

CITES COP 16 and sustainable use and livelihoods

Rosie Cooney

The 16th Conference of the Parties to CITES - the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Fauna and Flora - took place in Bangkok in early March. Over 1000 representatives from 170 of the 178 state Parties attended, along with around 1000 observers from inter-governmental and non-governmental organisations. IUCN and TRAFFIC both had large delegations in attendance - I was part of the IUCN delegation. Around 15 members of SULi were present¹, most of whom were part of delegations of a wide range of other organisations, and we took the opportunity to hold a very constructive and useful SULi meeting. COP debate and decision-making covered a vast range of species and issues - IUCN is preparing a full report, which should be available from the IUCN website shortly. Here I will briefly summarise key CoP decisions, outline relevant debate and decisions on sustainable use and livelihoods, and reflect on their implications. I have also developed a more extensive report for discussion within SULi and IUCN - please contact me if you would like a copy.

From one perspective, the outcomes of this CoP were very positive. The Conference was framed by the urgency of the poaching crisis for elephants and rhinos in particular, and enforcement actions had a high priority. For elephants and rhinos, agreement was reached on toughened sets of concrete and time-bound commitments, such as coordination of enforcement efforts, use and sharing of forensic evidence, use of more aggressive enforcement techniques, targeting "kingpins", better control of stockpiles, and so on. Many meetings and events to enhance cooperation on enforcement were held, including several events of the International Consortium to Combat Wildlife Crime (ICWC), bringing together government Ministers, Wildlife Enforcement Networks, the Asian Development Bank, senior lawmakers, police and Customs, and the first global meeting of regional Wildlife Enforcement Networks.

In terms of amending the CITES Appendices, the lists of species that determine what level of international trade regulation will be applied by Parties, many observers felt decision-making at the CoP was generally in line with sound science and analysis. Belying CITES' historic reluctance to list commercial fish and timber species, five commercially fished sharks, *Manta* rays and several freshwater rays, along with many tropical rosewoods and ebonies, were added to Appendix II. If the complexities of implementation can be solved, CITES trade controls should significantly help improve monitoring, legality and sustainability for these species. A large number of Asian and US freshwater turtle and tortoise species were uplisted to Appendix I or listed in Appendix II, reflecting the

¹ Steve Broad, Holly Dublin, Thomasina Oldfield, John Donaldson, Despina Symons, Deb Hahn, John Cheechoo, Carolina Caceras (who Chaired Committee I), Philippe Chardonnet, Michael t-Sas-Rolfes, John J. Jackson, Tamas Marghescu, Willem Wijnstekers, Diane Skinner, Rob Parry-Jones.

increasing level of threat faced by these species due to trade for food, pets and traditional medicines. Notably, several of these proposals were co-sponsored by the US and China, marking a new level of cooperation between these countries. The West Africa manatee was uplisted to Appendix I. Proposals to list polar bear in Appendix I and downlist part of Colombia's American crocodile population to Appendix II were defeated. Proposals on elephants and rhinos were withdrawn before the CoP.

Sustainable use and livelihoods at CoP 16

A new Resolution on CITES and Livelihoods

This CoP marked a major step forward on addressing the local livelihood impacts of CITES listing decisions. CITES involves restrictions of international trade in wild species, which can have positive impacts on local livelihoods by helping ensure long-term sustainability and counter illegal trade, but can also have negative impacts by restricting local livelihood options. The CoP adopted the new Resolution "CITES and Livelihoods"². Broadly, this resolution recognizes that CITES implementation is better achieved with the engagement of rural communities, particularly those that are traditionally dependent on CITES-listed species for their livelihoods. It recognises that CITES listing decisions can restrict income, employment, food and other resources for rural people, but can also enhance livelihoods by delivering long term species conservation and reducing illegal/unsustainable trade. The Resolution sets out a series of considerations for Parties when addressing livelihoods issues, including fundamental issues such as empowering rural communities through participation in development of CITES policies, maximizing benefits of trade for communities, recognizing resource tenure and ownership and traditional knowledge of rural communities, and mitigating negative impacts of listing through providing assistance (including financial). This resolution received a great deal of strong support in debate, led by South American countries, with the only objections to it raised by the US, who argued that livelihood issues belonged in other fora.

It is important to note that this resolution applies only to the *implementation* of listing decisions, not to the basis for listing. There remains no basis for recognition or consideration of the perspectives of communities, the impacts on communities, or traditional and local knowledge, in the making of CITES listing decisions. Work on two accompanying documents - the "Nazca Guidelines" and a "Toolkit" for addressing the impact of the implementation of CITES listings on livelihoods of the poor - will continue in the CITES and Livelihoods Working Group. A well-attended and energetic CITES and Livelihoods event organised by Peru brought this issue into focus, with presentations on indigenous and local communities and their use of vicuña in Andean countries, aloe in South Africa, American crocodiles in the Bay of Cispatá in Colombia, and polar bear in Canada.

