

# **Evaluation of IUCN SSC & TRAFFIC's Analyses of Proposals to Amend CITES Appendices**

## **Final Report**

**July 2000**

***Universalialia***

5252 de Maisonneuve Ouest #310

Montréal, Québec, Canada H4A 3S5

Tél. (514) 485-3565

Fax (514) 485-3210

[www.universalialia.com](http://www.universalialia.com)



## Executive Summary

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is the main international instrument in the regulation of international wildlife trade. Endangered species are contained in one of three Appendices to the Convention and are entered into or taken from the Appendices based on proposals made by signatories (Parties) to the Convention. Many proposals, which must meet a set of criteria defined by the Convention, are missing critical information when first received by the CITES Secretariat.

Funding has been received since 1987 to prepare a document for delegates to the Conference of the Parties (Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices) that summarizes the proposal, identifies if the criteria have been met or not and, where necessary and possible, gathers the required additional information. The Analyses were distributed through the formal CITES information distribution system (to the designated Management Authorities of each party) and were made available this year on the World Wide Web. The format of the Analyses was redesigned for CITES CoP 11 to make the Analyses as useful as possible to delegates. It is noted that the production of the Analyses is carried out within a very demanding timeframe, dictated by the final date for the acceptance of proposals and the need to distribute the document to the Management Authorities in time to make it of use in country and regional level decision making processes.

Working with the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Program and Universalialia (a Canadian based consulting company with significant experience in international evaluations) IUCN and TRAFFIC undertook an evaluation of the Analyses. The Evaluation sought primarily to determine the effectiveness of the Analyses in facilitating the CITES decision making process and of the new design format and current distribution system, to identify any ways in which these areas could be improved and to provide accountability to funders of the project.

Data was collected primarily by interview of delegates at the CoP 11 held in Nairobi, April 2000, a questionnaire distribute to all heads of delegations at the CoP, project staff persons and review of project related documentation. A breakdown of respondents geographic origins by region is appended to the report.

The evaluation report records 19 Findings and a related series of conclusions and recommendations. The major findings indicate that the Analyses are valued as an important and generally impartial source information to aid delegates in their decision making by those delegates who had received the document. Respondents emphasized the critical role that the Analyses played in providing data missing from the original proposals and as a key instrument for raising the level of decision making to a scientific basis.

Delegates also reported that IUCN and TRAFFIC were, in their view, uniquely qualified to produce the Analyses and no alternative approaches to the production of the them to achieve the same goals were suggested.

The new tabular format design of the Analyses was welcomed by most respondents, who also reported that the language used in it was suitable for readers and non-readers of scientific documents and suggested further improvements for future editions. Availability to the Analyses on the World Wide Web was welcomed by those with access to the Internet and usage statistics support the conclusion that this is an important complimentary distribution channel.

A limitation on the documents usefulness in this regard is the CITES formal distribution system of sending documentation to the country level Management Authorities for each party. A significant number of delegates to CoP 11 reported that they had not received a copy of the Analyses from their Management Authority prior to arriving in Nairobi.

While recognizing that production timing of the Analyses is dictated by the deadline dates for proposals contained within the Convention, some delegates indicated the desirability to receive the Analyses even earlier than is currently possible in order to use them in their country and regional pre-Cop decision making processes.

The evaluation concluded that the Analyses play a key role in facilitating decision making at CITES and that continuing donor support should be sought for their production for future COPs.

## Acronyms

IUCN	World Conservation Union
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
MA	Management Authority
SA	Scientific Authority
COP	Conference of the Parties
SSC	Species Survival Commission

## Contents

<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Background	5
1.2 Objectives	5
1.3 Methodology	5
1.3.1 Sources of data	5
1.3.2 Evaluation Team	6
1.4 Limitations to the evaluation	6
1.5 Organization of the Report	6
<b>2. Project context</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Project rationale</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>4. Key targets for the Analyses</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5. The effectiveness of the Analyses</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 Introduction	9
5.2 Meeting donor requirements	9
5.3 Provision of an effective vehicle for use of SSC's expertise	10
5.4 Design and distribution of the Analyses	12
<b>6. Efficiency of the Analyses Approach</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>7. Additional findings</b>	<b>16</b>
7.1 Specialist Groups	16
<b>8. Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>16</b>

## Exhibits

Exhibit 4.1 Key targets for the Analyses (in order of priority) and their uses of the Analyses	9
Exhibit 5.1 Delegate interview and survey results: Importance and impartiality of Analyses	11

## Appendices

Appendix I List of Findings	19
Appendix II Geographic breakdown of interview respondents and Delegate Questionnaires	21
Appendix III Example of in-country use of the Analyses	22
Appendix IV Example of Delegate Interview protocol and Head of Delegation questionnaire	24

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is the main international instrument in the regulation of international wildlife trade. By joining CITES, governments make a commitment to manage international wildlife trade. There are currently 151 parties to the convention.

Species under the remit of the convention are listed on three Convention Appendices, which provide different levels of protection, depending on the degree of threat to the species. CITES convenes a biannual Conference of the Parties (COP) at which delegates consider proposals from signatories to the Convention to make amendments to remove, add or transfer species between the three Appendices.

Decisions taken by the COP must be based on the best available scientific and technical information in order to maintain the credibility of the Convention. To help insure that such information is available to delegates to the COP, The World Conservation Union (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC) and TRAFFIC produce an *Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* ("The Analyses"). The Analyses aim to provide as independent an assessment as possible of each amendment proposal as measured against the requirements for the Convention laid out in the listing criteria established by a CITES resolution.

Given the significant resources allocated to production of the Analyses and a newly introduced format for them for CITES COP 11, SSC and TRAFFIC called for an evaluation of the project. IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Program staff and Universalialia, a Canadian consulting firm with significant experience in international evaluation, worked with SSC Program staff to design and implement the evaluation. This document reports on the results of the evaluation.

## 1.2 Objectives

Three major objectives were identified for the evaluation. The objectives were:

- To determine how effective the Analyses is in facilitating the CITES decision-making process;
- To determine the effectiveness of the design format and distribution system of Analyses and identify any opportunities for improvement in these areas;
- To provide accountability to the project funder.

