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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With recent estimates of the wild population at just 3,500-5,000, Tigers are one of the world’s most high profile endangered species, and international cooperation is necessary to end the illegal trade which is a leading threat. CITES has a long history of effort to stop illegal trade in Tiger parts and products, but unless these efforts are strengthened they risk failure. At its most recent Conference of the Parties (CoP14: The Hague, Netherlands, June 2007), CITES adopted by consensus a series of Decisions (14.65-14.72) aimed at improving trade prevention. This report highlights important new developments in Tiger conservation and trade control since adoption of the Decisions, including conservation initiatives, research on illegal trade and other studies, as well as law enforcement efforts. Implementation of Decisions 14.65-72 is reviewed and summarized below, with recommendations.

Decision 14.65: Strengthen implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5

For CoP14, TRAFFIC evaluated how well 13 Asian big cat range States have adopted the measures recommended in this key CITES resolution over the past decade (Nowell 2007). India and Southeast Asian Tiger range States scored relatively poorly, although there has been recent improvement in law enforcement effort. Reporting on implementation has been erratic, and should be improved through standardization, an annual independent review, and participation in a centralized trade monitoring system (Recommendations 1, 2 and 3).

Decisions 14.66 and 14.69 Domestic Tiger trade control policy and preventing trade in products from captive-bred Tigers

The world’s largest former and potential future consumer of Tiger bone, China’s domestic trade control policy is of central importance for global Tiger conservation. Although research indicates that China’s 1993 trade ban has reduced availability, production and use of Tiger bone medicines, with strong public support, the continuing global decline of wild Tigers has caused China to question the effectiveness of banning trade and consider satisfying demand by legalizing domestic trade in products made from captive-bred Tigers. China is home to several intensive Tiger breeding operations explicitly aimed at commercial trade which do not comply with best ex situ conservation practices. China has sought international input to its on-going policy review. CITES should place a close watch on China’s Tiger policy within the context of a wider annual reporting mechanism for Asian big cats (Recommendation 2).

Decisions 14.67 and 14.70 Improved international dialogue through workshops

International conservation dialogue is being improved through a series of high-level meetings and workshops, including development of an international Tiger conservation strategy, law enforcement intelligence training for Tiger range States, a Ministerial meeting, and the Year of the Tiger high-level Summit. The Summit is anticipated to produce a way forward, signed on by Heads of State of range States. Outcomes of these workshops should be built upon in a CITES Action Plan to End Tiger Trade (Recommendation 1), among other recommendations and actions.

Decisions 14.68 and 14.71 Regional enforcement networks and specialized intelligence units

The Wildlife Enforcement Network of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN-WEN) has been a model of such a network, and a similar initiative for South Asia (SAWEN) shows promise, but regional cooperation on Tiger trade issues should extend to Russia and East Asia as well as other important consumer markets. The CITES Secretariat provides ongoing support, but fewer than half of the Tiger range States have set up specialized intelligence units. This is a key element of Tiger trade control, and capacity building support should be included in the new World Bank Global Tiger Initiative, which will be an important future source of funding. Effectiveness would also be enhanced through participation in a centralized Tiger trade monitoring mechanism (Recommendation 3).
Decision 14.72 Establishment of a Tiger trade monitoring mechanism

CITES has long recognized that successful trade control depends on data collection and analysis, and in terms of Tigers has regularly requested reports on actions taken by CITES Parties. A Tiger trade monitoring system has great potential to improve the information base for CITES decision makers. TRAFFIC has played a leading role in organizing, managing and analyzing other CITES species databases, and has undertaken an in-depth exploration of the issues involved in creating a similar product for Tigers. The CITES Standing Committee could recommend that the CITES Secretariat and Tiger Enforcement Task Force collaborate with TRAFFIC to develop a detailed proposal for an Asian big cat seizures database (for consideration at CoP15 in 2010), to facilitate centralized reporting, which TRAFFIC hopes would lead in the future to a comprehensive trade monitoring system (Recommendation 3).
INTRODUCTION AND METHODS: TIGER CONSERVATION AND TRADE CONTROL SINCE CoP14

As members of CITES, Parties have agreed to prohibit international commercial trade in Tigers, listed on Appendix I since 1975. By consensus, CITES Parties have also agreed upon a number of measures to eliminate domestic markets and illegal trade in Tiger parts and products, through Decisions 14.65-72 and Resolution Conf. 12.5. Many elements of Resolution Conf. 12.5 (adopted at the 12th Convention of the Parties in 2002) date back to the early 1990s, with Resolution Conf. 9.14 adopted at CoP9, and so Parties have had over a decade to implement trade control measures. Based on recommendation of the CITES Standing Committee (SC54 Doc. 25.2 and SC54 summary record), TRAFFIC evaluated implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5 in a report distributed at CoP14 (Nowell 2007): Asian big cat conservation and trade control in selected range States: evaluating implementation and effectiveness of CITES recommendations.

This report evaluates implementation, over a much shorter time period of a year and a half, of Decisions 14.65-72 in order to aid deliberations at SC58 and CoP15. It builds on reports by the CITES Secretariat on its actions and recommendations regarding these Decisions (SC57 Doc. 31.1 and SC58 Doc. 33). This report has three sections: 1) a summary of important new developments for Tiger conservation and trade control since CoP14; 2) evaluation of implementation of Decisions 14.65-72; and 3) recommendations. An extensive literature review was the main method used for production of this report, emphasizing new information since CITES CoP14 took place in The Hague, Netherlands, in June 2007.

Tiger status

Tigers occur primarily in South and Southeast Asia, where mammals are disproportionately threatened according to a recent global assessment by IUCN (Schipper et al 2008). Their range has shrunk by 41% over the last decade due to habitat loss, prey base depletion and poaching (Dinerstein et al 2007). The species is classified as Endangered on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species (IUCN 2009). The Sumatran subspecies is classified as Critically Endangered (Table 1); in a rare bit of good news the Amur Tiger population in Russia appears to have stabilized over the past decade, thanks to intensive conservation effort, and no longer qualifies as Critically Endangered.

