

***Evaluation of IUCN/TRAFFIC
Analyses of the Proposals to Amend
CITES Appendices***

Draft Report – November 2002

Evaluation of the IUCN/TRAFFIC Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices

Summary

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is an international agreement between Governments which aims to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. To ensure that decision making at the CoPs can be based upon the best and most up-to-date scientific and technical information, IUCN – the World Conservation Union's (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC) and TRAFFIC produce *The Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices*. Over the years, the process and production of the *Analyses* has become more complex, requiring increasing levels of financial and staff input. As COP 11 was the first time that the CITES Trust Fund and a number of other donors had supported the project, an independent evaluation of the *Analyses* was undertaken, to determine whether or not the expenditure could be justified.

To determine whether IUCN and TRAFFIC should continue with this project in future and if so, to raise adequate support for the project prior to the proposal deadline it is vital to determine whether there is a significant demand for the *Analyses* to contribute to the CITES decision-making process; whether the *Analyses* are reaching their target audience; and whether the production and distribution process can be improved.

Interviews were conducted with delegates who attended the Conference of the Parties (CoP) in Santiago, Chile, from 3-15th November, 2002. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to all Party pigeonholes at the CoP as well as to Management and Scientific Authorities upon initial distribution of the hard copies and CDs prior to the CoP. Where possible and applicable the responses from the latter questionnaire types were added to the interview questionnaire responses. Of the 85 people approached, a full interview was conducted with 63 delegates. Over 80% of respondents from Europe, North America and Oceania had seen the *Analyses* prior to the CoP, whereas only 27 % of respondents from Africa had seen the *Analyses*.

It was noted by many delegates that an independent review of proposals is important to delegates, and is particularly important for countries that do not have the resources themselves to carry out such an assessment. This evaluation found that the *Analyses* are considered to be impartial or generally impartial (93%), and accurate (91%), by the majority of delegates from all regions. The majority of delegates found the *Analyses* helpful in assessing the proposals against the relevant CITES criteria and also believed that the *Analyses* have an effect on the quality of CITES decision making. This is important as one of the key purposes of the *Analyses* is to serve as an objective and independent review of the proposals that can provide accurate scientific and technical information to the parties. The format of the *Analyses* was generally considered to be clear and easy to follow. However, a number of delegates had suggestions of possible improvements. Many expressed strong support of the production of the *Analyses* and 95% of respondents believe that the *Analyses* should be available at the CoP along with other information. IUCN and TRAFFIC were generally seen as the organisations most suitable to prepare the *Analyses*.

A number of recommendations are suggested with regards improving the distribution and the format of the *Analyses*. In addition, it is recommended that production of the *Analyses* be continued.

Introduction

Aim and history of the Analyses

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) is an international agreement between Governments which aims to ensure that international trade in specimens of wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival. There are currently 160 Parties to CITES. Today CITES gives varying degrees of protection to over 30,000 species of plants and animals that are in trade. These species are listed in one of three Appendices, which provide for differing levels of trade regulation. To amend the Appendices and include species in Appendix I or II or to transfer species between these Appendices or to delete species from the Appendices, the Parties must submit amendment proposals. These proposed changes to the Appendices are debated by the Parties and either accepted, rejected, amended or withdrawn at the biennial meetings of the Conference of the Parties (CoP). The 12th CoP took place in Santiago, Chile from 3-15th November, 2002.

To ensure that decision making at the CoPs can be based upon the best and most up-to-date scientific and technical information, IUCN – the World Conservation Union's (IUCN) Species Survival Commission (SSC) has since 1987 produced *The Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices*. More recently, SSC has collaborated with TRAFFIC on the production of the *Analyses*. The *Analyses* aim to provide an objective, independent review of the proposals, to assess whether the listing criteria of Resolution Conference 9.24 are met and hence to provide the Parties with a tool to help them to assess CITES amendment proposals.