## 1.3 Methodology

### 1.3.1 Sources of data

The three principal sources of data from the evaluation were interviews, questionnaires, and document review. Four preliminary telephone interviews were held with key informants selected from a list prepared by SSC staff. A Universalialia team member attended the CITES COP 11 held in Nairobi, April 2000 for the first five days in order to interview a cross section of delegates and staff members in person. He was assisted by a SSC staff member who also carried out additional interviews after the Universalialia team member's departure. Thirty-three interviews were completed with delegates who had received the Analyses prior to their arrival in Nairobi. A further 43 delegates were requested to participate in an interview who, it was established, had not received a copy of the Analyses prior to their arrival. Interviews were also carried out with SSC staff and consultants who had worked on the preparation of the Analyses. In addition a written questionnaire was distributed to all heads of delegations during the COP; thirty-five were returned. A copy of the questionnaires used for the interviews and delegates are found in

Appendix IV and a breakdown of the geographic origin of the respondents are found in Appendix II. The latter Appendix indicates that 111 respondents were contacted from 71 different countries.

A questionnaire was administered by e-mail to the SSC Group Chairs who convened reviewers for the proposals; twelve were returned. Additional data with regard to Web site hits was collected from staff members at IUCN and TRAFFIC. Relevant documentation was gathered for review including: the IUCN SSC and TRAFFIC proposal for funding of the Analyses, the Analyses themselves, the SSC Strategic Plan (1996), and sample correspondence between SSC staff and SSC SG and SU Chairs and reviewers.

### **1.3.2 Evaluation Team**

The evaluation team was lead by two Universalia consultants, Dr. Charles Lusthaus and Mr. Steve Gruber. Mr. Gruber attended the COP 11 and the team was assisted throughout the evaluation by Mr. Neville Ash, IUCN Wildlife Trade Programme Assistant.

## **1.4 Limitations to the evaluation**

While the evaluation team is confident that its data gathering was sufficient to support the findings and recommendations recorded in this report a series of limitations were inevitably met that limited the depth and breadth of the evaluation. The main limitations encountered included the following:

- Limited availability of resources to permit the evaluator remain for the entirety of the COP 11;
- The attempt (failed) of one Party in the middle of COP 11 to attack the credibility of the Analyses as a tactic in its attempt to defeat a controversial proposal. The result was that for two or three days delegates were hesitant to be interviewed over the Analyses presumably not wishing to be associated with any controversy. However, the reluctance to be interviewed dropped off as the issue faded and delegates moved on to other proposals during the week. Interview results after the incident were compared to those held prior to the incident and the evaluation team is satisfied that they were not skewed by the incident, the major impact being a reduction in the number of delegates available for interviewing over a two to three day period;
- The fullness the COP agenda combined with additional delegate, regional and species meetings being organized significantly limited the opportunities to interview delegates.

## **1.5 Organization of the Report**

This report is organized in into eight sections. Following this introductory section a description of the project context is provided and the rationale for production of the Analyses. The evaluation findings are presented in sections four to seven and the last section reports on conclusions and recommendations.

## **2. Project context**

### **CITES history**

During the 1960's, countries became increasingly aware that over-exploitation of wildlife through international trade was contributing to the rapid decline of many species of plants and animals around the globe. In 1963, IUCN began drafting an international convention to regulate the export, transit and import of rare or threatened wildlife species. The international commitment for a convention was established in June 1972 at the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm, Sweden, which recommended the immediate preparation of an international convention to deal with these issues. The same year, IUCN, the United States and Kenya produced a unified working paper, which became the basis for convention negotiations. Despite difficulties over issues such as defining "species" for the purpose of the convention and applying the convention to endangered species from the marine



environment not included in a State's territory the convention was adopted in March 1973 and entered into force in July, 1975. There are currently 151 Parties to the Convention.

### **CITES goals**

CITES conservation goals are to: monitor and stop commercial international trade in endangered species; maintain those species under international commercial exploitation in an ecological balance; and assist countries towards a sustainable use through international trade.

### **CITES mechanisms**

The mechanisms by which CITES Parties regulate wildlife trade is through controls and regulations on species listed in three Appendices to the Convention. Appendix I lists species endangered due to international trade. Exchange of them is permitted only in exceptional circumstances. Appendix II species require strictly regulated trade based on quotas and/or permits to prevent their unsustainable use; and controls aimed at maintaining ecosystems and preventing species from becoming eligible for Appendix I. Appendix III species are subject to regulation by a Party who requires the cooperation of other Parties to control their international trade. To list a species, a Party provides a proposal for COP approval containing scientific and biological data on population and trade trends. The proposal must also contain information on a number of issues including legal provisions and monitoring and be supported by a two-thirds majority of Parties present and voting at a COP, not including abstentions. CITES only lists species whose populations are obviously impacted by trade. As the trade impact on a species increases or decreases, the COP decides whether or not the species should be shifted between, or removed, from the Appendices.

CITES regulates international trade through a system of permits and certificates that are required before specimens enter or leave a country. Each Party must adopt national legislation to provide official designation of a Management Authority (MA) responsible for issue these permits and certificates based on the advice of a Scientific Authority (SA). Parties maintain trade records which are forwarded to the CITES Secretariat annually, the sum of which enable it to compile statistical information on the world volume of trade in Appendix species. The two designated national authorities (MAs and SAs) also assist with CITES enforcement through cooperation with customs, police, or appropriate agencies.

### **History of the Analyses**

The first Analyses were produced in 1987 by the Trade specialist Group of the IUCN Species Survival Commission, in an attempt to bring science into the CITES decision-making process and to facilitate the adoption of rational decisions. Since then SSC and TRAFFIC have collaborated to produce the Analyses for every COP. In 1994, the Trade Specialist Group was incorporated in to the IUCN Species Survival program. As the issues have become more complex and the Analyses more sophisticated, the staff and volunteer commitment has increased dramatically, until it could no longer be supported by a minimal staff. Consequently, the CITES Standing committee was successfully approached by IUCN and TRAFFIC to contribute to the funding of the project for COP 11.

### **Production of the Analyses**

Production of the Analyses was carried out within a very demanding time frame, mainly during the 150 day period between submission of the proposal to the CITES Secretariat and the meeting. The major objective was to complete the English version eight weeks before the COP. In addition to a hardcopy version a web-based version is also made available in order that government agencies can make use of it in developing their positions on the proposals prior to the meeting. French and Spanish versions are made available about five weeks later. Effectively there is only a ten week period in which to identify the proposal reviewers, undertake the necessary intensive research to supply a substantial amount of data that

was missing from the proposals but required by the CITES criteria, and write, translate and distribute the Analyses.

Chairs of the relevant SSC Specialist and Sustainable Use Groups, Sustainable Use Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC offices were asked to identify reviewers for the proposals other reviewers were identified by having recently published on the species. Where reviewers were not able to be identified and/or additional reviewers were required to ensure all ranges of opinions were reflected in the Analyses the IUCN SSC staff in conjunction with IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme and TRAFFIC International staff identified additional reviewers with the necessary expertise. A consultant was hired to coordinate and write, in conjunction with the head of the IUCN Wildlife Trade Programme, the Analyses.