Two recent studies, based on both published and grey literature, compiled estimates of national Tiger populations (Table 2). While data quality is improving and monitoring effort is increasing, many national estimates are still speculative, with Russia and India the most scientific and reliable. The global population is estimated at 3,500-5,000, with fewer than 2,500 Tigers successfully reproducing into their populations’ gene pool (IUCN 2009). These recent estimates are significantly lower than the 5,000-7,000 Tigers estimated in the mid-1990s (Seidensticker et al. 1999), which correlates with the substantial range loss over the same period (Dinerstein et al 2007). Although improved knowledge of Tiger status and distribution accounts for some fraction of the population and range reduction, a serious decline is evident and warrants treating illegal trade as a top international and national priority.
Table 1. Conservation status of Tiger subspecies on the 2009 IUCN Red List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITICALLY ENDANGERED</th>
<th>ENDANGERED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely high extinction risk</td>
<td>Very high extinction risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South China Tiger <em>P. t. amoyensis</em></td>
<td>Amur Tiger <em>P. t. altaica</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatran Tiger <em>P. t. sumatrae</em></td>
<td>Bengal Tiger <em>P. t. tigris</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indochinese Tiger <em>P. t. corbetti</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malayan Tiger <em>P. t. jacksonii</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The South China Tiger is Possibly Extinct in the Wild. Three subspecies are confirmed Extinct in the Wild: the Bali Tiger *P. t. balica*, the Javan Tiger *P. t. sondaica*, and the Caspian Tiger *P. t. virgata*.

Table 2. National Tiger population estimates according to two recent compilations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>200-419</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhutan</td>
<td>67-81</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>11-50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>37-50</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>1,165-1,657</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>441-679</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>300-493</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>350-370</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Korea</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>331-393</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>250-720</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>3,402-5,140</td>
<td>3,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservation initiatives

Tiger trade is largely international; few Tiger products are consumed close to where Tigers are poached (Mills and Jackson 1994, Nowell 2000, Nowell 2007). International cooperation is thus necessary to conserve Tigers and eliminate illegal trade, and there have been a number of recent initiatives, including:

- **International Tiger Conservation Strategy.** Decisions 14.67 and 14.70 call on range States to improve international cooperation in conservation and trade control by participating in a conservation strategy workshop, to be facilitated by IUCN – The World Conservation Union and the Global Tiger Forum (building on recent scientific work, including the 2006 Tiger Conservation Landscape Assessment: Dinerstein et al 2007) and other relevant organizations. This is scheduled to take place in October 2009.

- **Global Tiger Initiative and 2010 Year of the Tiger Summit.** The World Bank has undertaken an analysis of Tiger conservation (*A future for wild Tigers*: Damania et al 2008), and in June 2008, the World Bank Group, Global Environment Facility (GEF), members of the International Tiger Coalition (ITC) and Smithsonian Institution launched the **Global Tiger Initiative (GTI: SC58 Inf. 3)** to stabilize and restore populations of wild tigers and associated habitats / landscapes to a sustainable level. Collaborating with range State governments and NGOs, in 2010 the Bank hopes to convene a **Year of the Tiger Summit** to foster high-level political commitment to Tiger conservation.

- **International Tiger Corridor.** The Wildlife Conservation Society and Panthera Foundation are working with governments to alter zoning to protect a 5,000 km continuous corridor of Tiger habitat from Myanmar to Bhutan to facilitate genetic exchange and reduce population isolation.

- **Tiger Network Initiative.** WWF is launching a major new initiative with the goal of increasing the Tiger population to at least 6,000 by 2020, working in 13 high-priority conservation landscapes in 11 countries and on trade and policy issues range-wide.

Countries have taken a number of significant steps since mid-2007 to help conserve Tigers, including:

- **Malaysia** has adopted a **national Tiger action plan** with the goal of increasing the population to 1,000 Tigers by 2020 (Govt of Malaysia 2008).

- At the World Conservation Congress in Barcelona in October 2007, the **government of Indonesia** announced the **Sumatra Commitment** to protect the island’s remaining natural forests from logging. In June 2009, the governments of Indonesia and the United States announced a debt-for-nature swap which will provide $30 million for conservation of 13 forest areas in Sumatra over the next eight years.

- **Russia** held its first national **Tiger Day** on September 28, 2007 in Vladivostok, featuring a well-attended public festival as well as scientific and political meetings. It is also notable that Russian Prime Minister Vladimir Putin has been personally involved in Amur Tiger conservation, participating in the immobilization and satellite collaring of a tigress (Faulconbridge 2008).

Illegal markets for Tiger products

Tiger trade markets, being illegal, are difficult to monitor and study, but there have been several recent market surveys as well as research on consumer attitudes and the drivers of Tiger trade.

- **What’s driving the wildlife trade? A review of expert opinion on economic and social drivers of the wildlife trade in Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam** (TRAFFIC 2008). This report, produced in collaboration with the World Bank, included a case study of Tiger trade. While all four countries examined have strong legislation to protect Tigers, illegal trade continues, with a structure shown in Figure 1. The report emphasizes that most Tiger poaching is done by professionals, and demand is driven by wealthy consumers.
**The wild cat trade in Myanmar** (Shepherd and Nijman 2008). From 1991-2006, 167 Tiger parts were observed for sale in Myanmar markets, representing a minimum of 107 Tigers. The main market is Tachilek, located on the border with Thailand and, despite its illegality, trade has carried on openly for many years. Tiger skins are the most common Tiger product, although the number for sale has declined over time, from more than 20 at markets in the early 1990s to few seen in recent years.

**Wildlife trade in the Russian Far East: an overview** (Lyapustin et al 2007). This TRAFFIC report included an analysis of seizures of Tiger parts and products in Russia, and found that specialized anti-poaching units had a higher annual average interdiction rate (5.5 cases) than Customs (4) from 1999-2006. Over that period, Customs authorities prevented two cases of Tiger skin smuggling, with 19 attempts to smuggle Tiger bone, and most smugglers being Chinese nationals.

