scientific Authorities sent a delegation to China to meet with the State Forestry Administration of the People's Republic of China. U.S. and Chinese officials discussed results of CoP16 and strategies for reducing consumer demand for products from threatened and endangered wildlife species. In addition, they participated in a turtle identification workshop with Chinese Customs officers and had the opportunity to visit a turtle farm and an ivory carving facility. |
| 11 | <p>Has any data been provided for inclusion in the CITES Identification Manual?</p> <p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>No information <input type="checkbox"/></p> |
| 12 | <p>If Yes, please give a brief description:</p> <p>The United States has taken an active role in improving the Wiki ID Manual, which currently presents challenges with respect to accessibility and content, and in its utility for inspection and enforcement officers. The United States led the Drafting Group for Decisions 16.59-16.61, adopted by the CITES Parties at CoP16, directing the Animals and Plants Committees and the Secretariat to survey existing and needed identification materials, and explore improvements and dissemination of these materials. During the reporting period, ID sheets for all species of North American map turtles (<i>Graptemys</i> spp.) and the alligator snapping turtle (<i>Macrochelys temminckii</i>) have been completed, and are ready for submission.</p> <p>This material has not been uploaded to the Wiki Manual because the Wiki platform is unable to accommodate identification materials that are produced on a genus level or that are based on a dichotomous key format. This problem will be explored as part of the Joint Intersessional Working Group on the Identification Manual. The United States</p> |

| | | | |
|----|---|-----------------------------|---|
| | is also developing ID Sheets for three turtle species that were listed in Appendix II at CoP 16: Blanding's turtle (<i>Emydoidea blandingii</i>), spotted turtle (<i>Clemmys guttata</i>), and diamondback terrapin (<i>Malaclemys terrapin</i>). Drafts are currently being reviewed internally and the completed pages will be ready for distribution by fall 2015. | | |
| 13 | Have measures been taken to achieve co-ordination and reduce duplication of activities between the national authorities for CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the biodiversity-related Conventions)? | Yes No No information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14 | If Yes, please give a brief description. For an example, see ANNEX 3, Section "D7," under "Cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO)." | | |
| 15 | Please provide details of any additional measures taken: See ANNEX 3, Section "D7," for highlights of some of the major CITES-related administrative measures taken by the United States for the period 1 January 2013 to 30 June 2015, with respect to collaboration and cooperative initiatives. | | |

D8 Areas for future work

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | Are any of the following activities needed to enhance effectiveness of CITES implementation at the national level and what is the respective level of priority? | | | |
| | Activity | High | Medium | Low |
| | Increased budget for activities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Hiring of more staff | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Development of implementation tools | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Improvement of national networks | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | Purchase of new technical equipment for monitoring and enforcement | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | Computerization Other (specify) | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <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 No No information | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| 3 | If Yes, which one(s) and what is the main difficulty? Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP14) on Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use: The United States worked with leopard (<i>Panthera pardus</i>) range countries to resolve problems associated with the import of some leopard hunting trophies. We developed a discussion document for consideration at the 62 nd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC62) in July 2012 (Document SC62 Doc. 35), and draft revisions to the Resolution for consideration at CoP16. The draft | | | |

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------|---|
| | revisions to Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP14) were adopted, with minor changes, at CoP16 in March 2013. | | |
| 4 | Have any constraints to implementation of the Convention arisen in your country requiring attention or assistance? | Yes No No information | <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <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 No No information | <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <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 NOTE: Already provided. | Enclosed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not relevant | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| C3 | Details of violations and administrative measures imposed NOTE: See attached ANNEX 2. | Enclosed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C5 | Details of specimens seized, confiscated or forfeited NOTE: See ANNEX 2. | Enclosed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C7 | Details of violations and results of prosecutions NOTE: See ANNEX 2. | Enclosed | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not relevant | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| C9 | Details of violations and results of court actions NOTE: See ANNEX 2. | 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 NOTE: These items are too numerous to gather together and attach to this report. Comments | Enclosed | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not available | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| | | Not relevant | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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: USFWS published revised CITES-implementing regulations in 2007, 2008, and 2014. The current regulations, which became effective in June 2014, incorporate provisions from Resolutions adopted by the Parties through CoP15. U.S. CITES-implementing regulations are found in the Code of Federal Regulations (in 50 CFR part 23) and are available at http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text-idx?SID=2e690de335b377fb74df3b384594d09d&mc=true&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title50/50cfr23_main_02.tpl. Revisions to incorporate relevant changes adopted at CoP16 are currently under development.

U.S. regulation to list four native U.S. freshwater turtle species in Appendix III: On 30 October 2014, USFWS published a proposed rule in the *Federal Register* to include the common snapping turtle (*Chelydra serpentina*), Florida softshell turtle (*Apalone ferox*), smooth softshell turtle (*Apalone mutica*), and spiny softshell turtle (*Apalone spinifera*) in Appendix III of CITES. The proposed listing includes live and dead whole specimens, and all readily recognizable parts, products, and derivatives of these species. Including these species in Appendix III is necessary to allow the United States to adequately monitor international trade in these species and to determine whether further measures are required to conserve these species. After analysis of comments received on the proposed rule, we will publish our final decision in the *Federal Register*. If we decide to list these species in Appendix III, we will contact the CITES Secretariat prior to publishing the final rule to clarify the exact time period required by the Secretariat to inform the Parties of the listing, so that the effective date of the final rule coincides with the effective date of the listing in Appendix III. The listing would take effect 90 days after the CITES Secretariat informs the Parties of the listing.

STRICTER DOMESTIC MEASURES

Executive Order on Combatting Wildlife Trafficking and the National Strategy for Combatting Wildlife Trafficking: On 1 July 2013, President Obama issued Executive Order 13648 (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2013/07/01/executive-order-combating-wildlife-trafficking>), which established a Presidential Task Force on Wildlife Trafficking and recognized that the “poaching of protected species and the illegal trade in wildlife and their derivative parts and products...represent an international crisis that continues to escalate.” The Executive Order calls on U.S. Government agencies to take all appropriate actions within their authority to “enhance domestic efforts to combat wildlife trafficking, to assist foreign nations in building capacity to combat wildlife trafficking, and to assist in combating transnational organized crime.” In February 2014, the President issued the National Strategy for Combatting Wildlife Trafficking (<https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2014/02/11/fact-sheet-national-strategy-combating-wildlife-trafficking-commercial-b>), which established guiding principles and strategic priorities for U.S. efforts to stem illegal trade in wildlife. The National Strategy identified three strategic priorities for combating wildlife trafficking: strengthening enforcement; reducing demand for illegally traded wildlife; and expanding international cooperation and

commitment. Among other things, the National Strategy called for increased control of the U.S. market for elephant ivory.

Director's Order 210: Following issuance of the Executive Order and the National Strategy for Combating Wildlife Trafficking, and in response to the unprecedented poaching of African elephants (*Loxodonta africana*), the United States made changes to its stricter domestic measures governing the import of African elephant ivory. Under the new provisions, first issued in February 2014 and revised in May 2014, import into the United States of African elephant ivory is prohibited, except for ivory that meets the purposes and applicable criteria of one of the following categories: ivory for law enforcement purposes; ivory for genuine scientific purposes that will contribute to the conservation of the species; or worked, pre-Convention ivory that is either part of a musical instrument, a traveling exhibition, or a household move or inheritance, if specific conditions are met.

Amendments to the U.S. Endangered Species Act 4(d) rule for the African Elephant: The African elephant is listed as threatened under the U.S. ESA with a rule under section 4(d) of the Act regulating trade in the species. We have recently published a proposed rule to revise the African elephant 4(d) rule to more strictly control the U.S. market for elephant ivory. None of the changes proposed will go into effect until we have considered input received during the public comment period and published a final rule. *[The proposed rule was published in the Federal Register on 29 July 2015.]*

Certification of Iceland under the Pelly Amendment to the Fishermen's Protective Act: On 31 January 2014, Secretary of the Interior Jewell certified to President Obama that she had determined that the actions of Icelandic nationals were diminishing the effectiveness of CITES. The certification was based on an evaluation of Iceland's commercial whaling activities and international commercial trade in whale meat and products. In response to the certification, as well as a 2011 certification by the Secretary of Commerce, President Obama directed his Cabinet to take a number of diplomatic actions aimed at encouraging Iceland to cease its commercial whaling and international trade in whale meat.

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

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

| Species | Publication Date | ESA Status | CITES Status |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| Yellow-billed parrot (<i>Amazona collaria</i>) | 03/12/2013 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Argentina population of broad-snouted caiman (<i>Caiman latirostris</i>) | 06/25/2013 | Reclassified from Endangered to Threatened | Appendix II |
| Southern white rhinoceros (<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i>) | 09/11/2013 | Threatened | Populations of South Africa and Swaziland = Appendix II (for certain purposes; other populations = Appendix I) |
| Fickeisen plains cactus (<i>Pediocactus peeblesianus</i> var. <i>fickeiseniae</i>) | 10/01/2013 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Acuna cactus (<i>Sclerocactus erectocentrus</i> var. <i>acunensis</i>) | 10/01/2013 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Blue-throated macaw (<i>Ara glaucogularis</i>) | 10/03/2013 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Florida semaphore cactus (<i>Consolea corallicola</i>) | 10/24/2013 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Aboriginal prickly-apple (<i>Harrisia aboriginum</i>) | 10/24/2013 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Esmeraldas woodstar (<i>Chaetocercus berlepschi</i>) | 10/29/2013 | Endangered | Appendix III |
| Blue-billed curassow (<i>Crax alberti</i>) | 10/29/2013 | Endangered | Appendix III |
| Sakhalin sturgeon (<i>Acipenser mikadoi</i>) | 06/02/2014 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Adriatic sturgeon (<i>Acipenser naccarii</i>) | 06/02/2014 | Endangered | Appendix II |

| | | | |
|--|------------|------------|-------------|
| Chinese sturgeon (<i>Acipenser sinensis</i>) | 06/02/2014 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Baltic sturgeon (<i>Acipenser sturio</i>) | 06/02/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Huso sturgeon (<i>Huso dauricus</i>) | 06/02/2014 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| White cockatoo (<i>Cacatua alba</i>) | 06/24/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Philippine cockatoo (<i>Cacatua haematuropygia</i>) | 06/24/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Yellow-crested cockatoo (<i>Cacatua sulphurea</i>) | 06/24/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Central and Southwest Atlantic Distinct Population Segment (DPS) and Indo-West Pacific DPS of scalped hammerhead shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) | 07/03/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Eastern Atlantic DPS and Eastern Pacific DPS of scalped hammerhead shark (<i>Sphyrna lewini</i>) | 07/03/2014 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora crateriformis</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora globiceps</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora jacquelineae</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora lokani</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora pharaonis</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora retusa</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora rudis</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |

| | | | |
|---|------------|--|-------------|
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora speciosa</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Staghorn coral (<i>Acropora tenella</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Coral (<i>Anacropora spinosa</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Pillar coral (<i>Dendrogyra cylindrus</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Trumpet coral (<i>Euphyllia paradivisa</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Boulder star coral (<i>Montastrea annularis</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Mountainous star coral (<i>Montastrea faveolata</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Boulder star coral (<i>Montastrea franksi</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Coral (<i>Montipora australiensis</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Rough cactus coral (<i>Mycetophyllia ferox</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Cactus coral (<i>Pavona diffluens</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Coral (<i>Porites napopora</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Birds nest coral (<i>Seriatopora aculeata</i>) | 09/10/2014 | Threatened | Appendix II |
| Straight-horned markhor (<i>Capra falconeri jerdoni</i>) | 10/07/2014 | Reclassified from Endangered to Threatened | Appendix I |
| Kabul markhor (<i>Capra falconeri megaceros</i>) | 10/07/2014 | Reclassified from Endangered to Threatened | Appendix I |
| Knifetooth sawfish (<i>Anoxypristis cuspidata</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |

| | | | |
|---|------------|--|-------------|
| Dwarf sawfish (<i>Pristis clavata</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Freshwater sawfish (<i>Pristis microdon</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Smalltooth sawfish (<i>Pristis pectinata</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Largetooth sawfish (<i>Pristis perotteti</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Common sawfish (<i>Pristis pristis</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Green sawfish (<i>Pristis zijsron</i>) | 12/12/2014 | Endangered | Appendix I |
| Mexican wolf (<i>Canis lupus baileyi</i>) | 01/16/2015 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Southern Resident DPS of killer whale (<i>Orcinus orca</i>) | 02/10/2015 | Remove exclusion for captive members of the population | Appendix II |
| Wyoming and western Great Lakes populations of wolf (<i>Canis lupus</i>) | 02/20/2015 | Endangered | Appendix II |
| Captive population of chimpanzee (<i>Pan troglodytes</i>) | 06/16/2015 | Reclassified from Threatened to Endangered | Appendix I |

For additional details and the *Federal Register* publications see: <http://www.fws.gov/policy/frsystem/default.cfm>.