### 3. Project rationale

One of the challenges faced by the Parties in considering proposals to change the listing of species on the Appendices is the lack of reliable, current information on the biological status and levels of trade for many of the species under consideration. Both biological and trade status issues are becoming increasingly complex and, with the increasing complexity, it becomes more and more difficult for governments, especially those with limited resources, to keep abreast of the scientific issues prevalent within the CITES debates. Few governments have access to the resources, capacity or expertise needed on all species in trade, frequently even for those species that fall within their own political borders. As referred to in Section 1.1 of this report, the Analyses aim to provide an objective assessment as possible for the amendment proposal against the requirements of the Convention. By providing a review of each of the amendment proposals by assessing the relevant biological and trade information against the criteria that must be met under the resolutions of the Convention, the Analyses attempts to bridge the information gap on biological and trade issues in order that COP delegates can make informed decisions when voting on the proposed amendments. In addition, the proposals vary considerably in their quality, many lacking key data required by the CITES criteria for proposals. The Analyses project team make every attempt to identify missing data and consequently bring substantial amounts of additional information to the table.

Further to the external project rationale described above, there is an internal organizational rationale for SSC undertaking production of the Analyses. Objective 4 of the IUCN/SSC Trade Programme Strategic Plan (1996) is to “Mobilize SSC Expertise to influence CITES and other appropriate mechanisms to ensure that the SSC’s expertise is used to influence decisions CITES and other relevant agreements.” One of the proposed actions in the strategic plan to achieve this objective is the production of the IUCN Analyses for CITES.

### 4. Key targets for the Analyses

At the outset of the evaluation the SSP staff team, working with the evaluation team, agreed on the need to clearly identify the key audiences for the Analyses in order of priority to guide the focus of the evaluation.

**Finding 1: The key targets for the Analyses in order of priority are: The Parties, CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC Network, Other interested parties.**

At a meeting of SSC staff the key targets for the analyses were identified as shown in Exhibit 4.1. They are listed in order of priority. The targets and their priority were identified in response to the question “Who are the key persons that can influence CITES decisions?”

**Finding 2: The key targets' (as defined in the stakeholder analyses) needs were served by the Analyses.**

The evaluation findings found in the following sections of this report confirm that the key targets needs were served by the Analyses as defined in the stakeholder analyses carried out by IUCN project staff for this evaluation.

**Exhibit 4.1 Key targets for the Analyses (in order of priority) and their uses of the Analyses**

RANK	TARGET	SUB-SETS OF TARGETS	TARGET USE OF ANALYSES
1	The Parties:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Management Authorities</li> <li>• Scientific Authorities</li> <li>• Other delegates to the COP</li> </ul>	For informing decision making at the COP.
2	CITES Secretariat		To assist in refinement of recommendations
3	TRAFFIC Network: Recommendations Process		To assist in the development of recommendations
4	Other interested parties	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IUCN Regional and Country Offices</li> <li>• IUCN taxonomic, disciplinary and sustainable use specialist groups</li> <li>• Other IUCN members</li> <li>• Other NGOs and observers to the COP</li> <li>• Interested media</li> </ul>	Various

## 5. The effectiveness of the Analyses

### 5.1 Introduction

A series of key evaluation questions were identified by the evaluation team working with the SSP staff in relation to the effectiveness of the Analyses tool. These questions ranged from the degree to which SSC had met the requirements of the donors to the extent to which the format design and delivery of the Analyses helps or hinders the decision making process at CITES. The evaluation's findings related to these questions are described in this section.

### 5.2 Meeting donor requirements

**Finding 3: SSC met all key donor requirements.**

The key donor requirements, identified from the IUCN SSC and TRAFFIC project proposal and Terms of Reference for the Analyses, were:

- To produce a review of the CITES proposals (except those relating to elephants);

- To produce the original English edition of the Analyses eight weeks prior to the COP to be held in Nairobi;
- To make the Analyses available on the World Wide Web;
- To produce French and Spanish version within five weeks of the English version; and
- To distribute the Analyses to the Parties' Management Authorities.

The Terms of Reference are found in Appendix 2 of this report.

Despite the fact that production of the Analyses is carried out within a very demanding time frame, largely during the period between submission of the proposals to the CITES Secretariat and the COP, all language versions of the Analyses were produced according to schedule and made available on the World Wide Web.

### 5.3 Provision of an effective vehicle for use of SSC's expertise

**Finding 4: The Analyses play an influential role in shaping decision making at CITES. However, limitations in their range and timing of the distribution limited them from reaching their full potential in this role.**

The IUCN/SSC Trade Program 1996 Strategic Plan originally envisioned production of the Analyses as a vehicle to *influence* CITES decisions. However, as agreed upon between IUCN and its donors for this project, the objective for the COP 11 Analyses was to provide an objective review of the available data in order that COP delegates can arrive at their own decision on each proposal. However, the evaluators were able to gather data that indicated the Analyses plays a key role in shaping and facilitating the CITES decision making process. For example:

*"We need to know that a third party has reviewed proposals and prepared information"* Interviewed African delegate

- The Analyses is referred to in 40 of the recommendations revised by the CITES Secretariat after their reception of the Analyses. Sixty proposals were analyzed in total.
- The Analyses is referenced to confirm the Secretariats' support for 14 proposals, and to confirm their recommendation for rejection of the proposals in nine instances. In three instances the Secretariat changed its recommendations in line with the IUCN and TRAFFIC's assessments of the relevant criteria (or other information contained within the Analyses). In only five proposals were both the Secretariat's provisional and revised recommendations maintained for rejection of the proposal despite the Analyses suggesting that the criteria were satisfied for the proposal.
- The TRAFFIC Network (the world's major wildlife trade monitoring program and a joint program of IUCN and the World Wildlife Fund for Nature) provides recommendations on the CITES proposal to Parties at the COP. As noted in the TRAFFIC Recommendations for COP 11, the information on which the recommendations are based is derived primarily from the Analyses. The TRAFFIC Director confirmed that the Analyses is the key starting point for development of TRAFFIC's CITES recommendations.
- When the final voting at COP 11 on proposals is compared to the Analyses there is found to be a close correlation between the direction of the votes and the Analyses conclusions as to whether or not

*"The Analyses are important to provide an assessment of the information against the CITES criteria. This is the only document which does this comprehensively"* Interviewed Australian delegate

criteria were satisfied. For example, of the 32 proposals that the Analyses noted as satisfying the criteria 18 were accepted outright, 5 more with amendments. Of the remainder, six were withdrawn and three rejected. Of the nine proposals identified in the Analyses as not satisfying the criteria only two were finally accepted at the COP (5 rejected and 2 withdrawn).