Sustainable use and livelihoods in debate

Sustainable use and livelihoods were important in discussion of several other proposals and side-events, several of which are briefly discussed here.

²<http://www.cites.org/common/cop/16/com/E-CoP16-Com-II-11.pdf>

Polar bear: This was one of the most contentious issues before the CoP and (along with sharks) a major focus of NGO lobbying and pressure. CoP delegates were "entertained" by someone in a polar bear suit outside the doors of the conference hall while lobbyists handed out fluffy polar bear toys saying "please save me". Inuit delegates commented the bears were a lot bigger in real life. Here the US proposed to uplist polar bear from Appendix II to Appendix I (in a similar proposal to that they brought at CoP 15), on the basis primarily of a projected steep decrease in their sea ice habitat due to climate change. The IUCN/TRAFFIC Analysis found the listing criteria for Appendix I were not met, and the CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC and WWF recommended rejection of the proposal. While some range states were in support, Canada, the major range state (with 2/3 of the population) opposed strongly, arguing that international trade was not a threat to the polar bear, that the US proposal risked the integrity of CITES itself, that the Canadian management system was adaptive and dynamic and based on sound science integrated with traditional knowledge.

Central to the debate was the role of the Inuit, who hunt and trade polar bear, and the impacts an Appendix I listing would have on them. Polar bear in Canada are co-managed with the Inuit, to whom polar bear is of central cultural importance. As Terry Audla of the Canada delegation (and President of the Inuit representative body Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami) explained in plenary, Inuit hunt polar bear under quotas established through this co-management system, which integrates traditional knowledge and scientific knowledge. For the Inuit, the harvest is primarily a meat harvest, with trade of skins, skulls or other parts of the bear providing additional income in a region with high unemployment and very limited economic opportunities. The right to hunt is established under land claim agreements and would not be affected by an Appendix I listing. This means that an Appendix I listing would be unlikely to affect the level of hunting by Inuit, but would remove a source of income to these communities. As John Donaldson of the South African delegation (and the SSC) said, the projections of the impact of climate change on polar bear were dire, but it was hard to see that alienating the communities who managed 2/3 of the polar bear population would help, and it could do the opposite by removing incentives for conservation.

Both an EU compromise proposal (involving setting of export quotas by range states at the level of subpopulations, the urgent entry of polar bear into the Review of Significant Trade, provision by range states of information on sustainability of management and trade regime to Animals Committee, IUCN making a review of status of subpopulations available, and an assessment of whether a tagging system would help to control trade) and the US proposal were defeated (38 in favor, 42 against and 46 abstaining). However, the NGO pressures on the US and other Parties (notably the EU Parties during the CoP itself, particularly via the European Parliament) were intense, and this issue may return at CoP 17.

American crocodile in Colombia: Local livelihoods and their role in sustainable use were central to the proposal from Colombia to downlist the population of the American crocodile *Crocodylus acutus* of a particular bay, the Bay of Cispatá, from

Appendix I to Appendix II. This population has been the subject of a ten year program involving nest collection, incubation and release of crocodiles, involving the release of more than 3000 individuals. The proposal sought to generate greater social and economic value of the wild resource for local communities, and change their perception of the crocodile through conservation through sustainable use. The local community, which is very poor, has been participating in protection and habitat conservation in part with the expectation that this would result in some sustainable economic benefits at some point. However, this proposal failed. IUCN/TRAFFIC's Analysis found the wild subpopulation still met the criteria for Appendix I and cast doubt on whether the precautionary measures for downlisting from Appendix I to II had been met. While the proposal gained considerable support from the floor, particularly from Latin America, with Peru linking the proposal to the work on CITES and Livelihoods and highlighting the community development aspect of the proposal, including the benefits to communities from sustainable use of the crocodiles, the proposal was rejected.

Sharks and rays: The CoP accepted proposals to list in Appendix II several sharks and manta rays. Livelihoods and the socio-economic impacts of listing were frequently raised in debate on these species, raised in various ways to support or oppose listings. For example, in debate on the oceanic whitetip, St Vincent and the Grenadines expressed concern about the impact of listing on the livelihoods of coastal communities. In debate on scalloped hammerhead, Mexico highlighted the importance of the catch for coastal communities, but pointed out most of its trade was national; the EU and others highlighted that curbing overfishing through listing was important to preserve the socio-economic benefits from tourism; and New Zealand argued that listing would help address IUU fishing and have a positive impact on food and livelihoods for subsistence fisheries.