Listing one python species and three anaconda species as Injurious: On 10 March 2015, USFWS published a final rule in the *Federal Register* listing the reticulated python (*Python reticulatus*), the Beni anaconda (*Eunectes beniensis*), the dark-spotted anaconda (*Eunectes deschauenseei*), and the green anaconda (*Eunectes murinus*) as Injurious. By this action, the importation into the United States and interstate transportation between U.S. States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory of the United States of any live animal, gamete, viable egg, or hybrid of these four snake species is prohibited, except by permit for zoological, educational, medical, or scientific purposes. These four species are also listed under CITES.

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

CITES COMPLIANCE MEASURES

U.S. efforts related to Peruvian mahogany: During the reporting period, USFWS continued to work closely with Peru regarding Peru's implementation of the Appendix-II listing of bigleaf mahogany (*Swietenia macrophylla*). For 2013, Peru did not set a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota and has not yet established one for 2015. However, for 2014, Peru established a voluntary bigleaf mahogany export quota of 801.143 cubic meters. USFWS closely monitored the volume of bigleaf mahogany imported into the United States from Peru during the reporting period and provided Peru with periodic reports on those imports, which totalled 224 cubic meters of wood in 2013, 72 cubic meters of wood in 2014, and 230 cubic meters of between 1 January 2015, and 30 June 2015. 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.

CITES ENFORCEMENT MEASURES

Seizures, confiscations, and forfeitures of CITES wildlife 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 2013 and 2014 are provided below (seizure data for 2015 will not be compiled until 2016):

- In Los Angeles, California, USFWS wildlife inspectors intercepted multiple shipments of CITES corals from Tonga, Viet Nam, and Australia. Other live wildlife seized included 800 emperor scorpions from Togo; a shipment of Sulawesi forest turtles from Hong Kong; 20 Indian star tortoises shipped from Slovenia; 10 superb parrots imported from the Netherlands; 86 chameleons and 600-plus spiders from Tanzania; and 120 seahorses from Brazil.
- Interceptions in Los Angeles also included a 12,000-pound ocean cargo shipment of live rock from Fiji; 518 CITES leather products smuggled by a traveler from Nigeria; and international mail parcels containing primate skulls from Indonesia, 737 pangolin scales from Hong Kong, iguana meat from Mexico and El Salvador, and big cat teeth from Malaysia.
- USFWS inspectors in Chicago, Illinois, uncovered a large-scale smuggling scheme involving live CITES-listed giant clams exported from Vietnam. Shipments were also seized in Los Angeles, California, and New York, New York.
- A USFWS wildlife inspector at John F. Kennedy (JFK) International Airport in New York, New York, caught a paid courier smuggling hundreds of caiman products from Columbia; the company involved paid a 13,475 USD penalty and abandoned 10,000 USD worth of wildlife.

- An air cargo shipment seized in New York, New York, contained 24 endangered Asian arowanas and 20 endangered catfish from Thailand worth 70,000 USD. USFWS inspectors stopped a shipment of gloves made from the broad-snouted caiman and intercepted a shipment of blue coral live rock being smuggled by a company that was already awaiting sentencing for coral trafficking.
- In Dallas-Fort Worth, USFWS inspectors interdicted the smuggling of seven endangered Asian arowana fish from Vietnam. In Houston, Texas, USFWS inspectors found an import from the United Arab Emirates that contained over 360 smuggled boots, shoes, and handbags made from sea turtle, African elephant, and other species.
- USFWS inspectors in Atlanta, Georgia, intercepted a cargo shipment from France containing Siberian sturgeon without CITES documents and caught a passenger from Nigeria smuggling ivory and undeclared currency. They also seized live corals from Fiji and 5,000 USD worth of hippopotamus knives from South Africa. In Seattle, Washington, USFWS inspectors seized 268 pieces of live coral that arrived from Indonesia without valid CITES permits.
- USFWS wildlife inspectors in San Francisco, California, seized multiple shipments containing Asian medicinals made from CITES species. These interceptions included an ocean shipment of raw herbs from China; an 88-box shipment (also from China) of products made from seahorse, seal, and turtle shell; a 300-box shipment of similar products from Hong Kong; 400 boxes of medicinals made from tiger, musk deer, seal, and orchids being smuggled by a traveler from Vietnam; and 1,440 bottles of medicine made from Appendix-III Chinese pond turtle.
- Other interceptions in San Francisco included a mail parcel containing 12 CITES Appendix-I serow horns; 10 parcels containing wildlife skulls and skeletons that all arrived in a single month; and 451 key chains made from dried seahorses from China.
- Inspections in New Orleans, Louisiana, resulted in the seizure of a shipment of crocodilian leather goods from Singapore; a crate of “handicrafts” from the Ivory Coast containing CITES reptile handbags; and two commercial shipments of river otter skins headed for Canada and Hong Kong.
- In Miami, Florida, USFWS inspectors stopped a shipment from Paraguay that arrived with false export permits and returned 2,272 live amphibians and tarantulas to that country. They refused clearance of four illegal shipments from Benin containing 6,660 pythons and 1,600 monitor lizards.
- Interceptions of live wildlife in Miami also included CITES tortoises and mammals from Guyana; 500-plus reptiles and amphibians from Madagascar; 90 Appendix-II pancake tortoises from Tanzania; and 40 CITES-listed giant clams re-exported from Viet Nam with altered permits; and a shipment from Ghana of 2,000 emperor scorpions falsely identified as to country of origin.
- USFWS inspectors in Miami turned back a 2,500 pound shipment of queen conch meat from the Bahamas. Other seizures included a shipment of over 200 live hard corals from Indonesia; 128 caviar-based cosmetic products from Spain that lacked CITES permits; 6,000 Queen conch shells from Belize and 12,000 from the Bahamas; and 4 crates from Jamaica containing 15 live birds.

- In Newark, New Jersey, USFWS inspectors seized over 588 musk deer pills from a shipment of traditional Chinese medicines and caught a dog food company importing 1,000 pounds of endangered saltwater crocodile bone parts from Australia. Other interceptions included a 50,670 USD shipment of saltwater crocodile handbags and 3,000 cartons of Chinese pond turtle medicinals.
- USFWS inspectors based in Baltimore, Maryland, seized an ocean container of Muscovy duck products and three container shipments packed with over 10,000 seahorse pills in Norfolk, Virginia.
- In San Juan, Puerto Rico, a USFWS inspector caught a crew member of a Hong Kong vessel smuggling elephant ivory carvings and stopped a shipment of 250 pounds of queen conch meat unlawfully imported by ocean ferry from the Dominican Republic.
- USFWS inspectors in Tampa, Florida, investigated a Florida company that illegally imported some 7,400 kilograms of frozen CITES II Amazonian cod (*Arapaima* species) from Brazil.
- Proactive inspections at Dulles International Airport outside of Washington, D.C., resulted in the seizure of a 3,500 USD shipment of Appendix-II agarwood chips and an air cargo export of CITES reptilian leather goods headed for Saudi Arabia.
- USFWS inspectors working the U.S./Mexico border in Texas seized two large shipments of wildlife leather products crossing via Laredo and caught a manufacturer smuggling more than 10,700 tegu lizard leather and skin pieces into El Paso.

Seizures of CITES plant parts and products in 2013 and 2014: During 2013 and 2014, U.S. plant inspection authorities seized the following specimens of CITES-listed non-living plant parts and products upon import into the United States (seizure data for 2015 will not be compiled until 2016):

2013

- 1 shipment of *Swietenia macrophylla*; imported from Mexico; containing 1,199 square meters of veneer.
- 2 shipments of *Cedrela odorata*; 1 imported from Ghana and 1 from an unknown country; containing a total of 37 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 2 shipments of *Cedrela fissilis*; imported from Brazil; containing a total of 6,428 square meters of veneer.
- 4 shipments of *Dalbergia nigra*; 1 imported from Canada, 1 from Italy, and 2 from the United Kingdom; containing a total of 1 wood product and an unknown volume of sawn wood and veneer.
- 2 shipments of *Dalbergia retusa*; 1 imported from Canada and 1 from Mexico; containing an unknown volume of sawn wood.
- 1 shipment of *Dalbergia stevensonii*; imported from Belize; containing 10 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 1 shipment of *Percopsis elata*; imported from Portugal; containing 4 cubic meters of sawn wood.
- 1 shipment of *Guaiacum officinale*; imported from Jamaica; containing 1 dried plant.
- 1 shipment of *Prunus africana*; imported from India; containing 450 grams of extract.

- 42 shipments of *Aquilaria* spp.; 1 imported from Canada, 7 from China, 4 from Kuwait, 1 from Pakistan, 1 from Qatar, 23 from Saudi Arabia, 2 from the United Arab Emirates, and 3 from unknown countries; containing a total of 29 wood chips and 18 kilograms of wood chips, 117 wood products and 2 kilograms of wood products, 310 medicinal products and 48 grams of medicinal products, 1 kilogram of powder, and 2.62 liters of essential oil.
- 1 shipment of *Bulnesia sarmientoi*; imported from Paraguay; containing 35 kilograms of essential oil.
- 6 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*; 3 imported from Canada and 3 from unknown countries; containing a total of 29 kilograms of root.
- 57 shipments of *Saussurea costus*; 53 imported from China, 2 from Hong Kong, 1 from Thailand, and 1 from Viet Nam; containing a total of 773 medicinal products and 1 kilogram of medicinal products, and 1,200 unknown units of powder.
- 14 shipments of *Cibotium barometz*; 11 imported from China, 2 from Hong Kong, and 1 from Viet Nam; containing a total of 1 kilogram of extract, 492 medicinal products, and 3 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 21 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*; 13 imported from China, 6 from Hong Kong, and 2 from Viet Nam; containing a total of 612 extracts, 999 medicinal products, and 8 kilograms of medicinal products.
- 1 shipment of *Cylindropuntia* cactus specimens; imported from Mexico; containing 14 kilograms of extract.
- 2 shipments of *Opuntia* cactus specimens; both imported from Mexico; containing 2 cactus skeletons.
- 22 shipments of *Gastrodia elata* orchid specimens; 2 imported from Cambodia, 16 from China, 1 from Hong Kong, and 3 from Viet Nam; containing a total of 240 extracts, 32 roots and 519 kilograms of root, and 2,014 medicinal products.
- 19 shipments of other orchid specimens; containing 1 dried plant and 185 grams of dried plants, 510 grams of extract, 2 kilograms of powder, 32 roots, 39 kilograms of stems, 131 medicinal products, and 1 kilogram of medicinal products.