- Of the 19 proposals for which the Analyses noted that either insufficient information was available (or that it was otherwise unclear) to determine whether the criteria were satisfied or not, only two proposals were accepted directly (four were rejected, nine withdrawn and four were amended and then accepted).
- Although timeliness and distribution of the Analyses were found to be issues limiting the use of the Analyses (see Findings 10 and 13) as input into some countries CITES policy making process, interviews with delegates confirmed that many countries referred to the Analyses to help them in their CITES decision-making processes. In most countries and regions that had the resources to produce their own proposal analyses respondents indicated that the data in the Analyses was compared to their own findings. In countries that did not have sufficient resources to prepare their own proposal analyses, access to the Analyses was noted as an essential resource to assist them in their decision making.

However, despite the evidence described above indicating that the Analyses plays an important role in CITES decision-making processes, limitations to the Analyses fulfilling its full potential in this regard were identified in relation to who it reaches and when it reaches them. These findings are detailed further in this section.

**Finding 5: The Analyses are valued as an important and generally impartial source of information, by those delegates familiar with the document, to aid them in their decision making.**

Another important indicator of the degree of influence of the Analyses is how the delegates value them. As shown in Exhibit 5.1, responses from 33 delegates who had read the Analyses and were interviewed for this evaluation and 35 head of delegations who returned a written survey indicated that the Analyses was valued as an important and generally impartial source of information for delegates. It is also noted that 44% of the delegates interviewed rated availability of the Analyses to delegates as *critically* important. Delegate interviews established that the credibility and perceived independence of the IUCN and TRAFFIC as the organizations responsible for production of the Analyses was a key factor in valuing the importance of the data contained in them by delegates.

Several other delegate and project staff interview respondents noted that many of the proposals were incomplete as originally submitted and that the Analyses provided critical additional information necessary for decision making by delegates. The general impartiality and additional data led one delegate interviewed to observe "that without the Analyses, discussion and decisions at the COP would be increasingly driven solely by political rather than scientific and trade issues."

*"The Analyses are essential for deciding on proposals – they provide scientific information to Parties with limited resources"*  
Interviewed Asian delegate

**Exhibit 5.1 Delegate interview and survey results: Importance and impartiality of Analyses**

ITEM	%
% Delegates rating it as important that the Analyses be made available to COP delegates (Head of delegation survey N=35)	100%
% Delegates rating it as important that the Analyses be available to them (Delegate interviews N=33)	80%

ITEM	%
% Delegates rating it as important that the Analyses be available to COP delegates in general (Delegate interviews N=33)	89%
% Delegates rating the Analyses as generally impartial (Head of delegation survey N=35)	94%
% Delegates rating the Analyses as generally impartial them (Delegate interviews N=33)	86%
% Delegates rating the Analyses as of overall good quality (Head of delegation survey N=35)	97%

The 12 IUCN Specialist Group Chairperson responding to a written evaluation survey unanimously agreed that contributing to the review of the CITES proposals is an important role for their Specialist Group (8 of the 12 expressing their strong agreement with this belief). They expressed even stronger agreement (11 of the 12 strongly agreeing) that preparation and distribution of the Analyses is an important support to the work of CITES and that it is important for IUCN to continue producing the Analyses for future CITES COP (11 agreeing, 10 strongly so and one chair noting insufficient knowledge of the CITES process to respond).

Even in controversial proposals that brought the objectivity of the Analyses under strategic attack by proponents of specific viewpoints (such as the proposals related to Whales) the critics noted in correspondence to IUCN that “analysis of most proposals appear to be based on solid scientific evidence.”

**Finding 6: The Analyses provided an important resource for at least one IUCN Country Office to use to sensitize delegates to CITES issues and to heighten awareness of IUCN in the country.**

At least one IUCN country representative (Dr. Ainun Nishat, Bangladesh) took the initiative to convene a CITES’ delegate preparation meeting at which key government representatives and scientists participated. Participants used the Analyses as the resource to frame discussion at the meeting. The successful meeting provided a neutral forum in which to discuss key CITES issues and, incidentally but importantly, helps to build the reputation of IUCN within the country. A fuller description of this process is found in Appendix III.

## 5.4 Design and distribution of the Analyses

While content is of paramount importance, the design and delivery of the Analyses is also a critical factor in deciding who can benefit from its preparation. Clearly an effective format design and distribution system enhances the effectiveness of the Analyses as a facilitation tool for CITES decision making. The format design of the Analyses has been the subject of some criticism at previous COP.. In response to this criticism, the format of the Analyses had been redesigned based on a tabular format for COP 11 and placed on the World Wide Web for the first time. This evaluation considered the effectiveness of the format re-design and delivery mechanisms.

**Finding 7: The new tabular format of the Analyses is an improvement over the format of previous versions of the Analyses.**

Delegate interview and head of delegation survey results overwhelmingly confirmed that delegates found the new tabular format a helpful way to present the data in the Analyses. Ninety percent of the head of delegates survey respondents reported it helpful, with 71% reporting it very helpful. Similarly, 79% of

those interviewed found it a helpful format. Those delegates interviewed who were familiar with the previous non-tabular format noted a strong preference for the tabular presentation.

**Finding 8: Information in the Analyses is presented at an appropriate language level for readers.**

The Analyses is written to be understood by both regular and non-regular readers of scientific documents. The evaluation explored the suitability of language level for this range of readers. Analysis of interview responses indicated that over 2/3 (69%) of the 25 respondents who classified themselves as regular readers of scientific documents found the language to be at a generally appropriate level for regular readers of scientific documents. Insufficient numbers of respondents classified themselves as non-regular readers of scientific documents to report conclusively from this category of Analyses user. However, two-thirds of all respondents judged the language level as generally suitable for non-regular readers of scientific documents. This data was confirmed by the Head of delegation survey responses that showed 30 respondents (86%) believed the language level to be appropriate for non-regular readers of scientific documents and 34 (94%) for regular readers of scientific documents.

**Finding 9: Suggestions were made for improvement of the Analyses format.**

The evaluation interviews produced several important suggestions for improvement to the format of the Analyses. The suggestions offered for strong consideration included the following:

- 1) Refrain from shading the columns as this makes it difficult and/or expensive to a) photocopy on older machines, b) print off the web version on non-laser printers;
- 2) Invest in an improved binding process rather than stapling because a) it would make the Analyses more easy to use, b) it would help raise the status of the Analyses in the minds of those unaware of its value (its image is thought by some delegates to suffer in comparison to the better bound, but less valuable, pieces of literature available to CITES delegates);
- 3) Provide a definition of Acronyms;
- 4) Combine the summaries into one document for those who wish to use it for quick reference or who will not be referring to the detailed analyses;
- 5) Enable web version of Analyses to be downloaded in its entirety or by species proposal.