As the biological and economic consequences of CITES listing are more fully understood, it has become vital that the CITES decision-making is based on the best available information. Furthermore, as biological and trade status issues are becoming increasingly complex, it becomes more and more difficult for governments, especially those with limited resources, to keep abreast of the scientific issues prevalent within the CITES debates. Few governments have access to the resources, capacity or expertise needed on all species in trade. In addition, the proposals vary considerably in their quality, many lacking key data required for assessment against the CITES criteria.

Context of the Analyses

Over the years, the process and production of the *Analyses* has become more complex, requiring increasing levels of financial and staff input. The production of the *Analyses* is necessarily limited to the 150 day period between the proposal submission deadline and the meeting of the COP. It is not cost-effective to start preparation much before the submission deadline in case the proposals are not submitted. Once the submission of proposals is confirmed, appropriate experts from the SSC, and TRAFFIC networks as well as from other organisations are identified and contacted for their input. Additional intensive research is undertaken to supply further information not already included in the proposals but necessary to assess the proposal against the CITES criteria. The compilation and analysis of comments and information as well as the translation and distribution of the *Analyses* are all undertaken in an intense couple of months by a team of six technical and administrative staff and consultants. To make the *Analyses* available early enough to meet the pre-COP provisional decision-making of some Parties, the *Analyses* were completed and on the web in English eight weeks prior to the CoP and in French and Spanish three weeks later. This means that the first electronic English version of the *Analyses* were produced in under 12 weeks. Hard copies were available for distribution by courier two weeks after the respective language version was available on the web. Hard copies and a CD version were sent to all Management Authorities, and a CD version alone was sent to Scientific Authorities. Distribution costs were extremely high as a courier mail service was used to ensure that the *Analyses* reached their

destination. However effective distribution of the *Analyses* is vital, so effective mechanisms must be in place to guarantee distribution.

Financing the Analyses

Clearly, the financial and staff resources necessary to adhere to such a demanding timeframe and high workload are significant (but even so, bear no relation to informal estimates of the support likely to be necessary to support the Assessment procedure advocated by the Committee on Fisheries of FAO). To ensure the smooth running of the project it is important that resources for the project, both financial and human, are secured well in advance of the proposal submission deadline. Uncertainty and delays in securing the necessary resources have resulted in unnecessary pressure in producing the *Analyses*, when staff should be concentrating on technical aspects of the project.

Funding for the *Analyses* in preparation for both the 11th CoP in 2000, and for the 12th CoP in 2002 was provided by a number of individual donors and from the CITES Trust, but almost one third of the budget was not confirmed until the project was underway in 2002. The following donors have contributed to this project France, Spain, Switzerland, Netherlands, European Commission, Japan, Saudia Arabia and the CITES Trust Fund.

Results of last evaluation - and Changes made to meet recommendations

As COP 11 was the first time that the CITES Trust Fund and a number of other donors had supported the project, an independant evaluation of the *Analyses* was undertaken, to determine whether or not the expenditure could be justified. The aims of the evaluation were to determine how effective the *Analyses* are in facilitating the CITES decision-making process; to determine the effectiveness of the design format and distribution system of *Analyses* and identify any opportunities for improvement in these areas; and to provide accountability to the project donors.

The evaluation involved distributing written questionnaires to Party delegates and also interviewing Party delegates and SSC Specialist Group members. Thirty-three interviews were completed with delegates who had received the *Analyses* prior to their arrival at the CoP. A further 43 delegates were requested to participate in an interview who, it was established, had not received a copy of the *Analyses* prior to their arrival. A written questionnaire was distributed to all heads of delegations during the COP; thirty-five were returned. In addition, interviews were also carried out with SSC staff and consultants who had worked on the preparation of the *Analyses*.

The main points that emerged from the final evaluation report were:

1. The key targets for the *Analyses* in order of priority are The Parties, CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC Network, Other interested Parties, and that the needs of the key targets were served by the *Analyses*.
2. the *Analyses* provide a very useful and important tool in assisting delegates with decision making.
3. in many cases the *Analyses* were not received by delegates until very close to the CoP or indeed at the CoP. Many believed that the *Analyses* should be available earlier and that copies should be available to more delegates.