2014

- 2 shipments of *Dalbergia nigra*; both imported from Brazil; containing an unknown volume of sawn wood and veneer.
- 1 shipment of *Gonystylus* spp.; imported from China; containing 3 cubic meters of wood products.
- 1 shipment of *Aquilaria* spp.; imported from the United Arab Emirates; containing an unknown number of wood chips.
- 24 shipments of *Panax quinquefolius*; 1 imported from Canada, 2 from China, and 21 from unknown countries; containing a total of 246 kilograms of root.
- 6 shipments of *Saussurea costus*; all 6 imported from China; containing a total 86 extracts and an unknown quantity of medicinal products.
- 7 shipments of *Cistanche deserticola*; 5 imported from China, 1 from Malaysia, and 1 from Thailand; containing a total of 4,200 extracts and 9 envelopes of extract, and an unknown quantity of powder.
- 3 shipments of *Opuntia* cactus specimens; all 3 imported from Mexico; containing 10 cactus skeletons.
- 2 shipments of other cactus specimens; containing 6 cactus skeletons.

- 4 shipments of *Gastrodia elata* orchid specimens; 2 imported from China and 2 from Hong Kong; containing a total of 300 medicinal products.
- 11 shipments of other orchid specimens; containing an unknown quantity of dried plants, 1 kilogram of leaves, 500 grams of powder, 9,588 stems, and 254 kilograms of stems.

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 1 January 2013 through 30 June 2015 are summarized below:

Operation Crash – Special agents with the USFWS Division of Law Enforcement continued their work on Operation Crash – a comprehensive nationwide investigation of trafficking in rhinoceros horn that, by the close of the reporting period, had multiple individuals and/or companies sentenced in addition to the disruption of two large-scale rhino horn smuggling networks.

- In May 2015, a Florida businessman and his company were sentenced to 36 months in prison followed by 2 years of supervised release. The company was ordered to pay a 1.5 million USD criminal fine and the corporation was banned from trading in wildlife during a five year term of probation.
- In May 2015, a Texas man was sentenced to 25 months in prison, followed by 3-years supervised release, and assessed a fine of 150,000 USD. He had previously pleaded guilty to a 1-count information charging conspiracy to smuggle and violate the Lacey Act for his participation in an illegal wildlife smuggling ring, during which rhinoceros horns and objects made from rhino horn and elephant ivory worth nearly 1 million USD were smuggled from the United States to China.
- In April 2015, a Chinese national was sentenced to time served, 4 months home confinement in the United States, and 2 years supervised release for his role in a scheme to smuggle protected rhinoceros carvings, ivory carvings, and other protected wildlife from the United States.
- In March 2015, a British Columbia, Canada, antiques dealer was sentenced to 30 months in prison in the Southern District of New York, New York, for his role in smuggling and attempting to smuggle rhinoceros horns, as well as items carved from elephant ivory and coral, from auction houses throughout the United States to Canada. He and his co-conspirators smuggled more than 500,000 USD worth of horns and sculptures from the United States to Canada, and attempted to smuggle two black rhinoceros horns he purchased from undercover USFWS agents.
- In May 2013, two Los Angeles, California, businessmen who ran one of these networks were sentenced to serve 42 months and 46 months in prison and pay 20,000 USD in criminal fines and a 185,000 USD tax penalty and assessment after having each pleaded guilty to five felony counts. Between January 2010 and February 2012 (when they were arrested), these men bought up rhino horns valued at as much as 2.5 million USD from suppliers across the country so they could export them overseas. These defendants abandoned their interest in 2 million USD worth of rhino horns and two seized vehicles. The judge also ordered that some 800,000 USD in cash, gold, jewelry, and precious stones (all profits from rhino horn trafficking) be turned over to the USFWS Multinational Species Conservation Fund for use in protecting rhinos in Africa. A company run by one of these individuals also pleaded guilty to smuggling and wildlife violations and was sentenced to pay 100,000 USD in criminal fines.

- Arrests and indictments in 2013 included a group of Chinese and U.S. antiques dealers operating a rhino horn and elephant ivory smuggling network. One of these defendants, a New York businessman who pleaded guilty to conspiring to smuggle rhino horn and elephant ivory to Hong Kong, was sentenced to serve 37 months in Federal prison.
- The owner of an antiques business in China pleaded guilty in December 2013 to 11 felony counts in connection with having orchestrated the smuggling of more than 4.5 million USD worth of rhino horn and elephant ivory out of the United States. This defendant was the “boss” of three U.S. antiques dealers (including the New York man mentioned above) who made purchases at his direction and shipped the items to him via Hong Kong.
- In September 2013, USFWS special agents working on Operation Crash arrested an Irish national at Liberty International Airport in Newark, New Jersey, as he was boarding a flight to London. This man, known to be a member of a crime organization operating out of Ireland, pleaded guilty to conspiracy to violate the Lacey Act in connection with rhino horn trafficking. He was sentenced in January 2014 to serve 14 months in prison, pay a 10,000 USD fine, and forfeit 50,000 USD in illegal proceeds.
- In April 2014, two California residents were indicted by a Federal grand jury in Las Vegas, Nevada, on felony charges connected with their sale of two black rhinoceros horns to an undercover USFWS agent. The men were arrested by USFWS officers on March 19, 2014, after closing the deal in a Las Vegas hotel room.

Totoaba Trafficking – In the spring of 2013 (and continuing into 2014 and 2015), the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement teamed with Homeland Security Investigations and CBP to disrupt large-scale trafficking of swim bladders removed from totoaba (*Totoaba macdonaldi*) fish – a CITES Appendix I-listed species that lives off the coast of Mexico. Ten individuals (including two Canadian women) were indicted on Federal charges in San Diego, California, in connection with these smuggling operations. The more than 550 swim bladders seized are worth an estimated 3.5 million USD in Asian markets where they are prized as a culinary delicacy with alleged medicinal properties.

- A lead player in this trafficking, who coordinated cross-border smuggling from Mexico with plans to market totoaba swim bladders in Asia, pleaded guilty to Federal charges and was sentenced to four months in prison and two years of probation. He was ordered to forfeit his residence (where he stored the smuggled fish parts) to the Government, but subsequent negotiations changed this penalty to forfeiting a significant percentage of its value (138,750 USD) in cash. He must also pay 500,000 USD in restitution to support conservation programs in Mexico.

Coral Smuggler Convicted – A three-year USFWS investigation into the mislabeling and smuggling of rare CITES-protected stony corals resulted in the successful prosecution of a co-owner of one of the largest live coral import businesses in the United States. The defendant, who pleaded guilty to one felony count of smuggling in March 2013, was sentenced in July 2013 to spend one year in Federal prison and was barred from possessing CITES species for three years following completion of that sentence. He was also fined 6,000 USD and ordered to forfeit 523,835 USD in illegal proceeds from coral trafficking. This investigation, which started when a USFWS wildlife inspector

discovered corals hidden in a routine tropical fish shipment arriving at John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York, New York, documented extensive coral smuggling over a seven-year period.

Two-way Reptile Trafficker Sentenced – In January 2014, a former reptile store operator in Washington State was sentenced to 12 months in prison and three years of supervised release in connection with a wide-ranging conspiracy to illegally traffic in protected reptile species. This man and five co-defendants operated a two-way smuggling network that was responsible for the illegal export of domestic species and the unlawful importation of foreign reptiles, all via Hong Kong. Trafficked wildlife included Eastern box turtles, North American wood turtles, and Gulf Coast box turtles from the United States; foreign CITES-listed species included a critically endangered Arakan forest turtle, black-breasted leaf turtles, Chinese striped-necked turtles, and big-headed turtles.

Ivory Smuggler Pleads Guilty – On 4 June 2014, the owner of an African art store located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, who was arrested by USFWS special agents in July 2011, was sentenced for smuggling African elephant ivory to 30 months' imprisonment, to be followed by 2 years of supervised release for smuggling elephant ivory into the United States. As part of that sentence, the court ordered him to pay a fine of 7,500 USD and to forfeit 150,000 USD, along with the approximately one ton of elephant ivory that was seized by agents from the store in April 2009.

Giant Clam Smuggling – In a joint investigation involving USFWS Law Enforcement and HSI Agents, a man was indicted in Hawaii in 2013 on smuggling and CITES charges in connection with the unlawful importation of some 100 pounds of Appendix-II giant clam meat via passenger baggage at Honolulu International Airport in Hawaii. The investigation revealed that the man may have been a ringleader who had family members and associates smuggle the wildlife on his behalf.

Caviar Cosmetics Imported in Violation of CITES – In August 2013, a Miami, Florida, customs broker investigated by the USFWS Division of Law Enforcement pleaded guilty to a felony violation in connection with the illegal importation of 12 shipments of cosmetics made from Siberian sturgeon caviar which arrived in the United States without the required CITES permits and were not declared as wildlife. Another company involved in these transactions agreed to pay a 97,836 USD civil penalty.

Arowana Trafficking – Two men in Washington State, investigated in connection with the smuggling of endangered Asian arowanas, were ordered at sentencing to forfeit assets valued at over 150,000 USD and spend three months in home confinement and one year on probation. The property forfeited included four of the highly prized and valuable endangered fish, 300 live marijuana plants, and commercial-scale drug production and processing equipment.

Bear Gall Smuggler Sentenced – A foreign national from Canada who lives in Washington State was sentenced to 12 months in prison for felony obstruction of justice and wildlife trafficking. The defendant illegally purchased 18 CITES Appendix-II black bear gallbladders and smuggled them to China for sale in that country for their alleged medicinal properties. He was also ordered to pay an 8,000 USD fine and spend five years on probation.

Indictment in Reptile Case – A U.S. reptile dealer was indicted in California in 2013 on multiple felony charges of conspiring to smuggle wildlife (including native U.S. species) into and out of the United States. This individual is the first U.S. defendant to be prosecuted in Operation Flying

Turtle – a USFWS investigation that already secured the successful prosecution of three Japanese nationals for smuggling thousands of CITES-protected turtles, tortoises, lizards, and snakes to and from the United States and Japan from 2004 through 2011.

Narwhal Tusk Trafficking – The USFWS Division of Law Enforcement teamed with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and the Canadian Wildlife Service to investigate four individuals involved in the unlawful harvest, sale and export of 1.5 million USD worth of CITES-listed narwhal tusks from Canada into the United States. The investigation secured Federal felony indictments against three U.S. residents and their Canadian supplier; charges include conspiracy and money laundering as well as smuggling. The Canadian defendant, who was arrested in the province of New Brunswick on December 19, 2013, on an extradition warrant requested by the United States, was successfully prosecuted in Canada in connection with smuggling hundreds of narwhal tusks across the border to U.S. buyers. Convicted on seven counts, he was fined 385,000 Canadian dollars and given an 8-month conditional sentence. Two of the U.S. defendants (both Tennessee residents) pleaded guilty to felony conspiracy and wildlife trafficking charges in January 2013. The third defendant (a New Jersey man) stood trial in Maine in March 2014 and was found guilty of smuggling narwhal tusks from Canada and related money laundering crimes. A New Jersey resident was sentenced to 33 months in prison for illegally importing and trafficking in narwhal tusks and associated money laundering crimes, ordered to forfeit 85,089 USD, six narwhal tusks, and one narwhal skull, and fined 7,500 USD. His prison sentence will be followed by three years of supervised release.