**Finding 10: The current distribution system for the Analyses does not ensure that they will be received by all stakeholders.**

In addition to the 33 delegates who had received the Analyses and were interviewed for this evaluation a further 43 delegates were asked for an interview who reported that they had not received a copy of the Analyses prior to its distribution at CITES at the COP in Nairobi. Discussions with these delegates established that, although distribution of a hard copy of the Analyses to the Management Authority contact for each Party and its placement on the WWW fulfilled the Terms of Reference, the current CITES distribution system is a significant limitation to the document reaching members of key audiences. A number of reasons were reported as to why the Analyses were not being made available to all appropriate audiences. These included: local political factors, photocopy costs and limited access to the WWW. In many cases those interviewed were unaware as to why they had not received a copy.

**Finding 11: Placement of the Analyses on the WWW is an important complimentary distribution channel.**

Statistics for the use of the IUCN web site are available for the reporting period Dec 27, 99 to March 27, 2000, the period during which the Analyses were mounted on the site. Analysis of the statistics for this period establishes that the

*“The Analyses are very important in developing countries, as often information is unavailable from elsewhere”* Interviewed Asian delegate

Analyses page was viewed 1,684 times in 1,523 sessions. The number of unique individual users can not be established from these statistics, however, the large number of times the site was viewed to confirm the interview responses of delegates (who had Internet access) noting the importance of being able to access the Analyses through the web. The web page statistics also reveal that for 80% (1,213) of the user sessions users went directly to the Analyses page indicating that users were intentionally seeking the Analyses page as opposed to “stumbling” across it while in another section of the IUCN web site.

**Finding 12: Most web page users most likely to located in North America or Europe.**

Review of the web site statistics also confirms the warning from several interview respondents that while helpful, the WWW can not be relied upon as the sole distribution channel for the Analyses without disadvantaging countries outside of Europe and North America. For example, the statistics for hits to the overall use of the IUCN web site for the period under review reveals that of the country of origin that can be tracked for 23,172 of the 94,618 total user sessions, 62% of users' ISP domain names were registered in North America and the top eight user countries, all in either N. America or Europe, accounted for 85% of user sessions.

**Finding 13: The Analyses would play a stronger role in Parties' pre-COP debates and policy formation if it were made available to them earlier.**

Interviews with delegates noted that the receipt of the Analyses although helpful in many ways (see Finding 5 for example), often came to late to feed into initial country or regional policy discussions held prior to the COP. The majority of respondents strongly requested that a way be found to move up the distribution date. In the case of the EC and other European countries the distribution date would have to be advanced by two or three months if it was to feed into their first round of policy formation debates.

## **6. Efficiency of the Analyses Approach**

This Section addresses the issue of whether there are better ways of achieving the desired results produced by the Analyses at less cost and, if not, if efficiencies can be found in the way they are produced.

**Finding 14: No alternative approach to production of the Analyses was identified.**

In all the data gathering carried out for this evaluation no alternative approach to the production of the Analysis was identified that would accomplish the same results. No other objective summaries of all proposals that incorporated complimentary data gathering and that were made available to all parties were identified from the data sources examined by this evaluation.

**Finding 15: Production of the Analyses produces significant direct economic and other benefits to many of the Parties and to CITES process as a whole.**

While delegates from some of the wealthier nations reported that they drew up their own analyses of proposals, those from less wealthy countries indicated that they either could not carry out such analyses or that to do so would be cause a significant drain on limited resources directed to this area. Given that IUCN and TRAFFIC produce the Analyses for 200,000 pounds sterling, a cost that does not reflect the volunteer input of proposal reviewers, the combined savings to Parties in not having to produce their own analyses is significant. The cost to the CITES process (and the species and socioeconomic systems which it is trying to protect) of many Parties not having access to any analyses of the proposals was reported by interviewed delegates to be incalculable as the debate would move further away from a scientific and economic data basis to the realm of the anecdotal and political.



**Finding 16: IUCN and TRAFFIC are uniquely qualified to produce the Analyses**

IUCN and TRAFFIC are seen by the delegates and CITES Secretariat interviewed and SSC Chairs surveyed as uniquely qualified to produce the Analyses. This is based on the; the credibility of the organizations as impartial “third parties”, and their having the necessary international organizational reach, and access to the necessary professional expertise.

*“IUCN and TRAFFIC have the best information available-other organizations cannot compete. They have a lot of experience and are not dominated by a particular state”* Interviewed European delegate

**Finding 17: The funding, budgeting and preparation process of the Analyses is in need of further review to identify cost and time saving opportunities.**

Interviews with project staff and others close to the preparation process established that the preparation and distribution of the Analyses to deadline was only possible thanks to the staff’s extreme effort and dedication to the project. However, these interviews indicated several areas that, based on the experience of CITES 11, are in need of closer examination to determine how changes to the current processes could result in a gain in efficiency for preparation of the Analyses. These areas include the following (specific examples of issues within each area are noted):

- **Fundraising**
  - Evaluation of fundraising strategy to enable earlier identification of funds
  - Revision of budget to realistically meet staffing, printing, translation and distribution needs:
  - The strategy should include a process to emphasize to donors the importance of providing early support for the process to enable the production process to proceed efficiently.
- **Accountability**
  - Clearly define, communicate and implement reporting accountability for staff and consultants with particular reference to accountability for deadlines.
  - Review and renewal of deadline commitments with partners (TRAFFIC, WWF etc.) prior to preparation period.
- **Activities prior to preparation period**
  - Pilot test any modifications to the format to ensure that it is successfully completed prior to the preparation period itself.
  - Revision of reviewer questionnaires to match new Analyses format.
  - Establishment of review process to ensure technological support is in place prior to start of preparation period.
  - Requesting SGs and other contacts for e-mail address and telephone numbers of all reviewers.
- **During the preparation period**
  - Compile Analyses tables prior to receipt of the reviewer questionnaires as much as is possible.

## 7. Additional findings

### 7.1 Specialist Groups

Although not identified as an issue for evaluation at the outset of this exercise the process of selecting reviewers and the role of the Specialist Groups and staff in the production of the Analyses emerged as an issue for some of those Groups involved with the more controversial proposals. The findings are reported here.

**Finding 18: The majority of SSC Group Chairs were satisfied with the reviewer selection and final version sign of process, however, for some, clearer communication over the role of Group in the production of the Analyses is requested. Some SSC Specialist Groups require clearer communication over the role of the Group in the production of the Analyses.**

Some SSC chairs observed that the process for compilation of the Analyses of the proposals had not been presented clearly to them. Issues requiring clearer communications included:

- That additional reviewers would be added to the list by SSC staff to provide a “balance of views”
- That the final edition of the Analyses would be edited by a non-specialist consultant or staff person and not the SSC Specialist Group.