Two major studies of consumer attitudes toward Tiger products were undertaken in China. *Attitudes toward consumption and conservation of Tigers in China* (Gratwicke et al 2008) surveyed 1,880 adults in seven cities. While 43% of respondents had used Tiger products in the past (mainly manufactured products: Tiger bone plasters and Tiger bone wine), 88% knew it was illegal to buy or sell Tiger products and 93% agreed that a ban on trade in Tiger parts was necessary to conserve Tigers. People who had used Tiger products in the past strongly preferred wild Tiger products to those made from captive-bred animals (71%). A second study, *Understanding the motives of wildlife consumption* (Tong 2007), through focus groups found consumers motivated by the belief that wild animals are “unpolluted,” “precious,” and “special,” as well as having nutritional and curative properties. Although Tiger meat is offered on the menu (often to Chinese tourists) in Southeast Asia (TRAFFIC 2008), this study found that Tigers are not considered desirable wild food (Figure 2), and the few that claimed to use it used only Tiger medicinal products.
Consumer attitudes toward Tiger products were also studied in Viet Nam (A matter of attitude: the consumption of wild animal products in Ha Noi, Viet Nam: Venkataraman 2007). Very few (less than 5%) of adult residents of Hanoi claimed to have used Tiger bone gel, the primary form of Tiger bone medicine illegally traded in Viet Nam. Nearly all knew Tigers were protected, and 37% were willing to use substitutes, although people in focus groups strongly preferred wild to farmed products.

All three consumer surveys indicated that demand from Tigers primarily comes from older men with higher education and income levels, indicating the audience that awareness campaigns should target.

**Law enforcement**

Since mid-2007 there have been significant seizures and prosecutions of illegal Tiger trade. There is currently no centralized and standardized collection of information on this, so that it is not possible to analyze data for trends. Description of the cases below is not meant to be exhaustive (and indeed, leaves out tens of recent cases from India alone), but rather illustrative of the range of methods, products and places involved. Cases were collected from the TRAFFIC Wildlife Trade News website (www.traffic.org; searching on “Tiger”), as well as from the compilation of seizures and prosecutions from the TRAFFIC Bulletin (TRAFFIC 2007).

- One of the most significant cases is the apprehension of Sansar Chand in India in June 2008, the country’s most wanted Tiger trader. Another major trader was one of 16 people arrested previously in northern India in December 2007, when three Tiger skeletons and skins were seized.

- Two Thai nationals were arrested in January 2009 when four Tiger carcasses, cut into parts, were seized from their truck in the border city of Hua Hin, believed to have originated in Malaysia and destined for China. Genetic testing was to be carried out to determine if the Tigers were wild or captive.
• In May 2009 two Thai nationals were arrested when five Tiger skin mounts were found in their car during a roadblock inspection by the Malaysian national Anti-Smuggling Unit. The Tigers were believed to have been poached in Malaysia.

• Two major Tiger bone gel manufacturing operations were broken up by Hanoi’s Environmental Police, in September 2007 and in January 2009, involving Tiger carcasses, skeletons and skin pieces. Also, four people were sentenced in January 2008 for smuggling bones from four Tigers from Myanmar through Laos and Thailand back to Viet Nam to produce Tiger bone gel. In June 2008 a man was arrested with a 190 kg Tiger carcass he had purchased in Laos to make Tiger bone gel.

• Four traders were named as suspects after a curio shop in Jakarta was raided and the Tiger products equivalent to five Sumatran Tigers were seized in February 2009.

• Stiff jail sentences were handed down in June 2008 in Russia against a Russo-Chinese smuggling ring; the case involved over 60 kg of Tiger bone, four Tiger skins and around 900 bear paws.

• An Indonesian and a Chinese national were arrested in east China in November 2007 with a Tiger pelt hidden in a sack of ground coffee.

• In the US, Federal agents seized manufactured Tiger bone medicines from a traditional pharmacy in Minneapolis in December 2008.

• In February 2009 in Canada, a local Chinese medicinal company was fined US$36,000 for illegally processing and selling medicines made from Tiger bone.

• In January 2008 four people were jailed in Nepal for trying to smuggle five Tiger skins and 113 kg of Tiger bone hidden in noodle cartons into China. That same month three people were arrested trying to smuggle a skin and 125 bone pieces from India.

• In February 2009 a young Bhutanese boy entering a border crossing point into India became nervous and fled, dropping a leopard skin and 4.5 kg of Tiger bone.

• Tigers were among the hundred of mounted trophies confiscated from two taxidermists in France in April 2008.

The law enforcement cases described above show that Tiger products are still being traded illegally in many countries in a wide variety of forms, from processed medicinals, raw skins and bones, frozen carcasses, stuffed specimens, to skin and tooth souvenir curios. There is also considerable variation in smuggling methods and the professionalism of those involved. Although cases are few, a substantial and ongoing illegal trade is indicated. An illustration of the daily volume of illegal international wildlife trade is provided by a one-day special exercise on January 15 2009 carried out by 90 Customs authorities around the world, resulting in the seizure (mainly from airports) of almost 5,000 live animals as well as large amounts of derivatives ranging from Tiger medicinals to ivory, caviar and big cat skins.
Workshop on the development of a Tiger trade monitoring system

In August 2008 TRAFFIC convened a workshop to explore issues related to development of a tiger trade monitoring system. Participants with database expertise reviewed a number of other wildlife trade and Tiger conservation data management systems, and considered technical challenges to be met in building a database for Tiger trade. They proposed a name, STRIPES - Sharing Tiger trade Records Internationally to Promote Effective conservation Strategies - and a purpose statement: measure, monitor, analyze and make available information on the nature, volume, impacts and causative mechanisms of illegal Tiger trade and their parts, and the impact of interventions on Tiger populations, to better inform target audiences in their Tiger conservation efforts (TRAFFIC in press). Conclusions are discussed in the section on implementation of Decision 14.72, which the workshop was designed to support.

Captive Tigers

The United States has one of the world’s largest captive Tiger populations, but despite a lack of efficient regulation of Tigers in private ownership, a TRAFFIC study (Paper Tigers? The role of the U.S. captive Tiger population in the trade in Tiger parts: Williamson and Henry 2008) found no evidence of any significant illegal trade in Tiger parts.

Captive Tigers will be a focus of the 58th meeting of the CITES Standing Committee (SC58), despite the failure of Parties with Tiger breeding operations are to submit reports on Tiger breeding operations (Decision 14.69) as requested (CITES Notification 2008/059, SC58 Doc. 33). Implementation of this and the other Tiger-related Decisions adopted at CoP14 is the subject of the next section.
RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS: IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CoP14 TIGER DECISIONS

Decisions 14.65-14.69: Directed to the Parties to CITES

Decision 14.65: Strengthen implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5

Asian big cat range States shall strengthen their efforts to implement Resolution Conf. 12.5 and, for Tiger range States, report on progress at the 57th meeting of the Standing Committee, and subsequent meetings of the Standing Committee, and at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP15), with a review for CoP15 identifying gaps and additional measures needed.