Cross-Border Reptile Trafficking – In 2013, a 28-year-old New York woman who over a two-year period smuggled over 18,000 protected reptiles (many of them species requiring CITES permits) from the United States to Canada for the pet trade was sentenced to spend 18 months in prison after pleading guilty to felony Lacey Act and conspiracy charges. USFWS and Canadian investigators showed that the defendant transported the reptiles by boat across the St. Lawrence River from the U.S. side of the Mohawk Indian Reservation to the Canadian side and delivered them to a Canadian co-conspirator. Species smuggled included native U.S. reptiles such as live American alligators and red-footed tortoises, as well as foreign wildlife such as Hermann's tortoises, Russian tortoises, Jackson horned chameleons, and green iguanas. Market value of the smuggled reptiles in Canada exceeded 800,000 Canadian dollars.

- The Canadian co-conspirator in this reptile smuggling ring was successfully prosecuted in Canada, where he was found guilty of two counts of violating that country's major wildlife law. He was sentenced to serve 90 days in jail, spend three years on probation, and pay 50,000 Canadian dollars in restitution to Canada's Environmental Defense Fund. The smuggled reptiles were forfeited to the Crown.

U.S./Canada Wildlife Smuggling – In the fall of 2012, the USFWS Division of Law Enforcement, the Canadian Wildlife Service, the Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, and New York State officers completed a successful investigation of the unlawful commercialization of CITES-protected Asian arowanas and injurious snakehead fish being smuggled into the United States from Canada. The main defendant – the owner of a commercial aquarium business in Toronto – pleaded guilty to violating U.S. and State wildlife laws and paid 13,000 USD in fines and restitution. He was also prosecuted in Canada on Federal and Provincial charges and was sentenced there to spend 60 days in prison and he and his business will pay some 75,000 Canadian dollars in fines.

Hummingbird Charms Trafficking – On 7 April 2015, a Texas man was sentenced to four years of supervised probation and ordered to pay 5,000 USD in fines and restitution for trafficking in dried hummingbird carcasses referred to as “chuparosas.”

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

Preparation for CoP16: North American Regional meeting: 4-8 February 2013. Canada, Mexico, and the United States met in Cuernavaca, Mexico, to discuss preparations for CoP16, including issues of shared interest and identification of issues on which there was agreement on a regional position.

Public participation in U.S. preparations for CoP16: CoP16 was held 3-14 March 2013 in Bangkok, Thailand. In addition to the five notices that USFWS published in the U.S. *Federal Register* in 2011 and 2012 leading up to CoP16, the USFWS published a notice on 28 February 2013, announcing the tentative negotiating positions of the United States on the issues on the agenda for CoP16.

U.S. approved 28 observers for CoP16: In accordance with CITES Article XI, paragraph 7, USFWS approved 66 individuals representing 28 national NGOs to attend CoP16 as observers.

Results of CoP16: The United States submitted 12 species listing proposals (10 animal proposals and two plant proposals) for consideration at CoP16 (March 2013), and also submitted two discussion documents, including a proposal for a new Resolution and revisions to an existing Resolution. The Parties adopted 10 of the species proposals submitted by the United States, which included: transferring from Appendix II to Appendix I the Roti Island snake-necked turtle (*Chelodina mccordi*), Burmese star tortoise (*Geochelone platynota*), and all big-headed turtles (family Platysternidae); listing in Appendix II the spotted turtle (*Clemmys guttata*), Blanding's turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*), diamondback terrapin (*Malaclemys terrapin*), a number of pond, river, and wood turtles in the family Geoemydidae, and a number of softshell turtles in the family Trioychidae; listing in Appendix II the oceanic whitetip shark (*Carcharhinus longimanus*); removing from Appendix II the Laguna Beach live-forever (*Dudleya stolonifera*) and the Santa Barbara live-forever (*Dudleya traskiae*); and amending the annotation to the Appendix-II listings of America ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) and Asian ginseng (*Panax ginseng*). Additionally, the Parties adopted the new Resolution proposed by the United States, Resolution Conf. 16.8, on *Frequent cross-border non-commercial movements of musical instruments*, and, with minor changes, the amendments proposed by the United States to Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP14), on *Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use*.

Preparation for CoP17: In preparation for the CoP17 (scheduled to be held in Johannesburg, South Africa, in September-October 2016), USFWS published two *Federal Register* notices during the reporting period. The first notice, published on 27 June 2014, solicited public comments on amendments to Appendix I and Appendix II that the United States should consider proposing for consideration at CoP17. The second notice, published on 11 May 2015, solicited public comments on Resolutions, Decisions, and agenda items the United States should consider submitting for discussion at CoP17.

STANDING COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

65th meeting of the Standing Committee: The United States sent a 9-person delegation to the 65th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC65), which was held 7-11 July 2013, in Geneva, Switzerland. The interagency U.S. delegation included five representatives from USFWS, one from the U.S. Department of State, one from NMFS, one from APHIS, and one from AFWA. The United States submitted two working documents for consideration at the meeting: the report of the interim working group on annotations for species listed in the CITES Appendices (submitted by the United States as chair of the interim working group); and the regional report for North America (submitted by the United States as the North American Regional Representative to the Standing Committee).

Communications with the Chair of the Standing Committee and the Secretariat: The United States served as both the North American Regional Representative and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee throughout the reporting period, and in the capacity of Vice-Chair had regular communications with the Secretariat and the Chair of the Standing Committee, primarily by e-mail. These communications were largely for the purpose of the Secretariat providing informal updates on its activities, such as preparations for meetings (including CoP16 and SC65), interactions with UNEP, and further investigation into the GEF as a potential funding source for CITES.

Introduction from the sea: The United States was an active participant in the Introduction from the Sea Working Group established by the Standing Committee. Following CoP15, Fabio Hazin (Brazil) was elected Chair of the working group and Robert Gabel (United States) was elected Vice-Chair of the working group. The group developed a discussion document and draft revisions to Resolution Conf. 14.6 (Rev. CoP15), *Introduction from the sea*. The draft revisions to Resolution Conf. 14.6 (Rev. CoP15) developed by the working group were adopted by the Parties at CoP16 (March 2013). The United States was a strong supporter of these efforts to reach a common understanding of implementation of the Convention for specimens taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State.

Implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens: At SC61 (August 2011), the United States and Hungary, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, submitted a document on implementation of the Convention relating to captive-bred and ranched specimens. The resulting discussion led to the creation of an intersessional working group, chaired by the United States. The United States introduced a document at SC62 (July 2012) describing the working group's activities and presenting a series of recommendations, including several draft Decisions for CoP16 (March 2013). The Standing Committee accepted these recommendations and draft Decisions, with some revisions. The Secretariat prepared a document on behalf of the Standing Committee for CoP16. The Parties adopted the draft Decisions contained in Document CoP16 Doc. 48 Annex.

Working group on development and application of annotations: At SC61 in 2011, the Standing Committee formed an intersessional working group, under the chairmanship of the Regional Representative of North America (the United States), to explore the shared understanding among Parties of annotations, and to explore the adoption of appropriate and reasonable procedures for crafting plant annotations. In October 2012, the United States, as Chair of the working group, submitted a document for CoP16 on the development and application of annotations that proposed amendments to six Resolutions, adoption of three new Decisions, revisions to one existing Decision and the retention of one existing

Decision, and adoption of a definition of the term “extract” as it applies in existing annotations in the Appendices. These proposals were adopted by the Parties at CoP16, with several changes. Also at CoP16, the Parties adopted several Decisions related to continued work on annotations, including Decision 16.162 directing the Standing Committee to re-establish a working group on annotations at SC65.

The United States, as Chair of the interim working group, submitted a document for SC65 (July 2014) presenting the history of the use of annotations in CITES and a discussion of options for where to permanently include definitions of terms in annotations. The Standing Committee re-established the formal working group at SC65 and the United States was again designated as the Chair.

In 2015, leading up toward SC66, the United States worked electronically with the other members of the working group to prepare a discussion document for SC66.

Working group on Decision 16.39: At CoP16, the Parties adopted Decision 16.39, which called on the Standing Committee, at SC65, to initiate a process to assess implementation and enforcement of the Convention as it relates to the trade in species listed in Appendix I. The Standing Committee formed a working group at SC65, chaired by the United States as the North American regional representative, and developed terms of reference. Since that time, the working group has been working intersessionally to develop recommendations for consideration at SC66.

Working group to review the administrative hosting arrangements for the CITES Secretariat: At SC65, the Standing Committee formed a working group to work intersessionally on this issue. The working group was initially chaired by the Standing Committee Chair, but in May 2015, the United States, as Vice Chair of the Standing Committee, was asked to continue to chair the working group on the Chair’s behalf. Since that time, the United States has been consulting with the other working group members and the working group will develop recommendations for consideration at SC66.

Other Standing Committee working groups: In addition to the working groups discussed above, the United States was also an active member of the following intersessional Standing Committee working groups leading up to CoP16 (March 2013): 1) CITES strategic vision; 2) review of Resolutions; 3) purpose codes; 4) use of taxonomic serial numbers; 5) e-commerce of specimens of CITES-listed species; 6) personal and household effects; 7) humphead wrasse; 8) Asian snake trade management, conservation and enforcement; 9) conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses; and, 10) review of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15), trade in elephant specimens; and, 11) Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).

The following working groups accomplished their mandates at CoP16 and were subsequently dissolved at the CoP: 1) introduction from the sea; 2) review of Resolutions; 3) personal and household effects; 4) humphead wrasse; and 5) transport. In addition to the working groups on which the United States is an active member that were in place prior to CoP16 and that have carried on their work after CoP16, following are the working groups on which the United States is an active member that were initiated after CoP16: 1) bushmeat; 2) disposal of seized specimens; 3) reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants; 4) decision-making mechanism for a process of trade in elephant ivory; 5) cooperation between CITES and FAO; 6) review of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP16), conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish; and, 7) pangolin.

In addition, the United States is currently chairing a contact group discussing the issues raised in Document SC65 Inf. 4, regarding the smuggling of Bahamian rock iguanas, such as the issuance of permits for endemic species for which the country of origin does not report their lawful export.

CITES TECHNICAL COMMITTEE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

Regional Alternate Representative for North America to the Animals Committee: At CoP16, the North American Region selected Dr. Rosemarie Gnam, Chief of the U.S. Scientific Authority, to serve as the Alternate Regional Representative for North America to the Animals Committee for the intersessional period between CoP16 and CoP17.

27th Meeting of the Animals Committee: The United States sent a five-person delegation to the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee (AC27) (Veracruz, Mexico, 28 April - 3 May 2014). The U.S. delegation included four representatives from USFWS and one from NMFS. In addition, Dr. Gnam participated at AC27 as the Alternate Regional Representative for North America. The United States submitted six documents for the meeting: (i) species reviews of *Monachus tropicalis* (AC27 Doc. 24.3.4), *Pteropus tokudae* (AC27 Doc. 24.3.5), *Grus canadensis pulla* (AC27 Doc. 24.3.6) and *Epicrates inornatus* (AC27 Doc. 24.3.7); and (ii) two information documents: Final Report on Planning and Implementation of an International Meeting in Puerto Rico for the Conservation of Caribbean Iguanas (*Cyclura* spp. and *Iguana* spp.) (AC27 Inf. 13) and Report on Implementation of the United States National Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (AC27 Inf. 19). At AC27, the United States was a member of eight working groups, which included: (i) Review of Significant trade of Appendix-II species; (ii) Captive-bred and ranched specimens; (iii) Illegal trade in Cheetahs (*Acinonyx jubatus*) (Decision 16.72); (iv) Snake trade and conservation management (*Serpentes* spp.); (v) Sturgeons and paddlefish; (vi) Standard nomenclature; (vii) Conservation and management of sharks; and (viii) Periodic review of species included in Appendices I and II. As the Alternate Regional Representative for North America, Dr. Gnam co-chaired the working group on the Review of Significant trade of Appendix-II species.