Vicuña dialogue: The Vicuña dialogue (a side-event organised by the International Trade Centre with partners TRAFFIC, Peru and others) focused on the CITES success story of vicuña, asking how vicuña use could more effectively reduce poverty among Andean communities. At least some populations of all range countries are now downlisted to Appendix II (after Ecuador's successful proposal at the COP). While local benefits are modest in dollar terms, several speakers highlighted that this income made a very important impact in practice, given the poverty of the communities involved. However, communities still gain only a half a percentage of the final value of vicuña fibre, and the event sought to encourage discussion about how to address this. The critical need to strengthen producers' associations and their bargaining power and market access was highlighted, in order to achieve more equitable benefit-sharing. Other issues included competition between vicuña and other land uses, and the need to strengthen local voices, improve quality, and increase value-adding in producer countries. Ecuador raised the issue of policy barriers to vicuña use, highlighting that [as is so frequently the case globally] sustainable use of exotic species was much easier than for vicuña, and they were making efforts to simplify the regulatory and administrative framework.

Rhino horn trade: A major series of side-events were organised by South Africa on rhinos. South Africa announced in the lead-up to the CoP that they were planning to explore the option of legal international trade in rhino horn, so these side-events were aimed at preparing the ground by informing CITES stakeholders of the state of rhino populations, management, anti-poaching, etc. The side event on “Rhino Economics” was particularly interesting. One presentation summarised the situation of the ca. 5000 private rhino owners in South Africa, who hold around a quarter of the national herd. It highlighted the increased poaching and security costs (160 million Rand to 450 mR over ten years) experienced by private owners, and the associated decrease in the prices of rhinos at auction. The speaker characterized private ownership as “hanging on a cliff edge”, with 340 000ha already lost to rhino conservation. He argued against following the same trajectory as black rhino, where (under a horn trade ban) populations declined by ca 80% over 45 years, and argued for taking the value of the horn trade out of the hands of criminals and into the hands of those who would invest in conservation. Johannes De Lange, a South African parliamentarian, stated that South Africa would only seek to trade in horn from natural mortality (i.e. no dehorning), and that this should easily replace the amount of horn currently on the market, removing the returns to poaching and therefore the incentives to poach. (It is worth noting it is questionable whether current stockpiles and horn from natural mortality would be enough to keep prices low over the medium term).

Issues

Two general issues stood out for me from this CoP in terms of SU and livelihoods.

The first concerns how CITES Parties make decisions. It is important to note that formally, Parties are directed to make listing decisions only on the basis of specified biological and trade criteria (according to Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev CoP13)³). CITES provisions do not ask Parties to judge whether a listing would help or hinder species conservation, how it would affect those who use or live with the species, or how these impacts are in turn likely to affect species conservation. (In practice, of course, Parties regularly raise quite different considerations in debate and make clear their positions are based on them, as do NGOs. For instance, TRAFFIC’s Recommendations to Parties include considerations that go well beyond these.) However, understanding the broader context of local use and reliance on a wild resource is arguably essential from both conservation and social justice perspectives. From a pure conservation perspective, understanding how a CITES decision will affect people, and in particular rural communities who use and live with wild species, will often be essential to understanding its likely conservation impact. An obvious lesson from CITES history is that trade restrictions do not seamlessly lead to decreased (legal and illegal) harvest and trade! From a rights-based perspective, it is arguably inconsistent with basic ethical requirements (and widespread policy commitments) for international species conservation to be pursued at the cost of making poverty and marginalization worse. These considerations argue in

³ <http://www.cites.org/eng/res/all/09/E09-24R15.pdf>

favour of livelihood impacts being integrated into the decision-making process, making any trade-offs between human wellbeing and conservation clear in decision-making, providing a basis for assessing whether alternative measures could achieve the same goal less restrictively, and whether mitigation measures are required.

Currently there are major information gaps around the local context of use with respect to a species, including the cultural importance, level of use and benefit for indigenous and local communities, how local people view the species (particularly in terms of human/wildlife conflict), how decisions are likely to impact on them, whether use is providing any incentives for management or benefits to offset costs of living with wild species, and how decisions would impact on these. The IUCN/TRAFFIC Analyses, widely viewed as the most authoritative and objective source of information, does not encompass these questions. This raises the question of whether IUCN could potentially play a role in addressing these in a structured way in the future.