Decision 14.65 contains three elements: range States should improve implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5; progress should be monitored through a regular reporting mechanism; and a review of implementation should identify priority actions for the next CITES meeting (CoP15).

Implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5 by Asian big cat range States

This was the subject of a performance review by the TRAFFIC Network (Nowell 2007), although only 13 of the 35 Asian big cat range States were included. Countries were graded according to three levels of implementation effort, which includes both policy and practice, on each element of the Resolution, and the scores summed to yield the results shown in Figure 3. The review found that implementation by the 13 range States had been uneven, with about half scoring Fair to Good and the other half Fair to Poor. Similar results were obtained as far as overall progress implementing the individual elements of the Resolution, with countries having made good progress implementing fewer than half of the measures (Table 3). Progress was poor in areas including targeted public awareness campaigns, as well as issues of national legislation, administration and adjudication of trade bans.

Countries which scored Fair to Good on implementation tended to have seen a recent reduction in poaching and commercial trade, whereas the opposite tendency is evident for those scoring Fair to Poor (Table 4). This suggests that CITES measures for Tiger trade control are effective when well implemented. The exception was India, which scored high for implementation effort but still suffers substantial commercial poaching. Better results are expected if conservation efforts remain high, and at SC57 the Government of India announced several new enforcement measures (SC57 summary record 2008).

1 Asian big cats include Tigers *P. tigris*, Leopards *P. pardus*, Snow Leopards *P. uncia* and Clouded Leopards *N. nebulosa* and *N. diardi*. There are potentially 35 range States (14 Tiger range States in bold face): Afghanistan, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, Georgia, India, Indonesia, Iran, Israel, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Malaysia, Mongolia, Myanmar, North Korea (possibly extinct), Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Sri Lanka, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, Yemen. However, the CITES Secretariat, when requesting reports from Asian big cat range States (Table 5), has excluded those from Southwest Asia, for a total of 21 (italic face).
Figure 3. Range State progress scores for implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5 (Nowell 2007)

Table 3. Progress scores for implementation of individual measures of Resolution Conf. 12.5 (Nowell 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implementation Fair to Good</th>
<th>Point score</th>
<th>Implementation Fair to Poor</th>
<th>Point score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Join and implement CITES</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>Multilateral, bilateral and</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent illegal trade from</td>
<td></td>
<td>transboundary cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>ex situ</em> sources</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>Regional wildlife trade</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>control workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public awareness and</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Legislative bans prohibiting</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>education campaigns for</td>
<td></td>
<td>international and national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>trade, including derivatives,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with deterrent penalties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish anti-poaching units</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>Prohibit medicinal use and</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and share intelligence</td>
<td></td>
<td>promote substitutes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support and participate in</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>Defined administrative trade</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international ABC</td>
<td></td>
<td>control responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research into poaching</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Strengthened and innovative</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motives and solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td>enforcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public awareness and education</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>targeting skin markets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prioritize prosecution of</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>wildlife crimes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidate, control and</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>destroy stockpiles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Partner with traditional</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>medicine communities to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eliminate demand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Correlation between Range State implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5 and control of poaching and illegal trade (Nowell 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range State grade</th>
<th>Resolution Conf. 12.5 implementation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range States which have seen a reduction in commercial poaching and illegal trade in recent years</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range States with some commercial poaching and illegal trade</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh,</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Range States with continued substantial commercial poaching and illegal trade</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Fair to Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laos</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>Poor to Fair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key elements for trade control include domestic trade bans, anti-poaching, law enforcement, public awareness, and prevention of illegal trade from captive-bred animals. Nowell (2007) found that law enforcement and implementation of domestic trade bans had been relatively poorly implemented and called for increased investment of effort in these areas. Also recommended was an increase in support in resources and capacity building for the less developed range States, and increased effort to protect not only the Tiger, but the other Asian big cat species which have received less attention.

Resolution Conf. 12.5 was adopted at CoP12 in 2002, but elements of it have been included in previous CITES resolutions dating back to the early 1990s. Therefore the time period for evaluation of implementation effort is over a decade. More recently, developments since CoP14 might alter the results shown in the accompanying figures and tables; for example, there have been worrying indications that illegal trade from ex situ sources is growing (see Decision 14.69 below), while there has been increased effort to improve regional and national law enforcement efforts, especially in Southeast Asia (see Decision 14.68 below), where countries scored relatively low in the 2007 analysis.
Monitoring implementation through regular reporting

Decision 14.65 calls for Tiger range States to report to SC57 and SC58. This reporting requirement is modeled after previous reporting requirements on aspects of Tiger and other Asian big cat trade conservation and trade control stemming back nearly a decade, with the CITES Standing Committee taking the lead. Compliance with this aspect of Decision 14.65 has been poor, deteriorating from previous high reporting rates (Table 5).

Table 5. History of Party reports to CITES on Tiger and Asian big cat conservation and trade-related issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Subject of report</th>
<th>Countries reporting</th>
<th>Reporting rate*</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Response to recommendations of the CITES Tiger Technical Missions</td>
<td>Cambodia, Canada, China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, The Netherlands, Russia, UK, USA, Viet Nam</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>Decision 11.47, CoP12 Doc. 33, Annex, CoP12 Com. II Rep 12 (Rev.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>community-based conservation efforts for Asian big cats</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Brunei, Cambodia, China, India, Indonesia, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Nepal, North Korea, Pakistan, Russia, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>SC49 Doc. 10, SC50 Doc. 16, CoP13 Doc. 28, CoP13 Com II Rep. 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>supply data on criminal activities involving Tigers and other Asian big cats for intelligence analysis</td>
<td>Bangladesh, China, North Korea, Russia, Thailand, Viet Nam</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>SC53 Sum Rec (Rev. 1), SC54 Doc. 25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>efforts to combat illegal trade and implement recommendations of CITES Tiger Technical Missions</td>
<td>Afghanistan, Bangladesh, China, India, Indonesia, North Korea, Russia, Thailand, Viet Nam</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>SC53 Sum Rec (Rev. 1), SC54 Doc. 25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Asian big cat range State implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5</td>
<td>China, India, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>SC54 Sum Rec, CoP14 Doc. 52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Tiger range State implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5</td>
<td>China, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Viet Nam</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>Notification 2008/003, SC57 Doc 31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>describe Tiger breeding operations</td>
<td>China (incomplete)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>SC57 Sum Rec, Notification 2008/059, SC58 Doc. 33,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Reporting rate is the percentage of countries from which reports were requested that complied

Since 2007 country reports submitted to the Secretariat have been posted on the CITES website. While the reports contain useful information, reporting format is non-standard and the quality and contents vary widely between countries. For example, not all countries include reporting of seizures, and when they do (Malaysia: SC57 Doc. 31.1 Annex 2 and China: SC57 Doc. 31.1 Ann 6), it is not in a format which can be easily compared and analyzed. Much of the information included in the country reports is publicly available, and
compiling the reports is a workload for Parties which does not yield substantial improvements to the information base for CITES to make further decisions upon.