For CoP 12, the *Analyses* were made available on the website as soon as possible in English, French and Spanish. In addition to hard copies, this year CDs were also sent to all Management and Scientific Authorities. Unfortunately as result of a very limited timeframe there is little that can be done to make the analyses available earlier.

4. the format of the analyses was clear but due to the shading was difficult to reproduce by photocopying. For CoP 12, the shading was omitted from the *Analyses* and a new tabular format was used.
5. Availability of the *Analyses* on the web was welcomed by those with internet access

Aims of Current Evaluation

The evaluation undertaken at COP 11 provided very useful feedback and recommendations to improve the process. However, there were still major challenges in raising the necessary level of support in a timely fashion to undertake the project at the level that has become expected. To determine whether IUCN and TRAFFIC should continue with this project in future and if so, to raise adequate support for the project prior to the proposal deadline it is vital to determine whether:

- there is a significant demand for the *Analyses* to contribute to the CITES decision-making process
- the *Analyses* are reaching their target audience; and
- the production and distribution process can be improved.

Methodology

Interviews were conducted with delegates who attended the Conference of the Parties in Santiago, Chile, from 3-15th November, 2002. This evaluation was based on a shortened questionnaire/interview procedure and a similar format to that used at CoP 11 was used. The questionnaire was shortened in order to reduce the time needed per interview. The evaluation involved one full time staff member (from the IUCN/SSC Wildlife Trade Programme) with assistance, where necessary from other members of the IUCN and TRAFFIC delegations. In addition, questionnaires were distributed to all Party pigeonholes at the CoP as well as to Management and Scientific Authorities upon initial distribution of the hard copies and CDs prior to the CoP (see Annex I for all three questionnaires).

Heads of Delegations, Scientific and Management Authority staff as well as delegates from other government departments were interviewed. Respondents were targeted so as to achieve as broad a continental representation as possible (see Table 1). A number of delegates had not seen the *Analyses* either before or during the CoP and so a full interview was not possible.

Table 1. The number of delegates with whom an interview was requested by geographic origin. *Includes four responses from postal/pigeonhole questionnaires

Region	Number of delegates with whom an interview was requested*	Number of Respondants* that had read/seen <i>Analyses</i> and full interview was conducted
Africa	22	11
Asia	18	13
Central and South America	14	9
Europe	25	24
North America	3	3
Oceania	3	3
	Total = 85	Total = 63

In addition, only two questionnaires distributed in pigeonholes and two distributed by mail were completed and returned. These latter two questionnaires were shorter than the interview questionnaires. Where possible and applicable the responses from these four questionnaires were added to the interview questionnaire responses. Because of this and also because of the reluctance of a few respondents to answer certain questions, the overall sample size (n) varies between questions. The percentage response results are calculated from the number of respondents that answered the particular question.

The website hits of the *Analyses* on the SSC website were also examined.

Results

The questionnaire responses produced both quantitative and qualitative data. A summary of both is presented in this section. Tables of all results can be found in Annexes 2 and 3. As mentioned in the Methodology section, it is important to note that the overall sample size (N) varies between questions and the percentages are calculated from the number of respondents that answered the particular question.

Of the 85 delegates approached for interview, 57% had received or seen a copy of the *Analyses* before the CoP (see Table 2). Comparing the numbers of respondents in a region who had seen the *Analyses* prior to Cop 12, with the numbers in the region who had not, suggests there may be some regional differences in availability of the *Analyses*. Over 80% of respondents from Europe, North America and Oceania had seen the *Analyses* prior to the CoP, whereas only 27 % of respondents from Africa had seen the *Analyses*.

Table 2 Did you receive/see a copy of the *Analyses* before the CoP?