The second issue is the general lack of participation at CITES meetings of the people directly affected by trade controls⁴. The Inuit participated strongly at CoP 16, both as part of Inuit organisations with observer status (Inuit Tapiriit Kanatami, Inuit Circumpolar Council, Government of Nunavut etc), and as part of the Canadian Delegation, and their participation was felt by many to have had a strong influence on debate. Hearing directly from people culturally or economically linked to the species in question about their views on a decision, and how it would affect them, carries considerable weight. But it is rare for the communities actually affected by CITES decisions to be present at the COP. In the past, communities affected by issues of debate (notably elephants), have attended and been active at CITES meetings on occasion. However, communities often have limited resources and are not necessarily strongly supported by their Governments. Notably, there is no organised voice at CITES meetings seeking to channel the perspectives of communities into the debate. When one compares this to the formidable organised forces acting in the interests of animal protection (the Species Survival Network), or for biodiversity conservation (IUCN/TRAFFIC/WWF and others), there is an enormous imbalance of power.

Implications for SULi?

- Based on our discussions at the SULi meeting held during the CoP, a key role for SULi with respect to CITES is to act as a platform for convening creative thinking and exploration of issues underlying CITES decisionmaking.
- There is considerable scope for SULi to engage in and contribute to the ongoing CITES and Livelihoods process, working with other parts of IUCN and TRAFFIC. Areas of potential engagement include assisting in finalizing the Toolkit and Guidelines; helping motivate, organize, and providing technical input into workshops/side-events on CITES and

⁴ I wrote an IUCN blog on this during the CoP; see

Livelihoods, as envisaged in CoP Decisions on this subject; and informing this process with detailed knowledge through e.g. developing case studies on (positive and negative) experiences of CITES and livelihoods.

- SULi could seek to help address the information gaps outlined above - on the context of use and management of a taxon and its relevance to culture and livelihoods - working with other parts of IUCN and TRAFFIC. For example, for a subset of proposals where local livelihoods/incentives are particularly relevant, IUCN could carry out an analysis of (or include in the Analyses) the context of indigenous/local community management and use of the species and its importance for livelihoods and incentives for conservation. This analysis could be based on a set of agreed and consistent parameters, drawn perhaps from the *Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity* (which have been endorsed as useful guidance by CITES Parties).
- IUCN could make a formal assessment of the sustainable management regime operating with respect to a species, to inform Parties' assessment of whether trade pursuant to such a regime constituted a threat requiring stricter trade controls. Given we have extensive expertise in sustainable management of species, both within taxonomic Specialist Groups and SULi, this expertise could be channeled to better inform decision-making.
- Rather than simply address the listing criteria, IUCN/TRAFFIC could evaluate the likely impact of a proposal on conservation (while, as now, not recommending a course of action), involving SULi expertise on SU and livelihoods where relevant. This could be a short section added to the Analyses, which assesses the importance of the wider pool of factors that may influence conservation impact of a decision.
- In terms of the participation of indigenous peoples and local communities at CITES meetings, there are no obvious easy solutions. CITES decisions affect communities in a very patchy and geographically dispersed way. SULi could consider whether it could help address this situation through means such as providing relevant civil society organisations (e.g. the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity) with advice and information; establishing processes to review proposals for relevance, gather indigenous and local perspectives, and seek to ensure these are represented at CITES meetings; or seek establishment of a travel fund earmarked for indigenous/local communities affected by CITES decision-making to attend.

Annex I: Report of SULi meeting

Date and place: Monday March 4, 9.30-12 noon, Queens Park Imperial Hotel.

Present: Alison Rosser (UNEP-WCMC), Thomasina Oldfield (TRAFFIC), Philippe Chardonnet (IGF/Antelope Specialist Group Chair), Despina Symons (EBCD/Fisheries Expert Group), Diane Skinner (African Ele SG), Steve Broad (TRAFFIC/FairWild), Deb Hahn (Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies), John Jackson III (Conservation Force), John Donaldson (South Africa National Biodiversity Institute/Cycads and Medicinal Plants SG), Willem Wijnstekers (CIC), Michael t'Sas Rolfes (Independent/Rhino SG), Kirsten Conrad (Independent), Rob Parry-Jones (Independent), Johan Svalby (FACE), Rosie Cooney (Chair).

Apologies: John Cheechoo.

1. Welcome and introductions

RC welcomed the group and highlighted that this was the first meeting of SULi members (apart from Steering Committee members). She hoped this would continue at major international meetings.