At the 57th Meeting of the CITES Standing Committee in July 2008, the Global Tiger Forum and many non-governmental organizations (including the International Tiger Coalition, a network of 39 conservation NGOs), urged that the reporting requirement of Decision 14.65 be improved through standardization of the reporting format. Such standard reporting formats had been used for other CITES-listed species, an example of which was the African Elephant and Ivory Trade questionnaire (CITES Notification 2007/029). A similar Tiger Trade questionnaire should be developed as a preparatory step for upcoming international Tiger workshops in 2009 and 2010 (see Decision 14.70), and the outcomes of these workshops should be built upon in a CITES Action Plan to End Tiger Trade (Recommendation 1). Regular reporting on aspects of Resolution Conf. 12.5 could also be satisfied through an annual review mechanism (Recommendation 2) and government participation in a centralized Asian big cat trade database (Decision 14.72 and Recommendation 3).

The conservation benefits of an annual independent reporting mechanism to CITES can be clearly illustrated with the example of African and Asian rhinoceroses. At the 14th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in June 2007, IUCN and TRAFFIC provided Parties with a report on the status, conservation and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses (CoP14 Doc. 54), in fulfillment of a mandate from the Standing Committee (SC54 Sum Rec). The report painted a very bleak picture, with sharp increases in the volume of rhino horn entering illegal trade and poaching in certain countries. Parties at CoP14 agreed to respond with a series of decisions (Decisions 14.88-14.90) requiring range States to declare the status of their stocks of rhinoceros horns and examine the implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP14) in the range States where illegal poaching of rhinoceroses appeared to have increased and posed a significant threat to populations of rhinoceroses. In addition, IUCN’s African Rhino (AfRSG) and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups (AsRSG) and TRAFFIC were mandated by CITES Resolution 9.14 (rev CoP 14) to produce another report for the Secretariat on African and Asian Rhinos - Status, Conservation and Trade prior to the 15th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES in 2010 (CoP15).

A similar process for Asian big cats could be implemented, where organizations such as the IUCN SSC Cat Specialist Group and TRAFFIC could report annually to the Standing Committee on progress with the implementation of Resolution Conf 12.5 and Decisions 14.65-14.72, addressing specific elements such as legislation, control of illegal trade, status of stockpiles, captive breeding of tigers and enforcement. Such reports could formulate recommendations and remedial measures for consideration by the Conference of the Parties (Recommendation 2).

Priority actions for CoP15

Decision 14.65 calls for preparation of a review of progress, identifying gaps and additional measures, for consideration of action at the next CITES meeting (CoP15). This report, reviewing implementation of the CoP14 Decisions as well as incorporating a previous review of implementation of Resolution Conf. 12.5, and making recommendations, helps to satisfy that requirement.

Decision 14.66 Domestic Tiger trade control policies should reflect the view of the CITES Parties

All Parties, especially those evaluating their domestic Tiger trade control policies, shall take into consideration the view of the Parties as expressed in Resolution Conf. 12.5.

All the Tiger range States and consumer countries prohibit domestic trade in tiger parts. However, China has recently announced that it is considering changes to its national tiger trade control policy (Govt of China 2006, CoP14 Doc 52 Annex 1, SC57 Doc. 31.1 Annex 6). Resolution Conf. 12.5 contains several elements regarding domestic policy, including that Parties voluntarily prohibit internal trade in Asian big cat parts and derivatives, remove references to them from official pharmacopeia, develop strategies for reducing and eventually eliminating their use, and prevent illegal trade from or through facilities with captive cats. China has one of the strictest domestic trade bans in the world, enacted in 1993, which prohibits hunting, sale, purchase and use of Tigers and Tiger products, including not readily recognizable derivatives (eg,
manufactured and processed medicinals), and requiring that pre-ban stocks be declared to the Government and sealed.

A TRAFFIC review of the Chinese market (Nowell and Xu 2007) found that China’s 1993 trade ban had been successful at reducing the production, sale and use of Tiger bone medicines (Figure 4). A substantial body of research, supported by the government, has developed numerous acceptable and inexpensive substitutes for Tiger bone. Skin trade has also declined (particularly in Tibet: Nowell and Xu 2007), although there are still problem areas (eg, markets in Linxia in western China: EIA 2008).

Figure 4. TRAFFIC surveys of hundreds of traditional medicine shops across China show a decline in availability of Tiger bone medicines since the 1990s (Nowell and Xu 2007)

In reconsidering this apparently successful policy of a ban on domestic trade, China looks to the declining number of Tigers in the wild as evidence that a new approach may be warranted. Of course, illegal trade is not the only cause of the Tiger’s perilous situation: a 41% contraction in known range was documented between 1997 and 2006 (Dinerstein et al 2007). At CoP14 in 2007, “China stated their intention to maintain the voluntary 1993 ban on domestic trade unless a policy review otherwise demonstrated that lifting the ban would provide positive benefits for wild Tiger populations” (CoP14 Com. II Rep 13).

China was an original sponsor of the Decisions that are the subject of this report (CoP14 Inf. 50 and CoP14 Com II Rep 11). However, in committee deliberations on the Decisions, China argued that provisions against commercial trade in captive-bred Tiger products should be applied to international and not domestic markets, but this view was rejected by majority Party vote (CoP14 Com. II Rep. 14). That is consistent with previous CITES CoP and Standing Committee decisions and resolutions for Tigers and Asian big cats.