Leading up to AC27, the United States participated intersessionally on the evaluation of the review of significant trade. To further the Committee's work on the Periodic Review of Species included in Appendices I and II, the United States offered to review *Epioblasma sampsonii* (AC27 WG8 Doc. 1). Leading up to AC28 (Tel Aviv 2015), the United States has agreed to work intersessionally on tortoises and freshwater turtles (*Testudines* spp.) (Decision 16.111), freshwater stingrays (*Potamotrygonidae* spp.) (Decisions 16.131 and 16.132), the Review of Significant Trade, and the Periodic Review of Species.

Joint sessions of the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee and 21st meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to the Joint sessions of the 27th meeting of the Animals Committee and the 21st meeting of the Plants Committee (AC26/PC20) (Veracruz, 2-3 May 2014). The U.S. delegation included four representatives from USFWS, one from NMFS, and one from APHIS. In addition, Dr. Gnam participated in AC27/PC21 as the Alternate Regional Representative for North America to the Animals Committee. The United States agreed to work intersessionally on capacity building (AC27/PC21 Doc. 9.1), extinct or possibly extinct species (Decision 16.164) (AC27/PC21 Doc.10), and review of identification and guidance material (Decision 16.59) (AC27/PC21 Doc.14). At AC27/PC21, the United States participated in the working group on review of reporting requirements (Decision 16.45) (AC27/PC21 Doc.11), and the evaluation of the review of significant trade (AC27/PC21 Doc. 12.1). The United States also participated in several

intersessional working groups leading up to AC27/PC21, including the periodic review of species, bigleaf mahogany and neotropical tree species, and evaluation of the review of significant trade.

21st meeting of the Plants Committee: The United States sent a six-person delegation to the 21st meeting of the CITES Plants Committee (PC21, Veracruz, 2-8 May 2014) The U.S. delegation included three representatives from USFWS, one from APHIS, and two from the U.S. Forest Service (USFS). Leading up to PC21, the United States chaired the interim Standing Committee working group on listing annotations (submitted AC27/PC21 Doc. 7.2 Annex 1), participated in working groups on evaluation of the review of significant trade (AC27/PC21 Doc. 12.1), and review of reporting requirements (Decision 16.45). The United States also participated in intersessional working groups on IPBES, standard nomenclature, and trade in artificially propagated plants. The United States submitted documents to the meeting, including a progress report on the periodic review of the genus *Sclerocactus* and *Lewisia serrata*, and four information documents: Distinguishing wild from cultivated agarwood (*Aguilaria* spp.) using direct analysis in real time and time-of-flight mass spectrometry (PC21 Inf.5), Evaluating agarwood products for 2-(2-Phenylethyl) chromones using direct analysis in real time time-of-flight mass spectrometry (PC21 Inf. 6), Analysis of select *Dalbergia* and trade timber using direct analysis in real time and time-of-flight mass spectrometry (PC21 Inf. 7), and Primer on Importing & Exporting CITES-Listed Species Used in the United States in Dietary Supplements, Traditional Herbal Medicines, and Homeopathic Products (PC21 Inf. 11). The U.S. delegation was active on numerous issues and participated in several working groups, including the review of significant trade in Appendix-II plants and the periodic review of the Appendices for plants for species selected following CoP16. The United States supported the preparation of a list of species for the current periodic review cycle (CoP16-CoP18).

At the request of the Plants Committee, the United States provided the Strategic Planning working group (PC21 WG1) a draft table it developed to show the work of the Plants Committee that supports the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2020 (Resolution Conf. 16.3) (PC21 Doc. 6.1).

Plants and Animals working groups: The United States worked cooperatively in the following intersessional Animals Committee working groups leading up to CoP16: 1) Asian snake trade management, conservation, and enforcement; 2) captive-bred and ranched specimens, and, 3) transport/IATA. Leading up to CoP16 there were also several working groups the United States worked cooperatively on that have application in both the Animals and Plants Committees: 1) evaluation of the review of significant trade; 2) periodic review of species, 3) capacity building; and, 4) annotations working group.

Several working groups have been created since CoP16. The United States is a member of the following new Animals Committee working groups: 1) tortoise and freshwater turtles (*Testudines* spp.); and, 2) freshwater stingrays (*Potamotrygonidae* spp.). The United States is a member of the following new Plants Committee working groups: 1) Global Strategy for Plant Conservation; and, 2) Neotropical tree species. The United States has also agreed to work intersessionally on the following new working groups that occur in both the Plants and Animals Committees: 1) extinct or possibly extinct species: and, 2) review of identification and guidance material

Periodic Reviews of the Appendices: Periodic Review is an evaluation of the status of CITES-listed species in order to determine if they need to have higher protection, remain the same or be removed from the Appendices. The United States conducted the following periodic reviews between 1 January 2013 and 30 June 2015:

- The United States conducted periodic reviews of the Caribbean monk seal (*Monachus tropicalis*), the Mississippi sandhill crane (*Grus canadensis pulla*), the Puerto Rican boa (*Epicrates inornatus*) and the Guam flying-fox/Guam fruit bat (*Pteropus tokudae*); these reviews were submitted to AC27.
- The United States conducted a periodic review of the Wabash riffleshell (*Epioblasma sampsonii*) (an extinct mollusk) and the results of the review will be submitted at AC28.
- The United States completed a periodic review of the native plant *Dudleya stolonifera*, and submitted a proposal to delist the species from Appendix II at CoP16, which was adopted by the Parties. The U.S. is completing periodic reviews of the genus *Sclerocactus* (Cactaceae); its range includes the United States and Mexico, and the native plant *Lewisia serrata*. A progress report on the periodic review of *Lewisia serrata* will be submitted to PC22.
- The United States is conducting a range-wide status review of Appendix-II-listed goldenseal (*Hydrastis canadensis*), native to the United States and Canada, which is harvested for its medicinal properties. In 2012, USFWS contracted with NatureServe, a U.S.-based non-profit conservation organization that maintains national conservation and status data on more than 70,000 species, to update the species' conservation status rankings and to complete assessments using the IUCN Red List Criteria and the Climate Change Vulnerability Index, as well as update information on economic botany of the species. The current phase of the review will include updating market and industry data.
- Canada and the United States are collaborating on the periodic review for *Puma concolor cougar* and *Puma concolor coryi* as part of the region's commitment toward the completion of the periodic review of the Felidae.

Review of Significant Trade: This is a review of the biological, trade, and other relevant information on Appendix-II species subject to levels of trade that are significant in relation to the population of the species, in order to identify problems concerning the implementation of Article IV paragraphs 2 (a), 3 and 6 (a) of the Convention, and possible solutions. The species subject to the Review of Significant Trade are selected by the Animals and Plants Committees. Non-compliance by any State with the solutions recommended by these Committees may ultimately lead to a recommendation by the Standing Committee to suspend trade with that State in specimens of the species concerned. The following Significant Trade Review activities concerning species native to the United States occurred between 1 January 2013 and 30 June 2015:

- At AC27, the Significant Trade Review Working group selected the polar bear (*Ursus maritimus*) and seahorse (*Hippocampus erectus*) for review. The United States subsequently responded to the Animals Committee concerning information on U.S. management and trade in these species.
- The U.S. Scientific Authority participated in a meeting of the Advisory Working Group on the Evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, held at the USFWS National Conservation Training Center (NCTC) in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, in April 2015. The meeting facilitated further discussions of the working group and prepared documents for review by the Animals and Plants Committees.

OTHER CITES-RELATED ACTIVITIES

U.S. submits its 2012 and 2013 CITES annual reports: Article VIII of CITES prescribes that each Party shall prepare annual reports on its trade in CITES-listed species. On 5 November 2013, USFWS submitted, directly to UNEP-WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2012 (148,594 data records), which contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2012. On 22 October 2014, USFWS submitted, directly to UNEP-WCMC in electronic format, the U.S. CITES Annual Report data file for 2013 (148,287 data records), which contained data on all U.S. trade with the rest of the world in CITES-listed species of fauna and flora during 2013. The data in these files represent actual trade and not just numbers of CITES permits issued.

U.S. Contributions to CITES Activities: USFWS has worked continuously with the Secretariat to direct additional voluntary contributions of the United States to execute the Decisions of the Conference of the Parties taken at CoP15 and CoP16. The United States has funded a wide range of activities and issues including, but not limited to, those related to elephants and rhinoceros, Asian snakes, tortoises and freshwater turtles, the making of non-detriment findings, website maintenance, and the Secretariat's meetings and registration database.

Animal Transport for the Animal Care Professional Class: In February 2015, a representative from the U.S. Management Authority participated in the first AZA class “Animal Transport for the Animal Care Professional.” The three day class presented information of legal, regulatory, veterinary and best practice techniques for moving live wildlife and will be presented annually.

Reducing Opportunities for Unlawful Transport of Endangered Species Meeting: On the 3rd and 4th of June 2015, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) convened a workshop in Washington, D.C., on Reducing Opportunities for Unlawful Transport of Endangered Species (ROUTES) to address the complex challenge of combating wildlife trafficking in transcontinental transportation and logistics supply chains. Participants included government agencies, NGOs, and transport industry representatives from Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Participants developed a joint understanding of the problems and challenges in order to clarify existing efforts and activities and identified key areas for collaborative action. Action plans for further cooperative efforts are in progress.

D4. Communication, information management and exchange

CITES 40th Anniversary: Leading up to CITES CoP16, USFWS launched a social media campaign highlighting facts about the Convention, as well as a representative sample of the animal and plant species that it protects. The 40-day campaign, which was anchored by a [blog](#) and subsequent posts on Facebook and Twitter, served as a countdown to CoP16 and also as a reminder that 2013 marked the 40th Anniversary of CITES. U.S. Department of State engaged on this campaign and a number of social media posts were shared or retweeted by U.S. Embassies around the globe. USFWS also wrote a series of articles on the history of the Convention and U.S. priorities for CoP16, all of which were prominently featured in the [Winter 2013 edition of Fish & Wildlife News](#)- a USFWS publication that is distributed to a variety of stakeholder groups and is available online.

Ivory Crush Design Challenge: In 2014, USFWS launched a “Crushed Ivory Design Challenge” calling on the public to submit ideas for a compelling, thought provoking, and informative display to increase awareness about the threats that poaching and illegal trade pose to elephants and other at-risk species. The goal is to use the crushed ivory from the U.S. ivory crushes to raise awareness, reduce the demand for illegal wildlife products, and ultimately protect wildlife from senseless killing and illegal trade. The Design Challenge closed on 31 March 2015, and submissions are currently under review by a panel of experts.

Online Presence and Social Media: USFWS continues to share information regarding CITES implementation and proceedings with interested stakeholder groups via the USFWS International Affairs website (www.fws.gov/international), Facebook (USFWS_International Affairs), Twitter (@USFWSInternatl), blogs, and email distribution list. Of particular note, USFWS launched a new webpage to educate and inform U.S. fishermen, exporters, and dealers about implementation of the shark and ray listings adopted at CoP16. This webpage can be viewed at <http://www.fws.gov/international/permits/by-species/sharks-and-rays.html>.

U.S. elephant seizure data: On 14 May 2013, USFWS submitted to TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa data files containing U.S. elephant part and product seizure data for the year 2012 for inclusion in the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS). On 10 December 2014, in response to CITES Notification No. 2014/052, regarding the same issue, USFWS submitted to TRAFFIC East/Southern Africa data files containing U.S. elephant part and product seizure data for the year 2013 for inclusion in ETIS.