2. Update and overview

RC highlighted following points:

- Membership had been re-established, from an out of date list of ca 740 to about 240 people who had re-applied for membership, ca 30% joining from other CEESP themes.
- All have expertise in some area of use and/or trade, covering a very broad array, from NTFPs to trophy hunting to community livelihoods and indigenous knowledge. Diversity is both a strength and a challenge in charting a course for the group.
- There was a lot of activity last year and a number of initiatives and directions are starting to take shape, to be reported on at this meeting. All of these are directions that I strongly believe build on SULi's strengths and are taking us in the right direction.
- However, we are still lacking a clear strategy – an idea of what our specific “unique selling point” is - our specific niche.
- Seeking to start a strategic planning process to identify this – a major priority for the next 6 months.
- Another crucial priority is a funding strategy. We have core funding of 100US/year up until the end of this year, with the possibility it will be continued. This is not certain, and we have to plan for the eventuality it will not continue.

3. Update and discussion on specific initiatives

3.1 Small scale fisheries initiative

- DS outlined this early stage initiative, which is focused on community management of small scale fisheries, and links SULi with the CEM Fisheries Expert Group. The aim is to explore or showcase models of

sustainable use in small scale fisheries, based on integration of local/traditional with scientific knowledge. The initiative would seek to bring together social science with fisheries science, and involve groups working at the community level along with researchers and policy people. Have concept note but still discussing which direction to head.

- General support for this initiative.

3.2 Trade structures study

- MtR: aim of proposed study was to draw on industrial organization theory, which focuses on how markets are structured, to ask questions about how market structure influences the conservation outcomes of wildlife trade chains. Could elucidate dynamics regarding e.g. the one-off ivory sales.
- There was much interest in this initiative and general agreement that trade structure was a very important aspect of wildlife trade chains that needed analysis, to better understand impacts on both conservation and local benefits. There was discussion around the species to be looked at, examples where market structure had influenced conservation, and links to the green economy. Some points made were:
- need to look not only at illegal markets, which are hard to study, but at legal markets such as vicuña, the fur trade, the Soviet central dispersal system, reptile skin trade. Other good ones to look at include cycads and abalone. Snake trade is an urgent issue for CITES (high levels of illegality) so a good choice.
- some work has been done on the crocodilian skin trade looking at impacts of e.g. bottlenecks in trade chain
- microeconomics at market end are challenging, with dynamics like rarity leading to increased demand.
- Market structure was important dynamic in elephant ivory one-off sales: in second sale there were two buyers, which appeared good, but they didn't compete on price as they were interested in different ivory (Chinese wanting small pieces, Japan wanting big).
- This is about using economic instruments to recognise the value of species, so is link with ecosystem services thinking. Sustainable use is not well linked to thinking on the "Green Economy", but should be. Where it is well-managed wildlife can be the best contributor to the green economy.
- This study could help understand how to help producers capture greater share of benefits. E.g BioTrade - helps producers realize market value in Europe for their products. People on the ground have no real idea of market value in consumer countries.

3.3 Indigenous/traditional knowledge and the Red List

- RC introduced study – aim is to explore potential to incorporate IK into Red Listings. International policy (e.g. IPBES) increasingly stressing need to integrate science and IK/TK.
- Generally agreed that good idea – but the issue is broader – should look at incorporating indigenous knowledge into e.g. CITES NDFs also
- Need case studies and examples to guide thinking.
- Canada clearly way ahead on this issue

- Cancun meeting on NDFs highlighted that if a management system was in place, could make positive NDF. If can assess TK system could make positive NDF based on this
- Guidance on NDFs states should use “best available information”, so this should encompass IK

3. *The role of SULi in CITES*

- RC asked for thoughts regarding what role SULi could best play in CITES, outlining a few points as background:
 - IUCN in CITES plays a very specific role – providing technical information and advice. It doesn’t advocate or take positions on specific proposals, although it coordinates closely with WWF and TRAFFIC who do.
 - Of all IUCN Specialist Groups we have the most people present at CITES, but most not in the IUCN delegation but pursuing the interests/agenda of our respective organisations/Parties, including taking and advocating for positions on proposals and other issues.
 - IUCN’s engagement on specific taxa is led by the taxonomic specialist groups.
 - RC leading for IUCN on some specific cross-cutting issues such as CITES and livelihoods, which is one useful but relatively minor role.
 - So what should our role here be?
- Discussion included the following points:
 - Sustainable use often confused with *use* in CITES – very pro-trade voices use the language of SU regularly to argue against any restrictions: need for raising awareness and understanding of what sustainable use means and how to do it. Particularly as more countries are shifting toward a protectionist stance
 - There is a potential role for SULi in technical evaluation of *management regime sustainability*. Currently, no one does this.
 - SULi can play a complementary role to TRAFFIC, doing some of the “big thinking” around the social/economic aspects of trade, such as on IK/TK and livelihoods. The Vienna symposium in 2011 on CITES and CBNRM is a good model for the kind of work we should do
- Overall, the clear idea that emerged was of SULi as a platform for creative, interdisciplinary thinking on wildlife trade and CITES.