Review of correspondence to SSC chairs for this evaluation indicates that these points were not communicated clearly in writing to the Chairs in the requests for the Chairs to select reviewers.

**Finding 19: Two SSC Specialist Chairs whose groups were concerned with controversial proposals objected to the use of non-specialist consultant being responsible for the preparation of the final version of the Analyses. Chairs of Specialist groups related to less controversial proposals did not indicate any objection in this regard.**

A concern was expressed by two SSC Chairs involved with controversial proposals over the use of a *non-specialist species* consultant for the preparation of the final version of the Analyses relating to their groups. The issue of the limited time available in which to correspond with reviewers was also a significant factor in this issue. The Chairs expressed concern over an earlier than desired conclusion to the review process prior to a final version of the Analyses having been reached.

## 8. Conclusions and recommendations

The major conclusions drawn from the findings of this evaluation are that:

- 1) The Analyses play a key role in facilitating decision making at CITES.
- 2) The Analyses is valued as an important and impartial document by delegates familiar with it.
- 3) Both external and internal rationales for IUCN and TRAFFIC undertaking the production of the Analyses are justified.
- 4) The role of the Analyses in facilitating CITES decision making is limited by the CITES formal distribution system and the timeliness of their distribution as governed by the date set by the Convention for proposal deadline.
- 5) The new tabular format of the Analyses is welcomed by users as a format for presentation of the Analyses but that further format improvements are possible.

- 6) The process for reviewer selection and the role of the Specialist Groups, particularly for those groups involved in controversial proposals, is in need of review prior to undertaking the production of future editions of the Analyses.
- 7) Additional organizational benefit to IUCN could be drawn from the production of the Analyses by developing an in country or regional process use of them to facilitate CITES related events by IUCN country and regional offices.
- 8) That examination (in light of the experience of COP 11) of the processes for fundraising and preparation of the Analyses will lead to efficiencies in the production of the Analyses.

### **Recommendations based on these conclusions:**

- 1) That IUCN and TRAFFIC continue to seek funds to produce the Analyses for future COPs;
- 2) That IUCN and TRAFFIC investigate additional distribution channels for the Analyses. Avenues for exploration include:
  - Ensuring that all delegates attending the COP11 (SAs and MAs, technical advisors etc.) are notified of the availability of the Analyses for COP 12
  - That Compact Disc (CD) production and distribution to all delegates of COP 11 be considered in future funding requests. If all COP 11 delegates are notified of the availability of the CD and the presence of the Analyses on the Internet, then perhaps the most efficient process would be to supply a CD to those who return a request one.
  - That IUCN and partner regional and country offices be included in the distribution list system.
  - Continue to make the Analyses available on the WWW.
- 3) That SSC undertake a review of the reviewer selection process and relationship between SSC staff and Specialist Chairs in the preparation of the Analyses well in advance of the preparation of the next edition and ensure that the process agreed to is clearly communicated to all Chairs. Suggestions received for consideration in such a review include:
  - How to ensure that the coordination process maximizes time available for exchange of views between reviewers and editors for final edition;
  - Publication of (and adherence to) a set of criteria for reviewer selection;
  - The advisability of those who review the proposals also being included as IUCN delegates;
  - The pros and cons of hiring a “generalist consultant” to coordinate the process and edit the Analyses;
  - Consider the desirability and feasibility of organizing a meeting (face-to-face?) of, for example, 4 key reviewers, and having them edit and sign off on the Analyses for the controversial proposals.
- 3) That IUCN and TRAFFIC continue to publish the Analyses in a tabular format while continuing to address the formatting issues identified in the evaluation relating to “photocopiability” and printability off the web pages. Changes to formatting should be pilot tested well in advance of the preparation period of the Analyses with a cross-section of users from different regions.
- 4) Recognizing the timeframe for the availability of the proposals is governed by CITES regulations, that IUCN strongly request the CITES Secretariat to undertake the necessary steps to move up the date by which proposals are made available to IUCN and TRAFFIC.

- 5) That IUCN research how the Analyses may be used across the organization (other Commissions and/or Programs and Country/Regional Offices) as a resource to develop CITES related events to build awareness around CITES issues and/or the awareness of the role that IUCN plays in the CITES process.
- 6) That IUCN SSC and TRAFFIC staff examine the preparation processes identified in Finding 17 in order to further improve the efficiency of production of the Analyses.

## Appendix I List of Findings

- Finding 1: The key targets for the Analyses in order of priority are: The Parties, CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC Network, Other interested parties.
- Finding 2: The key targets' (as defined in the stakeholder analyses) needs were served by the Analyses.
- Finding 3: SSC met all key donor requirements.
- Finding 4: The Analyses play an influential role in shaping decision making at CITES. However, limitations in their range and timing of the distribution limited them from reaching their full potential in this role.
- Finding 5: The Analyses are valued as an important and generally impartial source of information, by those delegates familiar with the document, to aid them in their decision making.
- Finding 6: The Analyses provided an important resource for at least one IUCN Country Office to use to sensitize delegates to CITES issues and to heighten awareness of IUCN in the country.
- Finding 7: The new tabular format of the Analyses is an improvement over the format of previous versions of the Analyses.
- Finding 8: Information in the Analyses is presented at an appropriate language level for readers.
- Finding 9: Suggestions were made for improvement of the Analyses format.
- Finding 10: The current distribution system for the Analyses does not ensure that they will be received by all stakeholders.
- Finding 11: Placement of the Analyses on the WWW is an important complimentary distribution channel.
- Finding 12: Most web page users most likely to located in North America or Europe.
- Finding 13: The Analyses would play a stronger role in Parties' pre-COP debates and policy formation if it were made available to them earlier.
- Finding 14: No alternative approach to production of the Analyses was identified.
- Finding 15: Production of the Analyses produces significant direct economic and other benefits to many of the Parties and to CITES process as a whole.
- Finding 16: IUCN and TRAFFIC are uniquely qualified to produce the Analyses
- Finding 17: The funding, budgeting and preparation process of the Analyses is in need of further review to identify cost and time saving opportunities.
- Finding 18: The majority of SSC Group Chairs were satisfied with the reviewer selection and final version sign of process, however, for some, clearer communication over the role of Group in the production of the Analyses is requested. Some SSC Specialist Groups require clearer communication over the role of the Group in the production of the Analyses.