Poster on CITES-listed tree frogs: The CITES Authorities of the United States, Canada, and Mexico (CONABIO) developed the poster “Tree frogs of the genus *Agalychnis* protected by CITES,” published in April 2013, for the purpose of identifying the frog species included in the Appendices at CoP15 (Doha, 2010). The poster was distributed at Mexico’s main ports, airports and border crossings. The purpose of, and dissemination of, this material is to encourage the legality and sustainability of international trade in those species.

Ginseng brochure: In 2014, USFWS developed and published a brochure titled “Wild American ginseng Information for Dealers and Exporters.” The brochure promotes good stewardship harvest practices and observance of laws and regulations for the harvest and export of wild American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*).

Brochures were distributed to American ginseng dealers and exporters in the United States, and can be viewed or downloaded at the USFWS website:

<http://www.fws.gov/international/pdf/factsheet-american-ginseng-harvesters-dealers-exporters.pdf>.

D5. Permitting and registration procedures

Applications for CITES permits: The U.S. CITES Management Authority handled over 21,500 applications for CITES documents received during 2013, over 20,500 CITES applications received in 2014, and 9,900 applications received in the first half of 2015.

A large portion of the applications received during the reporting period related to the export or re-export of commercially traded Appendix-II specimens. The bulk of CITES import permits issued by the U.S. Management Authority are for the import of sport-hunted trophies from Southern Africa.

International cooperation: The U.S. Management Authority works closely with other CITES Management Authorities to identify concerns and problems before CITES documents are issued. Such coordination ranges from informing other Management Authorities what documents the United States has issued, to discussions of how and when documents can be issued.

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

Non-Detriment Findings: A non-detriment finding is a conclusion by a Scientific Authority that the export of specimens of a particular species will not impact negatively on the survival of that species in the wild. The non-detriment finding by a Scientific Authority is required before an export or import permit or a certificate for an introduction from the sea may be granted for a specimen of an Appendix-I species, and before an export permit or a certificate for an introduction from the sea may be granted for a specimen of an Appendix-II species. The following are non-detriment findings conducted by the U.S. Scientific Authority during the reporting period:

- In August 2014, the U.S. Scientific Authority made a positive non-detriment finding for the export of wild American ginseng (*Panax quinquefolius*) legally harvested during the 2014 harvest season in 19 USFWS-approved States and for one Indian Tribal lands. The finding noted our continuing concern about illegal harvest of wild ginseng, including roots dug out of season and the harvest of under-sized/under-age plants, which puts additional harvest pressure on this species as plants are harvested before they produce seeds necessary for regeneration. Numerous States reported an increase in public interest in the harvest and selling of wild American ginseng resulting from the History Channel's television reality program "Appalachian Outlaws" that aired last winter.
- In August 2014 the U.S. Scientific Authority made a positive non-detriment finding for the export of porbeagle shark (*Lamna nasus*) legally harvested in the commercial fishery by U.S. fisherman in the 2014 harvest season. The finding was based on a species management plan produced by NMFS in 2006, which was developed to rebuild the porbeagle stock. The yearly harvest is based on a quota and all harvest is suspended when 80% of the quota is reported; all harvest must be reported within seven days of landing. The fishery was closed to harvest in 2015.
- In June 2015, the U.S. Scientific Authority made a positive non-detriment finding for the export of wild scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*), great hammerhead shark

(*Sphyrna mokarran*), and smooth hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna zygaena*) harvested in the commercial fisheries of the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico by U.S. fisherman in the 2015 harvest season. The positive finding was based on a management plan, produced by NMFS in 2013, which was developed to rebuild the hammerhead stocks. There are two separate management groups, one in the Atlantic and one in the Gulf of Mexico; each group has a separate harvest quota. Each group is regulated separately and all harvest in the group is suspended when 80% of its quota is reported; all harvest must be reported within seven days of landing.

D6. Capacity building

Regional Workshop on Sharks Listed in Appendix II of CITES - Preparing for Implementation: This workshop was held in Recife, Brazil, during 3-4 December 2013. The United States helped with preparations for this workshop, hosted by Brazil, to prepare for implementation of CITES provisions for the five species of sharks added to CITES Appendix II at CoP16 (with an effective date of September 2014). The United States actively supported adoption of the proposals to list these sharks under CITES and considers effective implementation of the listings to be a priority for shark conservation. Representatives from both USFWS and NMFS participated in the workshop in Recife, which was attended by more than 70 representatives from 28 CITES Parties in Latin America and the Caribbean.

Cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO): The United States continued to provide financial support to the ITTO-CITES Program, which supports work on CITES-listed tree species in all three tropical regions. The current work includes support to projects on the management, DNA traceability, timber tracking, and artificial propagation of a number of species, including *Aquilaria* spp., *Dalbergia* spp., *Gonystylus* spp., *Gyrinops* spp., *Pericopsis elata*, *Prunus africana*, *Swietenia macrophylla*, and *Cedrela odorata*.

Caribbean Iguana Conservation Workshop: USFWS hosted a Caribbean Iguana Conservation Workshop in San Juan, Puerto Rico, in December 2013. The workshop was intended to advance a regional approach to conservation and recovery problems for the Appendix-I Caribbean rock iguanas (*Cyclura* sp.) and the critically endangered Lesser Antillean iguana (*Iguana delicatissima*). While the main threats to the species include habitat destruction, predation, and competition from feral animals, hybridization with the Green iguana (*I. iguana*; Appendix II), a serious spike in poaching and trafficking of the animals to the western European and Asian pet markets is occurring. The workshop was attended by government and non-governmental islands across the insular Caribbean and a wide range of recommendations for actions were developed. USFWS is in the process of following-up on our commitments from the workshop.

First Pangolin Range States Meeting, De Nang, Viet Nam, 24-26 June 2015: Delegates from 14 Asian and 17 African pangolin range countries met 24-26 June 2015, for the First Pangolin Range States Meeting in De Nang, Viet Nam. The workshop provided an opportunity for delegates to develop a unified action plan with recommendations to protect pangolin species against over-exploitation as a result of international trade and resulted in enhanced connectivity between range states, heightened determination to tackle complex challenges, and progress towards CITES-prescribed calls for information and action. Experts from the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), Species Survival Commission (SSC), and Pangolin Specialist Group shared expertise on pangolins through presentations and working group sessions. The final outcomes from the workshop were joint recommendations for the following critical actions to address: making of CITES non-detriment

findings for exports of pangolin species; pangolin biological data deficits; evaluation of pangolin species against the CITES species listing criteria; legal and illegal harvest and trade; the care and husbandry of pangolins; and enforcement. The recommendations will be presented in a report to the CITES Intersessional Pangolin Working group, which will be reviewed by the Standing Committee at SC66.

Polar Bear Stakeholder Forum: Canada and the United States hosted a Polar Bear Stakeholder Forum at the USFWS NCTC facility in Shepherdstown, West Virginia, in June 2015. Because Canada and the United States have shared responsibility for the management of polar bears in the respective countries, a Stakeholder Forum was convened to present information about polar bear conservation and management among a broad range of perspectives. Forum participants had the opportunity to ask questions and to improve understanding of the different perspectives to polar bear conservation and management.

Wildlife Enforcement Network: USFWS has been working to develop a plan for wildlife law enforcement networking, capacity building, and technical assistance in the Caribbean - for both terrestrial and marine species. USFWS is working cooperatively with the U.S. Department of State and NMFS, as well as the Secretariat and others, to develop a plan to convene a workshop and advance the prospects for the development of a Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN) in the region. The development of improved enforcement coordination in the Caribbean was recommended by the Parties to the SPAW Protocol in 2014 and by an international workshop on iguana conservation in 2013. We hope to convene this enforcement workshop in early 2016.

Guide on Importing and Exporting CITES-Listed Species: The American Herbal Products Association (AHPA), a U.S. national trade association representing members of the herbal products industry, developed a “Primer on Importing & Exporting CITES-Listed Species” to provide guidance for U.S. importers and exporters of commonly traded CITES-listed species that are used as ingredients in traditional medicines and dietary supplements. The United States submitted the Primer as an information document (PC21 Inf. 11) to PC21. It is available on-line at: http://www.ahpa.org/Portals/0/pdfs/AHPA_CITES_Import_Export_Primer.pdf.

Central America, the Caribbean, Africa and Asian Regions: The United States participated in the following international workshops in an effort to enhance capacity in those countries/regions:

- Workshop to Strengthen the Capacity of Authorities to Implement CITES in the Republic of Panama (May 2013). Representatives from the U.S. Scientific Authority the U.S. Department of the Interior International Technical Assistance program (DOI-ITAP), and the CITES Secretariat conducted a workshop in Panama City to train Panamanian CITES officials in the making of non-detriment findings and general CITES matters. Approximately 35–40 officials, including government lawyers, military personnel, border patrol agents and environmental police, and plant and wildlife inspectors participated in the 3-day workshop.
- Sub-Saharan Africa Red List Workshop in Togo (August 2013). A U.S. Scientific Authority representative participated in the IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group's workshop on Conservation Status of the Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles of Sub-Saharan Africa, with other African CITES Authorities (Liberia, South Africa, Kenya, and Tanzania). This workshop was critically important because it included a discussion on the potential listing of African turtles, particularly soft-shelled turtles, for CoP17.

- Regional Workshop to Build Capacity to Undertake CITES Non-detriment Findings in Central America and the Dominican Republic (September 2013). Thirty-five experts from the CITES Scientific and Management Authorities, and national fisheries agencies of Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama, as well as representatives from the Organization of Fisheries and Aquaculture Sector of the Central American Isthmus (OSPESCA), participated in a 3 ½ day regional training workshop on making non-detriment findings (NDFs), held in San Salvador, El Salvador, 3-6 September 2013. Workshop participants learned about CITES Resolutions pertaining to NDFs, tools and methodologies to improve making NDFs, and discussed NDFs developed by other countries. Participants analyzed plant and animal species case studies from the region, and developed recommendations and agreements intended to improve the general knowledge and capacity relating to making NDFs for CITES-listed species traded in the region.
- Caribbean Region-Wide Workshop on Rock Iguana (*Cyclura* species) Conservation in San Juan, Puerto Rico (December 2013). USFWS, in cooperation with the Puerto Rico Department of Natural and Environmental Resources, San Diego Zoo Global, Island Conservation, the Caribbean Landscape Conservation Consortium, and the Fort Worth Zoo, sponsored a Caribbean-wide workshop on rock iguana conservation in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The workshop was attended by 61 participants from 16 nations, islands, and NGOs which identified the most critical issues for rock iguana conservation and developed actions plans and timelines for high priority projects focused on alleviating threats to rock iguanas, including unsustainable or illegal international trade. Iguanas are the largest native vertebrates that remain on many Caribbean islands and face threats from introduced mammalian predators, habitat destruction, collection for the pet trade, hunting, vehicular mortality, and competition and interbreeding with the invasive green iguana. As seed dispersers, rock iguanas are vital to maintaining native plant communities and supporting ecosystem health.
- Third Workshop on Non-Detriment Findings (NDF), Guatemala City, Guatemala (March 2014). The objectives of the workshop, which was attended by 32 participants including several representatives from the United States, were to share the progress made by countries on the implementation of the new CITES marine species listings, including three species of hammerhead sharks in Appendix II; to share efforts in preparing NDFs considering the agreements and recommendations of the workshop in September 2013 (El Salvador); and to establish collaborative mechanisms both regionally and nationally among CITES Authorities, fisheries, and organizations to contribute to sustainable and responsible management of shark species in Appendix II.
- The U.S. Scientific Authority attended the workshop in Bonn, Germany, hosted by the German CITES Scientific Authority, 2-22 August 2014, to assist in developing an NDF guidance document for shark species. The main outcome of the workshop was the development of General Guidelines for the formulation of NDFs of CITES-listed sharks. It is now available to all Parties to help guide their making of NDFs for sharks.
- Capacity Exchange Workshop between Guatemala and the United States (3-7 November 2014). Representatives of the U.S. Scientific and Management Authorities participated in this workshop, hosted by the Guatemalan CITES Scientific Authority, for CITES-listed timber species. The

purpose of the workshop was to improve the effective implementation of CITES for Guatemalan timber species.