Annex II: CITES and Livelihoods Resolution and Decisions

(As adopted by Committee II.)

Original language: English
CoP16 Com. II. 11 (Rev. 1)

Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Bangkok (Thailand), 3-14 March 2013

CITES and livelihoods

This document has been prepared by a drafting group, on the basis of document CoP16 Doc. 19 (Rev. 1), Annex 1 (with all proposed amendments accepted), after discussion in the fourth session of Committee II. Proposed new text is underlined and proposed deleted text ~~crossed out~~.

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

CITES and livelihoods of ~~poor rural communities~~

RECALLING Resolution Conf. 8.3 (Rev CoP13), adopted at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Bangkok, 2004) where the Conference recognized that implementation of CITES-listing decisions should take into account potential impacts on the livelihoods of the poor;

RECALLING ALSO Decision 15.5 requesting the Standing Committee to continue the operation of its Working Group on CITES and Livelihoods and to finalize the toolkit for the rapid assessment at the national level of the positive and negative impacts of implementing CITES-listing decisions on the livelihoods of the poor, as well as voluntary guidelines for Parties to address the negative impacts;

NOTING that these two documents were prepared by the Working Group on CITES and Livelihoods (Information Document CoP16 Inf. 21);

RECOGNIZING that CITES-listing decisions are neither the sole cause nor the sole solution to the livelihood problems of the ~~poor~~ rural communities¹, but that the effective implementation of such decisions can form part of a strategy to provide sustainable livelihoods for ~~the~~ ~~poor~~ rural communities, ~~in accordance~~ consistent with paragraph 203 of the outcome document of the Rio+20 Conference The Future We Want;

RECOGNIZING that poor rural communities may attach economic, social, cultural and ceremonial importance to some CITES-listed species;

RECOGNIZING that the implementation of CITES is better achieved with the engagement of ~~poor~~ rural communities, specially those which are traditionally dependent on CITES-listed species for their livelihoods;

RECOGNIZING that the ~~proper~~ implementation of CITES listings may enhance livelihoods by delivering long- term species conservation and reducing unsustainable and illegal trade;

RECOGNIZING ALSO that implementation of some listings (particularly Appendix-I listings) may impact livelihoods of ~~the~~ ~~poor~~ rural communities by restricting access to income, employment and other resources such as food, materials and medicines, but that it need not always do so if appropriate implementation strategies are adopted;

RECOGNIZING that livelihoods issues and this Resolution do not pertain to the criteria for the amendment of the Appendices or the requirement to make non-detriment findings;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

AFFIRMS ~~AGREES~~ that the following ~~principles~~ be considered when Parties address livelihood issues:

Regarding empowerment of ~~poor~~ rural communities

ENCOURAGES Parties to work with key stakeholder groups to design, implement and monitor effective strategies with regard to the implementation of CITES listings recognizing that:

- a) Solutions are likely to be case and situation specific;
- b) Although amendments to the CITES Appendices must, unless indicated otherwise in an annotation, come into effect 90 days after their adoption by the Conference of the Parties, developing appropriate solutions to mitigate negative impacts on the livelihoods of ~~the poor~~ rural communities may require more time to implement relevant policy changes;
- c) Developing guidelines ~~must be~~ is an ongoing process as more knowledge is gained about specific impacts and successful as well as unsuccessful experiences, which means that the monitoring and evaluation of strategies will be priority aspects in the development of appropriate implementation strategies and policies; and
- d) Community and traditional knowledge should be considered, as appropriate and in accordance with the provisions of the Convention and national laws, regulations and policies; in the implementation of CITES;

RECOGNIZES ~~AGREES~~ that:

- a) Empowerment of ~~the poor~~ rural communities should be encouraged through measures that include, as appropriate:
 - i) Promoting transparency and participation of rural communities in the development and implementation of national CITES-related policies regarding ~~poverty and the use of natural resources, and in the value chains concerned;~~
 - ii) Maximizing the benefits share for poor rural communities of CITES implementation and trade in the value chains concerned, in particular to support poverty eradication;
 - iii) Promoting Developing associations of harvesters, managers, growers or any primary users of wildlife, however they are defined;
 - iv) ~~Developing socially responsible trade associations with clear obligations for benefit sharing; and~~
 - v) Recognizing resource tenure and ownership and traditional knowledge ~~cultural and intellectual property rights for indigenous, tribal and poor of or in rural communities associated with CITES-listed species, subject to any applicable national or international law;~~
- b) Support for the implementation of CITES listings should be enhanced by public awareness and education, including ~~education~~ programmes for ~~poor~~ rural communities, to ensure that:

- i) The positive aspects of CITES and related legislation are understood;
 - ii) CITES-listed species are conserved, and potential benefits to poor rural communities realized; and
 - iii) ~~Peer~~ eCommunities support policies and activities designed to reduce or eliminate illegal trade in specimens of CITES-listed species; and
- c) As implementation of some listings may have short-term negative impacts on ~~the~~ ~~peer~~ rural communities, mitigation strategies should be adopted as appropriate. These strategies may include:
- i) ~~Providing Developing aid plans to provide~~ assistance, including short-term financial support, to rural communities ~~the harvesters, managers, growers or any primary users of wildlife, however they are defined,~~ most severely affected by the implementation of the CITES-listing decisions; and
 - ii) Promoting ~~Providing~~ alternatives to rural communities to enhance the effective implementation of CITES-listing decisions, for instance: ~~means of livelihoods~~.
 - a) income generation approaches ~~compensation schemes~~, such as payment for ecosystem services, sustainable tourism, employment in eco-tourism or as game wardens; and
 - b) Licences or concessions for tourism, hunting, fishing and harvesting; the development of alternative products; ~~and~~

Regarding enabling policies

INVITES Parties to initiate or strengthen collaborative partnerships among local, regional, national and international development and conservation agencies to enhance:

- a) Financial support for wildlife conservation and ~~peer~~-rural communities; and
- b) The complementarity of their work and CITES implementation;

~~RECOMMENDS~~ that INVITES Parties to explore the use of registered marks of certification and origin consistent with CITES provisions for products obtained legally and sustainably by poor rural communities, ~~to indicate that the products are obtained legally and sustainably;~~

~~ENCOURAGES~~ INVITES international financial institutions and cooperation agencies to assist Parties in the development of supportive policies and institutions at the regional, national and local levels to address ~~negative~~ impacts of the implementation of listings on ~~peer~~ rural communities.

Regarding the potential ~~compensatory mechanisms for the shift from in situ to ex situ production~~

RECOGNIZES that:

- a) ~~Implementation of some CITES listings may encourage e~~Ex situ production, ~~which may lead to loss of revenues profits for poor rural communities.~~
- b) Positive incentives to promote in situ ~~Market based incentives may then be required to encourage benefit sharing and to remove barriers to the development of in situ production systems may encourage benefits for these communities;~~
- b) Cooperation between exporting and importing countries may include:

~~Consumer countries may work with producer countries to develop effective strategies to support positive impacts and minimize negative impacts of the implementation of CITES listings. These can include:~~

- ~~i) Working with in situ and ex situ producers and trade associations; and~~
- ~~ii) Developing supportive strategies through bilateral conservation and development projects; and~~

RECOMMENDS the adoption of that Parties adopt mitigation strategies for human-wildlife conflict with respect to CITES-listed species;

~~, where appropriate, to provide:~~

- ~~a) compensation schemes, such as payment for ecosystem services, employment in eco-tourism or as game wardens; and~~
- ~~b) Licences or concessions for tourism, hunting, fishing and harvesting; the development of alternative products; and~~

RECOMMENDS ALSO that mitigation activities take into account not only ~~not be based on~~ CITES-listed species only but also on the whole ecosystem that contains them.

DRAFT DECISIONS FOR THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

Directed to Parties

16.A ~~Exporting and importing countries are encouraged~~ invited to carry out voluntary rapid assessments of the ~~impact~~ of implementation of CITES listing decisions on the livelihoods of ~~poor~~ rural communities and to mitigate ~~any~~ negative impacts ~~that are identified through the use of the voluntary guidelines provided in Resolution Conf. 16.xx on CITES and livelihoods of poor rural communities.~~

16.B ~~Parties should~~ are encouraged to develop case studies and to facilitate exchange visits between relevant stakeholders from the different ongoing conservation and sustainable use programmes which address issues related to CITES and livelihoods in order to stimulate the exchange ~~the~~ of lessons learnt ~~from positive and negative experiences on regarding~~ CITES-listed species living in similar environments and/or social conditions.

16.C Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and public and private donors/investors ~~that are major consumers of wild fauna and flora~~ are encouraged to ~~provide financial assistance in support of~~ rapid assessments of the impact of the implementation of CITES-listing decisions on the livelihoods of ~~the~~ ~~poor~~ rural communities, the implementation of activities which mitigate any negative impacts and cooperation agreements between relevant national government agencies and ~~poor~~ rural communities.