Finding 19: Two SSC Specialist Chairs whose groups were concerned with controversial proposals objected to the use of non-specialist consultant being responsible for the preparation of the final version of the Analyses. Chairs of Specialist groups related to less controversial proposals did not indicate any objection in this regard.

## Appendix II Geographic breakdown of interview respondents and Delegate Questionnaires

	Africa		Australia		Asia		Europe		Latin America	
	# Delegates	# Countries	# Delegates	# Countries	# Delegates	# Countries	# Delegates	# Countries	# Delegates	# Countries
Interviewed - recieved Anlyses	7	6	1	1	8	7	5	5	4	3
Interview requested - Analyses not available prior to Nairobi	19	11	1	1	5	4	9	7	2	2
Delegate questionnaire	11	10	0	0	5	5	13	12	1	1
Total delegate contact	37	24	2	2	18	13	27	20	7	4
# countries (discounting overlaps)				1						4

  

	Meso-America		Middle East		North America		Totals
	# Delegates	# Countries	# Delegates	# Countries	# Delegates	# Countries	
Interviewed - recieved Anlyses	4	4	1	1	3	2	33
Interview requested - Analyses not available prior to Nairobi	1	1	6	4	0	0	29
Delegate questionnaire	2	2	3	2	0	0	43
Total delegate contact	7	6	10	3	3	2	30
# countries (discounting overlaps)							35
							32
							111
							73

## Appendix III Example of in-country use of the Analyses

*The following is a description of the use made of the Analyses by Bangladesh IUCN country representative, Dr. Ainun Nishat as requested by the evaluation team.*

We have been organizing Pre-Consultative Meetings on implementation of Conventions meetings since 1999. The first consultative meeting was organized on SBSTTA-4 of CBD in June, 1999, and the second on SBSTTA-5 of CBD in December, 1999. Then, we continued with COP11 of CITES and COP-5 of CBD.

These meetings have been found very useful by the concerned authorities in the process of their efforts to follow up the activities of the International Conventions. The meetings are usually organized prior to the COP or technical committees. The participating government delegates to the technical committees or COP are ensured. So that the delegates can enrich and update their knowledge with the agenda of the concerned COP or Meeting in the context of the situation in the country. The whole agenda of the concerned COP or Meeting are presented in the meetings. Important issues are discussed in detailed. Relevant scientists, managers and conservationist of the country are invited in the meetings. IUCN's Regional experts are also invited for presentation of special issues. We have full support of Ministry of Environment and Forest in our efforts.

The following points are provided in reply to your specific questions related to the Consultative Meeting on COP11 of CITES:

The main objective of the meeting was to facilitate participation of the Bangladesh Delegate in the COP, and to prepare recommendations and comments on the important agenda items. Another objective of the meeting was to make aware the biologists, conservationists and environmentalists of the country about the activities and implementation of CITES in Bangladesh.

- 1) Members of the Bangladesh National Biodiversity Group (BNBG), members of the IUCN SSC Specialist Groups in the country, relevant IUCN institutional members of Bangladesh including the President of the IUCN National Committee, and the Chief Conservator of Forests (CCF), Bangladesh were invited in the meeting. Current CCF, Mr., Md. Ghulam Habib who was delegate in the COP, presided over the meeting. Staff of IUCN Bangladesh Country Office also participated in the meeting. A total of 18 participants (list attached) including the Country Representative of IUCN Bangladesh were present in the meeting.
- 2) The meeting was scheduled for two hours but lasted for over four hours. Interest of the participants kept the meeting ongoing for a longer duration.
- 3) Format of the meeting was: Welcome Address and Purposes of the Meeting; Brief Presentation of the Amendment Proposals along with the IUCN's Analysis; Open Discussion on the Selected Proposal; Formulation of Recommendations of the Consultative Meeting; and Conclusion of the Meeting.
- 4) Analyses of proposals by IUCN were used in the preparation of the presentation of the proposals for the participants by Mr. Abdul Wahab Akonda, Senior Programme Officer of this office.
- 5) The Proceedings of the meeting was circulated to the Administrative and Management Authorities of CITES in Bangladesh as well as to the Delegate of Bangladesh to the COP, and also to the participants. A copy of the Recommendations was sent to the Head of the Asia Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP) (copy attached).

It should be mentioned that RBP had agreed to cover the cost of the meeting. Bangladesh Delegate to the COP11 got feedback for participation in the COP. IUCN Bangladesh Country Office has successfully brought to notice the interested professionals about the CITES implementation process.



We strongly recommend for consultative meetings for better understanding and implementation of Conventions, Protocols, Treaties etc particularly in the developing countries. The budget requirement for one consultative meeting is around US\$ 1000 for organizing the meeting plus another US\$ 1000 for publication of a Proceedings and its distribution.

The IUCN's Analyses of CITES proposals may preferably be sent to the IUCN Country Offices as attachments of e-mails.

Please do not hesitate to contact us for further details.

Ainun Nishat

IUCN Country Representative

## **Appendix IV Example of Delegate Interview protocol and Head of Delegation questionnaire**

IUCN CITES Analyses Evaluation, 2000  
Interview Protocol

Interviewee Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Date Interviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

Title: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Interviewer: \_\_\_\_\_

Category(ies):

MA

Donor

SA

Other \_\_\_\_\_

-

**Introduction:**

As you know, IUCN produces the *Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* to assist the Parties in their deliberations at the biennial Conference Of the Parties. Currently IUCN is in the process of evaluating this activity and Universalialia, a Canadian consulting firm, is assisting them to do so. As a delegate, you are a key informant in the evaluation process and we value your participation in this short interview. Thank you for having agreed to help in this way.

**1. General Background Questions**

---

1.1 If you played any role in the development of the Analyses please describe it.

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

	Not read them yet but plan to	Not read them, do not plan to	Scanned them	In the process of reading them	Read them or pertinent section of them
1.2 How well have you read the Analyses to date?	θ	θ	θ	θ	θ
Comments on reading plans	_____				
	_____				
	_____				

## 2. Valuing of Analyses

### *Question if interviewee was involved in the preparation of the Analyses*

	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	Not very satisfactory	Unacceptable
2.1 How satisfactory was the preparation process of the Analyses that you were involved in?	θ	θ	θ	θ
2.2 What aspects of the preparation process lead you to this conclusion? (probe re timeliness, citations, selection of reviewers, time to review, final summary etc.).	_____			
	_____			
	_____			
	_____			

### *Question for all delegates*

	Critically Important	Important	Not particularly important	Not important at all
2.3 How important is it that the Analyses be made available to you?	θ	θ	θ	θ
2.4 How important do you believe it is that the Analyses be made available to delegates to the COPs in general?	θ	θ	θ	θ