- The United States participated in the 11th Meeting of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS). The meeting occurred from 4-9 November 2014, in Quito, Ecuador. While not a signatory to the CMS, the United States has many international commitments for CMS-listed species. CMS agenda items of conservation interest to the United States included migratory birds, sharks and rays, polar bear, Asiatic and African lion, and wildlife crime.
- CITES Authorities from the United States, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement, and NMFS participated in the “International CITES Workshop: Articulating Experiences and Strategies for the Implementation of Shark Species Included in Appendix II”, in Santa Marta, Colombia, 25-27 November, 2014. More than 60 participants, representing over 20 countries, participated in the workshop. Topics discussed included: the making NDFs to ensure sustainable use of shark species in international trade; species identification; and traceability of products (fins and meat). The presentation of the identification software iSharkfin (an application to aid the identification of shark’s fins through photographs) was an outcome of the workshop. The participants also identified current needs and recommendations for effectively implementing the shark listings. This workshop was hosted by the government of Colombia, with support from the CITES Secretariat, NMFS, and USFWS.
- To improve the effective implementation of CITES, the United States provides assistance to other CITES Parties through capacity building. The African French speaking countries are a U.S. priority area for these efforts given their high biodiversity and volume of traded wildlife. At the request of both Gabon and Cameroon, representatives of the U.S. CITES Authorities conducted two CITES Needs Assessments: one in Gabon (June 2014) and the other in Cameroon (December 2014), in order to provide them with recommendations to improve CITES implementation in their respective countries.
- The U.S. Scientific Authority attended a two day workshop hosted by Amphibian Survival Alliance, Defenders of Wildlife, Animal Welfare Institute, and Singapore Zoo, jointly held 12-13 March 2015, concurrently in both Washington, D.C., and Singapore. The workshop brought together experts from around the world to identify amphibian species that are most threatened by international trade activities, and for which a listing proposal at CoP17 could possibly be warranted.
- The U.S. Scientific Authority participated in a regional workshop in Georgetown, Guyana, on 21 May 2015, at the request of the U.S. Embassy. The workshop, which was organized by the NGO Panthera and the Government of Guyana, and partially funded by a USFWS grant, was designed to build the capacity of governments in the region to make scientific-based decisions under CITES, particularly in the setting of export quotas for wild-caught specimens.

Foreign Service Training: On 23 June 2014, DOI-ITAP and USFWS presented a talk on CITES and anti-wildlife trafficking measures to 20 trainees of the U.S. Department of State (Foreign Service Institute). The trainees will be assigned to U.S. Embassies and Consulates around the world.

United States participates in the Masters Course module on plant trade: The United States continued its long history of participating in the International University of Andalucia's CITES Master's Course: Management, Access and Conservation of species in trade: The International Framework. In 2014, USFWS provided an instructor to participate in the modules on introduction and implementation of CITES and the scientific aspects related to flora.

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

Central America and the Caribbean

Costa Rica

- Spring 2014, San Jose: DOI-ITAP assisted Costa Rican CITES authorities in developing and establishing an on-line, automated CITES permit application and tracking system, increasing efficiency and reducing workload and data errors for users and government officials.
- March 2015, Punta Arenas: DOI-ITAP provided support to a meeting for Costa Rican authorities from INCOPESCA and other agencies, and their counterparts they invited from El Salvador and Guatemala, to learn about risk assessment methodologies in developing a CITES NDF. Technical experts: Mexico's National Fisheries Institute (INAPESCA), the CITES Secretariat, and the Costa Rican Government.

Dominican Republic

- April-May 2013: DOI-ITAP sponsored two 2-day CITES workshops, one in Santo Domingo and one in Barahona.

Guatemala

- 25 February 2014, Guatemala City: DOI-ITAP assisted the National Committee for Protected Areas (CONAP), CITES administrative authority, in conducting a national-level workshop to discuss with relevant government institutions the processes to implement the new CITES Appendix-II shark listings. The institutions defined the actions to be taken for the regulation, control, and procedures for the export and import of these species beginning in September 2014. A series of meetings were planned to continue working together inter-institutionally.
- May 2015, Guatemala City: DOI-ITAP developed and supported a 2-day workshop to provide an overview of CITES and wildlife inspection techniques to Guatemalan Customs, border protection, and inspection officials. Technical experts: USFWS Office of Law Enforcement, DOI-ITAP, and the Guatemalan National Committee for Protected Areas (CONAP).

Honduras

- 2013-2014, Tegucigalpa: DOI-ITAP assisted Honduran CITES authorities in developing and establishing an automated CITES permit tracking system, increasing efficiency and fraud detection while reducing workload and data errors for government officials.
- April 2015, La Cieba: DOI-ITAP developed and supported a 2-day workshop to provide an overview of CITES and wildlife inspection techniques to Honduran Customs, border protection, and inspection officials. Technical experts: USFWS Office of Law Enforcement and DOI-ITAP.

Nicaragua

- DOI-ITAP was not able to use funding to support the Government of Nicaragua during this period.

Multi-national and Regional

- September 2013, San Salvador, El Salvador: DOI-ITAP supported a 4-day intensive workshop to provide training on numerous aspects of CITES NDFs, such as risk assessment, methodology, information and data needed, and other considerations and guidelines in formulating an NDF. Participating countries: Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Panama, and Peru. Technical experts: USFWS, the CITES Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC, OSPESCA, and Traffic.
- March 2014: DOI-ITAP worked with UNEP-WCMC to develop a CITES Trade Data Analysis report for Central America and the Dominican Republic. The companion web site to this report in Spanish: <http://citescentroamerica.unep-wcmc.org/wordpress/spanish/> In English: <http://citescentroamerica.unep-wcmc.org/wordpress/english/>.
- March 2014 in Guatemala City, Guatemala: DOI-ITAP, USFWS, and the CITES Secretariat supported a 2-day workshop focused on developing national and potentially regional CITES NDFs for hammerhead and other shark species. DOI-ITAP also supported a 1-day training session on use of CITES databases and an overview of the recently completed CITES Trade Data Analysis report conducted by UNEP-WCMC. Participating countries: Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Panama. Technical experts: CITES Secretariat, USFWS, NMFS, IUCN, OSPESCA, and WCS.
- 25-27 November 2014, Santa Marta, Colombia: DOI-ITAP with the support of USFWS facilitated the participation of CITES authorities of Honduras and Costa Rica to the International Shark CITES Workshop: Joint Experiences and Strategies for Implementation of the Inclusion of Species in Appendix II. Participants from the region shared their progress on regional processes to define protocols for making NDFs, implementing strategies to ensure monitoring, and identification of species.
- January 2015, Guatemala City, Guatemala: DOI-ITAP, in conjunction with OSPESCA, USFWS, and Humane Society International supported a Regional Expert Consensus Workshop for the Procedures for Making Non-detriment Findings for Species of Sharks and Rays in Central American Integration System (SICA) member countries. Participating countries: Belize, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Panama. A regional protocol on guidelines for the development of marine species NDFs was agreed upon

by the CITES scientific authorities and was presented to the board of OSPESCA for their review and implementation.

- 1 January 2013 - 30 June 2015, various locations: DOI-ITAP has provided judicial authorities (judges, prosecutors, and solicitors) training on CITES and the regulations promulgated for implementation in various CAFTA-DR countries within the framework of the Central American Wildlife Enforcement network (CAWEN, or ROAVIS in Spanish).

South America

Chile

- 1 January 2013 – 30 June 2015, Santiago and Valparaiso, Chile: In a CITES legislation support effort, DOI-ITAP helped contact 70 legislative stakeholders to inform them about the status of Chile's CITES-implementing legislation and potential challenges associated with Chile remaining in Category 2 status. These efforts helped to reactivate legislative discussion of the CITES bill 4 years after its original introduction to the Legislature. DOI-ITAP also served as a technical assistance resource to the CITES National Committee and others during each one of its legislative stages.
- June 2014, Santiago, Chile: DOI-ITAP sponsored a 4-day workshop on CITES Enforcement for 40 Chilean officials from a variety of agencies. Technical experts from USFWS Office of Law Enforcement and CITES offices provided presentations along with Chilean officials and CITES authorities. As a result of intensive working sessions, the group identified a series of best practices for inter-agency coordination protocols and species ID techniques in border controls.
- August 2014, Santiago, Chile: DOI-ITAP, in partnership with two leading agencies in marketing and strategic communication from Chile and the United States, delivered a multi-media campaign proposal to CITES national authorities. It aimed to call citizens' attention to protecting Chilean wildlife and increasing awareness about CITES among Chilean policy-makers. The campaign was valued at 80,000 USD and was financed through in-kind donations from both agencies.
- September 2014, Santiago, Chile: DOI-ITAP and the CITES National Committee of Chile sponsored a 1-day CITES seminar attended by over 100 government officials, policy makers, NGOs, and other relevant stakeholders to increase awareness of the value and importance of CITES. DOI-ITAP supported the participation of CITES Secretariat Communications and Outreach Officer Juan Carlos Vásquez and FWS Assistant Director for International Affairs Bryan Arroyo.
- October 2014, Valparaiso, Chile: DOI-ITAP supported the participation of CITES Secretariat Communications and Outreach Officer Juan Carlos Vásquez and USFWS Assistant Director for International Affairs Bryan Arroyo in a series of meetings with key Chilean congress members involved in re-introducing CITES implementation legislation, providing testimony to the Agricultural Commission of the Representatives' Chamber, and meeting with National Customs Service of Chile to discuss CITES enforcement issues.

- November 2014, Santiago, Chile: DOI-ITAP sponsored a ½-day seminar for a group of Chilean judges to familiarize and update them on CITES legislative and enforcement efforts in Chile.
- November 2014, Santa Marta, Colombia: DOI-ITAP funded the participation of three Chilean delegates in an international shark workshop sponsored by the Government of Colombia and held in Santa Marta, Colombia. Its goal was to evaluate the necessary monitoring and control mechanisms to ensure traceability of international trade in products (fins and meat) of shark species listed in CITES Appendix II, and to define strategies for the development of NDFs on newly listed shark species.
- 10 December 2014, Santiago, Chile: DOI-ITAP delivered a total of 40 CD-ROMs to national authorities with audio-visual material about CITES and DOI-ITAP technical assistances projects executed during 2014 about CITES capacity building. These CDs will support independent training initiatives within Chilean Government agencies.

Multinational Species Conservation Funds: The Multinational Species Conservation Funds consist of five programs created to fulfill direct congressional mandates to conserve populations of and habitats for African elephants, Asian elephants, great apes, rhinoceroses and tigers, and marine turtles. These programs involve CITES-listed species: the African Elephant Conservation Act of 1989, Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994, Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997, Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000, and Marine Turtles Conservation Act of 2004. These programs provide direct support to range countries through broad-based partnerships with national governments, NGOs, and other private entities for on-the-ground activities to conserve these species and their habitats. USFWS administers the Multinational Species Conservation Funds. During the period from January 2013 through June 2015, USFWS granted a total of 19,992,482 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: | 38 projects totalling 2,959,899 USD in funding |
| Asian elephant: | 86 projects totalling 4,448,448 USD in funding |
| Rhinoceros & tiger: | 96 projects totalling 5,264,872 USD in funding |
| Great ape: | 61 projects totalling 3,701,856 USD in funding |
| Marine turtles: | 100 projects totalling 3,617,408 USD in funding |

D7. Collaboration/co-operative initiatives

U.S. CITES Export Tagging Program: The United States cooperates with its States and Indian Tribes in utilizing a tagging program for the export of skins of the following Appendix-II species: bobcat (*Lynx rufus*); river otter (*Lontra canadensis*); Canada lynx (*Lynx canadensis*); gray wolf (*Canis lupus*); brown bear (*Ursus arctos*); and American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*). During the reporting period, USFWS approved the State of Montana’s request to annually export up to 200 gray wolf hides/skins. This approval was for one year, with renewal conditional upon compliance with tagging and reporting conditions.