Directed to the Standing Committee

~~16.D The Standing Committee shall review at its 66th meeting, Parties' progress in the implementation of Resolution Conf. xx~~

16.ED The Standing Committee shall continue the operation of its Working Group on CITES and Livelihoods so that it can ~~additional~~ provide guidance, develop and share case studies and monitor progress in addressing livelihoods issues. the Working Group can review the comments on the toolkit and guidelines submitted by Parties, stakeholders and interested organizations and make recommendations to the

Standing Committee.

16.E The Working Group shall continue to work electronically through a forum available on the CITES website. The Working Group may, subject to availability of external funding, recommend to the Standing Committee that a meeting of the working group is required. If funding is available, consideration may be given to holding one or more meetings, if possible in most concerned regions.

16.F The Standing Committee shall review at its 65th and 66th meetings the progress made with regard to CITES and livelihoods.

16.G The Standing Committee shall present a report to the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties on the progress made on results of this work.

Directed to the Secretariat

16.H The Secretariat shall, via a Notification, invite Parties, stakeholders and interested organizations to provide comments on document CoP16 inf. 21. The comments shall be made available for consideration by the Working Group.

16.I Subject to the availability of external funds, the Secretariat shall, in collaboration ~~coordination~~ with interested ~~importing and exporting~~ Parties and relevant international and regional organizations:

a. ~~Publish, in the three working languages of the Convention, and with an express disclaimer that they have not been endorsed by the Parties to the Convention the final versions of the “toolkit for the rapid assessment at the national level of the positive and negative impacts of implementing CITES listing decisions on the livelihoods of the poor rural communities” and the “Nazca guidelines for Parties to address the negative impacts of implementing CITES listings”.~~

~~fFacilitate the organization of Workshops, meetings of the Working Group and side-events to showcase successful livelihood experiences, develop case studies on the application of the toolkit and guidelines and create a section on the CITES Website to publish good practice experiences and case studies related to CITES and livelihoods submitted by Parties, stakeholders and interested organizations in order to make them accessible to interested Parties and stakeholders.~~

References

Abensperg-Traun M (2011) CITES and community-based conservation: the need for constructive engagement. In Abensperg-Traun M, Roe D and O’Criodain C (Eds) (2011) *CITES and CBNRM. Proceedings of an International Symposium on “The relevance of CBNRM to the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species in exporting countries”, Vienna, Austria, 18-20 May 2011*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN and London, UK, pp 1-3. Online at <http://pubs.iied.org/14616IIED.html>.

Abensperg-Traun M, Roe D and O’Criodain C (Eds) (2011) *CITES and CBNRM. Proceedings of an International Symposium on “The relevance of CBNRM to the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species in exporting countries”, Vienna, Austria, 18-20 May 2011*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN and London, UK: IIED. Online at <http://pubs.iied.org/14616IIED.html>.

Hutton JM (2011) A question of balance? Reflections on the appropriate relationship between rural development and international protocols to regulate wildlife trade. In Abensperg-Traun M, Roe D and O’Criodain C (Eds) (2011) *CITES and CBNRM. Proceedings of an International Symposium on “The relevance of CBNRM to the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species in exporting countries”, Vienna, Austria, 18-20 May 2011*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN and London, UK: IIED, pp 7-10. Online at <http://pubs.iied.org/14616IIED.html>.

Hutton JM and Leader-Williams N (2003) Sustainable use and incentive-driven conservation: realigning human and conservation interests. *Oryx* 37 (2) 215-226

O’Criodain C (2011) CITES and community-based conservation: where we go from here. In Abensperg-Traun M, Roe D and O’Criodain C (Eds) (2011) *CITES and CBNRM. Proceedings of an International Symposium on “The relevance of CBNRM to the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species in exporting countries”, Vienna, Austria, 18-20 May 2011*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN and London, UK: IIED, pp 135-142. Online at <http://pubs.iied.org/14616IIED.html>.

Schally HM (2011) Sustainable livelihoods, community involvement and awareness as driving forces for biodiversity conservation. In Abensperg-Traun M, Roe D and O’Criodain C (Eds) (2011) *CITES and CBNRM. Proceedings of an International Symposium on “The relevance of CBNRM to the conservation and sustainable use of CITES-listed species in exporting countries”, Vienna, Austria, 18-20 May 2011*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN and London, UK: IIED, pp 5-6. Online at <http://pubs.iied.org/14616IIED.html>.