2.5 Why is the information in the Analyses important/*not important* to delegates in your view?

---



---



---



---

Very impartial (go to 2.8)	Generally impartial (go to 2.8)	Somewhat biased (go to 2.7)	Very biased (go to 2.7)
-------------------------------	------------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------

2.6 How impartial do you consider the information contained in the Analyses to be?

                

2.7 In what way do consider the information to be biased? \_\_\_\_\_

---



---



---



---

2.8 Is all the information contained in the Analyses easily available in summary form from another source?

Yes       No

If yes continue, if no continue with question 2.12

2.9 Where else is the information available to you? \_\_\_\_\_

2.10 Is it important to you that the IUCN Analyses be available as well?

Yes       No

2.11 Why is it important/not important the IUCN Analyses be available as well?

---



---



---

\_\_\_\_\_

2.12 Do you have any other comments on the type and quality of the information contained in the Analyses? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Language level used in the Analyses

3.1 We now want your opinion on the suitability of the language level used in the Analyses. Before asking for it, can you tell me if you are a regular reader of scientific documents or not?

Yes                       No

	Generally too complicated for non-scientific readers to understand	Generally appropriate level for non-scientific readers to understand	Generally at too low a level for non-scientific readers
--	--	--	---

3.2 How would you rate the language level used in the Analyses for non-scientific readers?

                                          

	Generally too complicated even for scientific readers to understand	Generally at the appropriate level for scientific readers to understand	Generally at too low a level for scientific readers' needs
--	---	---	--

3.3 How would you rate the language level used in the Analyses for scientific readers?

### 4. Format of the Analyses

---

4.1 The information in the Analyses was arranged in a new tabular format for the first time this year. How helpful was the tabular format in helping you access the key decision making information that you needed? (*Probe for comparison to previous format if interviewee has seen it*)

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

4.2 Are there any improvements you would like to see made to the way in which the information is presented in the Analyses?

Yes                       No

If yes continue with question 4.3, if no proceed with question 4.4

4.3 What improvements would you like to see made?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Very easy	Easy	Not very easy
-----------	------	---------------

---

4.4 In summary, please rate how easy the tabular format made it to access the key information that you needed.

## 5. Distribution of the Analyses

---

We would now like to ask you a few questions concerning the distribution of the Analyses.

- 5.1 To the best of your knowledge, are copies of the Analyses distributed to the appropriate Scientific Authorities in member countries?

Yes                       No

- 5.2 Are you aware of any groups of people who should or could usefully contribute to decision making on CITES' issues but who are excluded by their not receiving a copy of the Analyses?

---

---

---

---

- 5.3 Are there any ways in which distribution of the Analyses could be improved to make them more useful to you and others involved in decision making related to CITES?

Yes                       No

If yes continue with question 5.4, if no go to question 5.5.

- 5.4 In what ways could the distribution of the Analyses be improved?

---

---

---

---

- 5.5 Are there any ways you are aware of by which distribution of the Analyses could be made more cost effective?

Yes                       No

If yes continue with question 5.6, if no go to question 6.1.

- 5.6 In what ways could the distribution of the Analyses be made more cost effective?

---

---

---



## 6. Utility of the Analyses

---

To conclude this interview we want your opinion on the overall usefulness of the Analyses.

- 6.1 Are you aware of any major economic benefits resulting from the preparation and distribution of the Analyses? (*Probe also for any economic costs of not producing the Analyses*)

---

---

---

---

---

- 6.2 Are you aware of any major non-economic benefits resulting from the preparation and distribution of the Analyses?

---

---

---

---

- 6.3 What impact do you think it would it have on the quality of CITES decision making at the COPs if the Analyses were not available?

---

---

---

---

---

- 6.4 Are you aware of any examples of CITES decisions that have been directly influenced by the Analyses? Please describe.

---

---

---

---



---

---

Thank you for your input to this process. Your feedback will be helpful to IUCN to ensure that it can provide the most useful service possible through preparation and distribution of the Analyses.

## EVALUATION OF IUCN ANALYSES OF PROPOSALS

As you know, IUCN produces the *Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* to assist the Parties in their deliberations at the biennial Conference Of the Parties (COPs). Currently IUCN is evaluating this activity. As a delegate to the COPs your opinion on the *Analysis* is important information for the evaluation. Please take 5 minutes to respond to the questions below.

In addition to this questionnaire, face to face interviews will be carried out with a sample of delegates to gain a fuller understanding of their opinions. Your participation in such an interview if requested is also another important contribution to the evaluation and as such will be much appreciated.

**Please return all completed questionnaires as soon as possible to the registration desk or to staff appointed to collect them.**

### 7. Background information

7.1 Please check the box(es) that describe your role(s):

Management Authority  
Scientific Authority

Delegate  
Other \_\_\_\_\_

7.2 Name of the country that you represent \_\_\_\_\_

7.3 I read scientific documents regularly       Yes       No

### 8. Value of the IUCN Analyses

	<i>Critically Important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Not particularly important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>
8.1 Rate the importance of making the <i>Analyses</i> available to COPs delegates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Very impartial</i>	<i>Generally impartial</i>	<i>Somewhat biased</i>	<i>Very biased</i>
8.2 Rate the degree of impartiality of the <i>Analyses</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Needs Improving</i>

	<i>Critically Important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Not particularly important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>
8.3 Rate the overall quality of the <i>Analyses</i>	0	0	0	0

## 9. Presentation of the Analyses

9.1 Rate the suitability of the language level used in the <i>Analyses</i> for people who are not regular readers of scientific documents?	<i>Generally too complicated for readers of non-scientific documents to understand</i>	<i>Generally appropriate level for readers of non-scientific documents to understand</i>	<i>Generally at too low a level for readers of non-scientific documents</i>
--	--	--	---

0

0

0

9.2 Rate the suitability of the language level used in the <i>Analyses</i> for regular readers of scientific documents?	<i>Generally too complicated even for readers of scientific documents to understand</i>	<i>Generally at the appropriate level for scientific readers to understand</i>	<i>Generally at too low a level for scientific readers' needs</i>
---	---	--	---

0

0

0

9.3 The information in the <i>Analyses</i> was arranged in a new tabular format for the first time this year. Please rate how helpful the tabular format was in helping you access key decision making information?	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>
---	---------------------	----------------	-------------------------

0

0

0

9.4 Please describe any improvements you would like to see made to the presentation of information in the IUCN *Analyses*.

---



---



---

9.5 Note here any other comments concerning the IUCN *Analyses* you may have. Attach additional pages if desired.

---



---

**Please return the completed questionnaire as soon as possible to the registration desk or to staff appointed to collect them.**

***Thank you for your cooperation***