USFWS initiated this program over 30 years ago to streamline their CITES permit issuance process for the export of skins of these species. USFWS currently cooperates with 48 States and 30 Indian Tribes that have instituted approved harvest programs. USFWS approves a State or Indian Tribe for inclusion in the CITES Export Tagging Program when it can make the two CITES findings based on that State's or Tribe's harvest program and enforcement regime. Each approved State or Tribe applies CITES tags, provided by USFWS, to new skins of approved species taken in that State or Tribe and intended for export from the United States. The tags serve as evidence that the skins were legally taken and that their export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species.

During 2013, USFWS issued nearly 780,000 tags, and during 2014, the USFWS issued over 735,000 tags. During the reporting period, USFWS approved into the program one Tribe for exports of river otter and six Tribes for exports of bobcat.

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

CITES Plant Rescue Center Program: USFWS established the CITES Plant Rescue Center Program in 1978 in response to the need to care for live CITES-listed plants legally abandoned or forfeited to the U.S. Government due to non-compliance with the import/export requirements of the Convention. USFWS administers this program in cooperation with APHIS, the U.S. inspection agency for live CITES-listed plants entering the United States. Currently, 84 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 2013, APHIS confiscated 31 shipments of live plant material that were in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 6,695 plants. The 31 shipments assigned to plant rescue centers contained 3,864 orchids, 2,343 aloes, 411 cacti, 27 euphorbias, 27 pitcher plants, and 8 tree ferns. During 2014, APHIS confiscated 28 shipments of live plant material that were in violation of CITES. These shipments contained a total of 3,985 plants and 16 cactus skeletons. The 26 shipments assigned to plant rescue centers contained 2,693 cacti, 1,113 euphorbias, 112 orchids, 50 podophyllums, 11 succulents, 3 tillandsias, and 2 cycads, 2,343 aloes, 27 pitcher plants, and 8 tree ferns, plus 14 cactus skeletons.

USFWS participates in Wood Summit: A representative of the U.S. Management Authority participated in the Fifth Bi-Annual Wood Summit on 7 May 2015, hosted by the C. F. Martin & Co., Inc. at the company's headquarters in Nazareth, Pennsylvania. Topics on the agenda ranged from the

regulation of international trade in CITES-listed timber species and Lacey Act Due Care to DNA Chain of Custody tracking and alternative material sourcing.

USFWS participates in European Regional CITES Plants Meeting: A representative of the U.S. Management Authority participated in the IX European Regional CITES Plants Meeting, held in Wageningen, the Netherlands, in November 2014. The U.S. representative participated in discussions on plant issues of interest to the European region and gave presentations on the progress of work in the Standing Committee Working Group on Annotations and initiatives and challenges in the United States related to implementation of CITES tree species listings.

20th North American Trilateral Meeting (April 2015): The CITES Table met during the 2015 annual meeting of the Canada/Mexico/United States Trilateral Committee for Wildlife and Ecosystem Conservation and Management, held April 2015, in San Diego, California. Much of the work of the CITES Table focuses on regional coordination in preparation for CITES meetings. Topics addressed included evaluation of the Review of Significant Trade, the periodic review of the Appendices, listing annotations, implementation of CITES listings for timber species, implementation of CITES for marine species, illegal trade of *Totoaba macdonaldi*, and the U.S. Executive Order on Combating Wildlife Trafficking.

Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (AFWA) workshop: In partnership with USFWS, a workshop was convened by AFWA in January 2014 to discuss management measures and the conservation status of the paddlefish (*Polyodon spathula*). Representatives from 20 U.S. State Fish and Wildlife Agencies and three USFWS regions attended. The primary outcome of the workshop was an agreement that paddlefish should be managed by river basins, rather than individually by each State. The Lower Mississippi River Basin States previously developed a management plan for paddlefish in Alabama, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee, which may serve as a model for management of the species on a multi-state level. In an effort to implement recommendations that came out of the workshop, the States have begun to age paddlefish. Aging data is needed for the models the States anticipate to develop in order to inform paddlefish management and set regulations. The aging data should be available by August 2015. Also, the commercial paddlefish States continue to advance the development of basin-wide management plans and look for ways to provide the funds needed to manage paddlefish.

National Assessment of Non-Timber Forest Products (September 2014): The USFS sponsored this stakeholders meeting to inform policy options and identify information gaps that can limit effective decision making in the sustainable harvest and management of non-timber forest products (NTFPs). A segment on CITES and NTFPs was presented by a representative of the U.S. Scientific Authority, as part of in-depth discussions of the major issues affecting NTFPs (e.g., ecology, culture, economics, and regulations). NTFPs include the more than 200 medicinal plants that are listed in the CITES Appendices, along with numerous plant species used for food, wax, fragrances, and horticulture. The meeting represented one of the first national, “all-lands” meetings to bring together multiple disciplines from Federal and non-Federal entities to focus exclusively on NTFPs, and will result in the publication of a comprehensive national assessment of NTFPs and impacts from climatic variability and change (anticipated publication early 2016).

Chambered nautilus meeting: NMFS and USFWS hosted a meeting on 4-5 June 2014, in Silver Spring, Maryland, with several chambered nautilus species experts. The goal of the meeting was to bring these experts together to share and discuss recent and historical, biological and trade data. This species has been recommended for listing in the CITES Appendices in the past; however, to-date there has been a lack of biological and trade information on the species.

AZA meeting: The U.S. CITES Authorities participated in the mid-year meeting of the AZA held in Columbia, South Carolina, on 21-27 March 2015. The meeting included a workshop on CITES permitting requirements for the export and/or import of animals.

National seed strategy: The U.S. Scientific Authority is participating in the development of a U.S. national seed strategy to improve coordination between Federal and non-Federal land managers to conserve, restore, and rehabilitate native landscapes, ecosystems, and plant communities that are increasingly impacted by fire, development, encroachment from invasive species, or climate change. Of particular interest to U.S. CITES authorities are opportunities to coordinate with the variety of botanical experts (including plant geneticists, rare plant specialists, and restoration ecologists) to explore prospects for germplasm conservation and restoration for U.S. native CITES-listed plant species. The National Seed Strategy for Rehabilitation and Restoration 2015-2020 is near completion and is expected to be publicly released soon.

CITES-listed pollinators and pollinator health strategy: Through the Pollinator Partnership, a diverse set of partners who promote pollinator conservation and education, the USFWS raises the visibility of CITES-listed plants and animals that depend on pollination. Several animal species involved in pollination or seed dispersal, including bats, beetles, butterflies, hummingbirds, marsupials, primates, rodents, and treeshrews are regulated under CITES and are variously traded for consumption, for the pet trade, and for collectors, among other trade activities.

During U.S. National Pollinator Week in 2013, USFWS developed a social media campaign to raise awareness of CITES-listed pollinators and outreach material featuring such pollinators as hummingbirds (family Trochilidae; Appendix II) and pollinated plants such as Appendix-II listed saguaro cactus (*Carnegiea gigantea*; Appendix II). The featured species for National Pollinator Week in 2014 were orchids (family Orchidaceae; Appendix I and II), and carnivorous plants in 2015 (including Appendix-II *Sarracenia* spp. and *Dionaea muscipula*).

In May 2015, the United States released a comprehensive pollinator health strategy to outline needs and priority actions to better understand pollinator losses and improve pollinator health. The Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators and accompanying Research Action Plan, written by an interagency task force at the direction of U.S. President Obama, can be accessed at <https://www.whitehouse.gov/blog/2015/05/19/announcing-new-steps-promote-pollinator-health>. More at: <http://www.fws.gov/pollinators/>

Criminal investigations training in Africa: In response to the wildlife poaching crisis in Africa, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement presented comprehensive criminal investigations training programs in both June 2013 and August 2013 at the U.S. State Department's International Law Enforcement Academy in Gabarone, Botswana. A total of 65 officers from 10 sub-Saharan African nations – Botswana, Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Gabon, Kenya, Namibia, Republic of the Congo, South Africa, Tanzania, and Zambia – completed the intensive two-week course.

Anti-smuggling training in Asia: In the fall of 2013, USFWS law enforcement officers helped conduct an anti-smuggling training program hosted by the Department of Homeland Security in Bangkok, Thailand. They provided courses on CITES, surveillance, controlled deliveries, and crime scene processing to 40 participants from the Royal Thai Police; Royal Thai, Laotian and Myanmar Customs; Thailand's Attorney General's Office; INTERPOL; the FREELAND Foundation; and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network.

Transnational Organized Crime Rewards Program: The first reward offered under this new U.S. program (which was created by Congress in 2013) was related to wildlife trafficking. In November 2013, the U.S. Department of State announced that the United States was offering up to 1 million USD reward for information leading to the dismantling of the Xaysavang Network. Based in Laos – with affiliates in South Africa, Mozambique, Thailand, Malaysia, Vietnam, and China – the Xaysavang Network facilitates the killing of endangered elephants, rhinos, and other species for products such as ivory.

Wood identification workshop in Nicaragua: The USFS sent an expert from its Forest Products Lab to Nicaragua in 2013 to deliver a wood identification workshop using the USFS' Central America wood identification manual. The workshop in Nicaragua had approximately 40 attendees from local government and universities.

USFWS senior special agent/international attache program: The USFWS Office of Law Enforcement created the first-ever program for stationing wildlife special agents at U.S. Embassies as international attaches to coordinate investigations of wildlife trafficking and support wildlife enforcement capacity-building. The first posting was effective January 2014 at the U.S. Embassy in Bangkok. USFWS will hire and recruit four additional agent/attaches over the course of 2014. Plans call for two postings in sub-Saharan Africa; one in South America; plus one additional posting in Asia.

International investigative liaison: During the reporting period, USFWS Office of Law Enforcement staff completed a 3-month detail focused on investigative coordination in Bangkok, Thailand; spent three weeks in Togo providing investigative assistance to enforcement authorities there; made multiple trips to the Philippines to help that nation develop a wildlife law enforcement database capability; and met with counterparts in South Africa and Namibia on investigative strategies and coordination.

CITES enforcement assistance to Viet Nam: In response to a request by Viet Nam's CITES Management Authority for assistance with wildlife trade enforcement, a forensic scientist from the USFWS Forensics Laboratory was selected by the U.S. State Department and USFWS for a Science Fellowship in Viet Nam during the summer of 2013, to work with Viet Nam's Management Authority to share the U.S. experience with wildlife trade enforcement, and to provide recommendations to increase the effectiveness of CITES enforcement in Viet Nam.

Targeting capacity enhanced: In March 2013, the USFWS Office of Law Enforcement expanded its abilities to target illegal wildlife shipments by joining 10 other Federal agencies with border management or import safety responsibilities as a member of the Commercial Targeting and Analysis Center in Washington, D.C. Two USFWS employees will be part of an interagency group of trade and intelligence analysts at the Center, which facilitates information sharing and collaboration across U.S. border enforcement agencies.