CITES Decisions take effect 90 days after their adoption, so Decisions 14.65-72 went into effect in September 2007. In July 2007, the State Forestry Administration hosted a large workshop in order to solicit international advice on its domestic Tiger policy. The workshop included visits to China’s two largest Tiger breeding operations and the country’s largest manufacturer of traditional medicines, as well as a session which explored the benefits of legalizing trade in medicines derived from captive-bred Tigers. Among the international participants was the Co-Chair of the IUCN SSC Cat Specialist Group, who presented a Cat SG expert opinion survey which concluded that allowing domestic trade in captive-bred Tiger products would pose unacceptable risks to the global wild Tiger population (Figure 5) (Breitenmoser 2007).
After the workshop, Wang Wei, the Vice Director General of the SFA, gave an exclusive interview to the Xinhua news service. He said, “Tiger bone was taken out of the dictionaries but that doesn’t mean we think they have no medicinal value. Tiger bones have been a key item in Chinese traditional medicine for several thousand years, and not using them is a huge waste...All animals die, and there should be no problem using the bones of captive-bred tigers that died from natural causes...The parks were set up according to Chinese law. With strict controls and management of the processing of bones, and tougher law enforcement, the ban can be removed and it will not affect the wild tiger population...We are very prudent and cautious, and we will not make hasty decisions. We are still carrying out research and soliciting the views of other countries, and the ban will not be lifted in the near future” (Xinhua 2007)

As the world’s largest former and potential future consumer of Tiger bone, China’s national wildlife policy is of central importance for wild Tiger conservation (Nowell in press). China has requested international scientific input to its policy review (Global Tiger Forum 2007, Cat SG 2007, Breitenmoser 2007, Xinhua 2007). CITES should place a close watch on China’s Tiger policy within the context of a wider annual reporting mechanism for Asian big cats (Recommendation 2).

**Decision 14.67 Improved international dialogue**

*Asian big cat range States shall improve international cooperation in conservation and trade control through continual dialogue, and when convened, Tiger range States are invited to participate in the Tiger trade enforcement workshop and the conservation strategy workshop.*

Decision 14.67 refers to workshops called for in Decision 14.70, and this is discussed under that heading. Although there have been encouraging signs of fruitful results from continual international dialogue among Asian big cat range States (for example, Malaysia and Thailand cooperated in the seizure of four dismembered Tiger carcasses in Thailand in January 2009), such contacts are ad hoc and there is considerable room for improvement through development of a development of a CITES Action Plan to End Tiger Trade and an international Tiger information database (Recommendations 1 and 3).
Decision 14.68  Regional enforcement networks

Parties are strongly encouraged to develop or improve implementation of regional enforcement networks.

The Wildlife Enforcement Network of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN-WEN), including the 10 ASEAN member States as well as other country and NGO partners, was launched as an outcome of CITES CoP14 in Bangkok 2004 and is proving a highly successful model. The network operates on two levels: national and regional. On the national level, each country operates an inter-agency task force comprised of police, customs, and environmental officers. Task forces form the backbone of a regional network dedicated to battling trans-national wildlife crimes. The concept is similar to already-existing networks dealing with other trans-national crimes such as drug smuggling and human trafficking. The network is coordinated by a Secretariat in Bangkok employing two full-time program officers. Training and workshops are conducted, with the most recent A Forgotten Crisis: Arresting Wildlife Depletion in Asia through Strengthened Regional Cooperation and Effective Partnerships in April 2009. Tiger-specific issues included strengthening collaboration with South Asia, and gathering national perspectives in preparation for the 2010 Year of the Tiger Summit (ASEAN-WEN 2009).

Although ASEAN-WEN focuses on illegal wildlife trade in general, the Tiger and other Asian big cats are a priority. In January 2009, they organized the First Special Investigation Group Workshop on Pangolins and Big Cats. Included were police from ASEAN member countries Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, Cambodia, Lao, and Vietnam; along with police from China and the United States and representatives of INTERPOL and other international agencies. Participants worked together towards the development of an improved intelligence sharing framework effective across the range of national protocols, laws and capacities within ASEAN, and connecting to other key nations, such as China and the United States. Participants also used the workshop to develop specific action plans for the initiation of investigations (ASEAN-WEN 2009).

A second regional cooperation initiative was recently established, the South Asia Wildlife Trade Initiative (SAWTI) under the South Asian Co-operative Environment Program. Under this initiative, a South Asia Experts Group on Wildlife Trade was set up and a regional strategic plan for wildlife trade is being developed. Creation of a South Asian Wildlife Enforcement Network is also under discussion. Four Tiger range States are members (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal) (Boaz 2008).

India, the range State with the largest Tiger population, also has bilateral agreements on Tiger conservation and trade control with Nepal and China (SC57 Doc. 31.1 Annex 1). In SC57 Doc. 31.1, the CITES Secretariat described bilateral contacts between China and Russia, and advised there was greater scope for inclusion of Russia in other regional bodies.

The success of regional networks rests upon national capacities, and some Tiger range States have set up dedicated enforcement units for wildlife crime (Cambodia, India, Malaysia, Thailand and Viet Nam), as well as Tiger-focused anti poaching units (India, Indonesia, Laos, Russia).

Regional enforcement initiatives would be enhanced through a centralized information system in which all Tiger range and consumer countries would participate (Recommendation 3).
Decision 14.69 Preventing trade in captive-bred Tiger products

Parties with intensive operations breeding Tigers on a commercial scale shall implement measures to restrict the captive population to a level supportive only to conserving wild Tigers; Tigers should not be bred for trade in their parts and derivatives.

The countries with the two largest captive Tiger populations (approximately 5,000 Tigers each) are the US and China; however, the facilities where these animals are held are fundamentally different in nature and purpose. US zoos control breeding to maximize genetic diversity for conservation purposes, and Tigers in private ownership are widely scattered in small holdings and constitute poorly regulated exotic pets and rescue animals (Williamson and Henry 2008). China is the only country with very large breeding centers (two having approximately 1,000 Tigers each) and should be the focus of attention as these operations appear to be engaged in intensive breeding of Tigers to maximize production of offspring (otherwise known as farming) for trade in their parts and derivatives, according to market surveys as well as statements of intent from the operators (Nowell and Xu 2007). There is also evidence that breeders in other Southeast Asian countries are involved in illegal trade in Tiger products, including Thailand, Viet Nam, Laos, and possibly Malaysia. Indonesia also has a number of Tigers in private ownership and has had difficulty regulating them.

Breeding of Tigers for conservation purposes (e.g. maintenance of genetic diversity; CITES Notification 2008/059) is coordinated through a series of international programs and studbooks by recognized zoological institutions around the world. Existing programs are judged to be more than adequate; there is an oversupply of zoo Tigers and many zoos do not breed Tigers at all. Large breeding centers are not necessary for conservation of genetic diversity, and pose a public health and safety risk, as do most of the big cats in private ownership. H5N1 avian flu outbreaks have resulted in high Tiger morbidity and public safety risk in large breeding centers in Thailand and China in recent years (Nowell and Xu 2007).

The CITES Standing Committee requested Parties with Tiger breeding operations to submit reports on implementation of this Decision to the 58th meeting (SC57 Sum Rec, CITES Notification 2008/059). China was the only Party to do so (SC 58 Doc. 33 Annex 1). Its report was very brief (one sentence), reiterating China’s commitment to prohibit international trade in Tiger parts and derivatives (SC 58 Doc. 33 Annex 1). However, China’s report did not address the subject of the Notification - Tiger breeding and trade in captive Tiger parts and derivatives. Rather than prepare a more detailed report, China should cooperate with the recommended regular independent review of Asian big cat status, conservation and trade (Recommendation 2). A detailed review of China’s policy would assist South East Asian countries grappling with the problem of private citizens breeding Tigers for production and consumption.

Decisions 14.70-14.72 Directed to the Secretariat

Decision 14.70 Tiger conservation and trade enforcement workshops

Contingent upon availability of external funding, the Secretariat shall: convene a Tiger trade enforcement meeting within 12 months of the end of CoP14; and cooperate in the development of a conservation strategy workshop, to be facilitated by IUCN – The World Conservation Union and the Global Tiger Forum (building on recent scientific work, including the 2006 Tiger Conservation Landscape Assessment) and other relevant organizations.

The CITES Secretariat has been working with Interpol to develop a law enforcement intelligence training course for Tiger range states before the end of 2009 (SC58 Doc. 33). In October 2009, IUCN, the Global Tiger Forum and the CITES Secretariat plan to convene a workshop to develop an international Tiger conservation strategy, to be hosted by the government of Nepal. This is being coordinated with the World Bank’s Global Tiger Initiative and the planned Year of the Tiger Summit in 2010. TRAFFIC and others hope that the international Tiger conservation strategy workshop can be as strategic as possible, building on extensive good work by range State governments and many NGOs, and can in particular provide useful input into the Summit process. As an intermediary step prior to convening the strategy workshop, the CITES Standing Committee could ask the Secretariat (in consultation with relevant partners including IUCN and the
Global Tiger Forum) to develop and distribute a questionnaire to gather information on Party trade control efforts in a standardized process (as has been done for African elephants: CITES Notification 2007/029). Analysis of results could improve the trade information base and help the workshops to develop workable goals and targets. Outcomes of these workshops and meetings should also be further developed by a CITES Action Plan to End Tiger Trade (Recommendation 1).

**Decision 14.71 Support for specialized wildlife crime units**

The CITES Secretariat, in consultation with Parties that have or seek to have specialized wildlife crime units, shall provide technical assistance and assist with the identification of additional opportunities for technical and financial support.

The Secretariat notes (SC57 Doc. 31.1) that it considers this part of its ongoing support activities, and that specific Tiger-related guidance is provided in Annex 3 of Notification 2001/047, developed by the CITES Tiger Enforcement Task Force. There is considerable room for improvement of support for such units through development of a more efficient, standardized and centralized information sharing structure to aid decision-making (Recommendation 3).

**Decision 14.72 Establishment of a trade monitoring mechanism**

The CITES Tiger Enforcement Task Force shall, in conjunction with the CITES Enforcement Expert Group and in consultation with Tiger range States, establish a mechanism to regularly monitor and evaluate the scale and nature of illegal trade in Asian big cats.

Understanding the dynamics of illegal Tiger trade is hampered by both a paucity of data and lack of efficient collection of it (Nowell 2000). This compromises intelligence-led enforcement efforts as well as other conservation action. CITES has tried to improve the information base for decision-making through its requesting of country reports (Table 5). A professional intelligence analysis was also attempted in cooperation with the Canadian Wildlife Service, but it was unable to be carried out due to a lack of sufficient data, despite contributions from several range and consumer States as well as a number of NGOs (SC54 Doc 25.1). With this Decision, CITES has taken the first step toward development of standardized data collection, which has worked well for other species, and could simplify aspects of Party reporting and yield benefits for trade control.

However, the CITES Tiger Enforcement Task Force (with members consisting of officials and experts from both range and consumer States) has only met twice since its establishment in 2001 (CoP14 Doc. 52, 2007). At the 57th meeting of the Standing Committee, the Secretariat announced plans for the Task Force to participate in a meeting of the CITES Expert Enforcement Group in 2009 (SC57 Doc. 31.1), and reported no new developments in the year since (SC58 Doc 33). To achieve this important objective, it may be more practical and appropriate for the task of developing a detailed proposal to TRAFFIC, which has had a leading role in designing, managing and analyzing other CITES species trade databases (e.g., African elephants and rhinoceroses) (Recommendation 3).

In August 2008 TRAFFIC convened a workshop to gather ideas for and explore the challenges involved in setting up such a system for Tigers (TRAFFIC in press). The strengths and weaknesses of a number of other examples of species and trade databases were considered, including:

- **CITES databases:** the UNEP-WCMC CITES trade database; the African Rhino Crime Database, ETIS (the African Elephant Trade Information System) and MIKE (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants); and the discontinued TIGERS database (Trade Infraction Global Enforcement Recording System

- **International law enforcement databases:** Interpol’s ECOMESSAGE and the World Customs Organization’s ENVIRONET communication systems

- **National and regional government databases:** the European Union’s EU-TWIX (Trade in Wildlife Information Exchange); India’s National Tiger Conservation Authority Tiger poaching database;
national Rhino horn stockpile databases; India’s interest in developing a national wildlife crime database

- **NGO databases**: TRAFFIC national databases in Russia and China and regional Monitor database in Southeast Asia; the Tiger intelligence database of the Wildlife Protection Society of India (WPSI); the IUCN Red List database; the IUCN SSC Cat Specialist Group’s library and project databases; captive Tiger population databases maintained by zoo organizations; and wild Tiger population geospatial databases maintained by conservation organizations

Participants identified a number of issues to be resolved in order to produce an effective Tiger trade monitoring system, including:

- **System purpose**: whether the system could provide actionable intelligence as well as *ex post facto* seizures and prosecutions and to what extent it should track other aspects such as regulatory measures to implement CITES Resolutions and Decisions

- **System access and ownership**: whether the system could be accessed by NGOS or the public in addition to CITES Party governments

- **System data**: whether data should be expanded beyond seizures and prosecutions (which are relatively few) to include market surveys, stockpiles, and anecdotal information

- **Data quality**: whether fake or substitute Tiger derivatives could be distinguished, as well as captive vs. wild Tigers, and how reliability of data inputs could be measured

- **Data input**: how to ensure active participation and data provision, and if input could be simplified, online and in multiple languages

- **Data range**: whether data could be linked to Tiger poaching and Tiger population databases, and whether other Asian big cats could be included

- **Data quantification**: to what degree data fields could be standardized to enhance system functionality without sacrificing contextual detail

- **Impact assessment**: whether data could be translated into estimated number of Tigers killed, molecular markers to determine origin of Tiger products in trade, measuring Law Enforcement Effort (LEE) and other ways to assess the impact of trade control interventions and system effectiveness

- **System support**: funding has been a problem for many other databases and an adequate financial commitment must be obtained for a Tiger system to be successful
The workshop identified a number of valuable insights that could be derived from a successful trade monitoring system, including into the scale of the trade and its drivers, as well as measuring the effectiveness of law enforcement and anti-poaching, leading to improvements. There is the possibility that the system could be used to predict trade impacts, trade patterns, and Tiger population persistence, and could be used in conjunction with other parameter to model potential intervention outcomes. While recognizing that many aspects of Tiger conservation and trade control could be included, they suggested an initial design purpose of: measure, monitor, analyze and make available information on the nature, volume, impacts and causative mechanisms of illegal Tiger trade and their parts, and the impact of interventions on Tiger populations, to better inform target audiences in their Tiger conservation efforts. TRAFFIC Southeast Asia indicated that it would start consolidating the data already available in its ‘Monitor’ seizures database, to serve as a potential starting point. (TRAFFIC in press). As a first step toward the goal of a comprehensive Tiger trade monitoring mechanism, the CITES Secretariat and Tiger Enforcement Task Force could collaborate with TRAFFIC to develop a detailed proposal for an Asian big cat seizures database for CoP15 in 2010 (Recommendation 3).
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CITES

1. Build on international Tiger workshops to develop a CITES Action Plan to End Tiger Trade

This recommendation is aimed at improving implementation of Decisions 14.65, 14.67 and 14.70. Several major international dialogue processes will be concluded in 2009 and 2010: production of the first international Tiger conservation strategy developed through range State and expert dialogue; Tiger-focused intelligence training for range State enforcement authorities; and a high-level Year of the Tiger political summit to secure range State governments’ commitment to Tiger conservation. CITES should develop a Tiger trade control action plan which spells out steps for implementation of the goals put forward by these workshops.

As an intermediary step prior to convening the first workshop, the CITES Standing Committee could ask the Secretariat (in consultation with relevant partners including IUCN, the Global Tiger Forum, range State governments and international NGOs) to develop and distribute a questionnaire to gather information on Party trade control efforts in a standardized process (as has been done for African elephants: CITES Notification 2007/029). Analysis of results could improve the trade information base and help the workshops to develop workable goals and targets.

2. Standing Committee and CoP reports on the status, conservation and trade in Asian Big Cats

This recommendation is aimed at improving implementation of Decisions 14.65, 14.66 and 14.69. Country reports on Asian big cat trade and conservation have not proved to be a satisfactory method of information provision to CITES. There are other successful species-specific CITES reporting processes conducted by independent inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations that have greatly assisted conservation action on endangered species, such as for rhinoceroses and elephants. It is recommended that the CITES Standing Committee request relevant organizations, such as the IUCN SSC Cat Specialist Group and TRAFFIC, report annually to the Standing Committee on progress with the implementation of Resolution Conf 12.5 and Decisions 14.65-14.72 and that such reports address the following specific issues:

a) the legislation governing the protection of tigers and other Asian big cats in the country concerned, including:

- the division of responsibility among the various government agencies responsible for regulating trade within and outside of protected areas and in outlets for parts and derivatives such as in wildlife markets and shops, etc;

- the regulation or prohibition of internal trade in tigers and other Asian big cats – including their parts and derivatives;

- the penalties laid down under such legislation;

b) measures undertaken to ensure that the captive breeding of tigers and other Asian big cat species is restricted to a level determined solely by the objective of contributing to the long-term conservation of the species in the wild and to scale back or reduce breeding in facilities where it is taking place at a more intensive level;

c) measures undertaken to ensure that captive Asian big cat species held within the territory of any Party are managed and controlled to an extent that they are unable to filter into and fuel illegal trade, thereby contributing to a market demand which threatens wild populations;

d) status of existing stockpiles of parts and derivatives of tigers and other Asian big cats; and

e) indicators of effort and success in the fields of enforcement and awareness raising with regard to the protection of tigers and other Asian big cat species, including successful enforcement operations, innovative measures undertaken, participation in relevant regional networks etc.

The Secretariat can review the report and formulate recommendations for consideration by the Conference of the Parties as appropriate.
Range States of Asian big cats and consumer countries should be encouraged to support the relevant organizations in collecting information for their reporting to the Secretariat on trade in and conservation of Asian big cats.

3. Develop a detailed proposal for an Asian big cat seizures database

This recommendation is aimed at improving implementation of Decisions 14.68, 14.71 and 14.72. CITES has long recognized that law enforcement efforts are enhanced through trade data collection and analysis, and in terms of Tigers has regularly requested reports on actions by CITES Parties. A Tiger trade monitoring system has great potential to improve the information base for CITES decision makers. TRAFFIC has played a leading role in organizing, managing and analyzing other CITES species and regional trade databases, and has undertaken an in-depth exploration of the issues involved in creating a similar product for Tigers. The CITES Standing Committee can recommend that the CITES Secretariat and Tiger Enforcement Task Force collaborate with TRAFFIC to develop a detailed proposal for an Asian big cat seizures database (for consideration at CoP15 in 2010), to facilitate centralized reporting, which TRAFFIC hopes could lead in the future to a comprehensive trade monitoring system.
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