Region	Yes	No	Don't know/Can't remember	Total
Africa	6	15	1	22
Asia	10	8	0	18
Central and South America	6	8	0	14
Europe	22	3	0	25
North America	2	1		3
Oceania	2	1		3
Total	48	36	1	85

Of those who had seen a copy of the *Analyses* either prior to or during the CoP, 57% had read the *Analyses* or the pertinent section of them, 4% were in the process of reading them and 6% had scanned them (Table 3). In addition, 100% of North American respondents, 79% of European delegates, 54% of Central and South American delegates, 45% of African delegates, 41% of Asian delegates and 33 1/3% of delegates from Oceania had read the *Analyses* or the pertinent section of them (0%, 8%, 31%, 55%, 47% and 33 1/3% respectively of delegates had not read the *Analyses*).

Table 3 How well have you read the *Analyses* to date?

Region	Not read them yet but plan to (%)	Not read them, do not plan to (%)	Scanned them (%)	In the process of reading them (%)	Read them or pertinent section of them (%)	Total
Africa	0 (0%)	12 (55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (45%)	22
Asia	2 (12%)	6 (35%)	0 (0%)	2 (12%)	7 (41%)	17
Central and South America	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	7 (54%)	13
Europe	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	19 (79%)	24
North America	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3
Oceania	1 (33 1/3%)	0 (%)	1(33 1/3%)	0(%)	1 (33 1/3%)	3
Total	5	22	5	3	47	82

Value and Utility of the *Analyses**Importance of the Analyses*

When asked how important it was that an independent review of the proposals be available to delegates, 74% of those responded felt that it was “critically important” whilst a further 20% said it was “important”. Representatives from all six regions felt that such an independent review was important. When asked why the information in the *Analyses* is important to delegates, a number (9/63) responded that many countries do not have the resources to carry out such a review themselves, and that IUCN already has the scientific and technical information to carry out such a review. Over 10% of respondents noted that the *Analyses* are important as they represent an objective view and so help to assess the proposals and provide missing information.

Impartiality, accuracy and utility of the Analyses

When asked about the partiality of the *Analyses*, 40% of respondents considered the *Analyses* to be “very impartial”, and a further 53% said they were “generally impartial”. Only 2% said they were somewhat biased and a further 5% didn’t know. When asked in what way they considered the information to be biased, two delegates noted that there was sometimes more information on the conservation needs of the species and less information provided when a species is “doing well”. One suggestion was to include two reviewers that are “pro” the proposal and two that are “contra” in order to gain the confidence of the Parties.

Regarding the accuracy of the *Analyses*, 91% of respondents found the information to be accurate, the remaining 9% said they did not know. In addition, 96% of respondents found the *Analyses* helpful in assessing the proposals against the relevant CITES criteria. In response to a question about the utility of the *Analyses*, 80% of respondents believed that the *Analyses* have an effect on the quality of CITES decision making (11% believed they didn’t have an effect and 9% didn’t know). Indeed, a number of delegates noted that the *Analyses* were used as basic reference material when formulating decisions. However, it was also noted that politics often play a stronger role in decision making than scientific and technical information. In addition, a number of respondents noted that the utility of the *Analyses* would be significantly decreased if they are not distributed until after countries have already decided their positions.

When asked if there were any major advantages/ disadvantages of IUCN and TRAFFIC being the organisation to prepare the *Analyses*, 76% of delegates believed that there were advantages to

IUCN and TRAFFIC being the organizations to prepare the *Analyses*. It was noted that IUCN is an established scientific body, that it is objective, and that it has a strong background in CITES. Several delegates noted that TRAFFIC also has a lot of conservation expertise and is an excellent source of trade data. However, several delegates also expressed concern about TRAFFIC's objectivity as a non-governmental organisation and since TRAFFIC also produce their own recommendations. Over 80% of respondents think that the *Analyses* have an effect on the quality of CITES decision-making. Indeed, 95% of delegates believe that the *Analyses* should be available at the CoP along with any other information.

However, there were suggestion to change the current content and presentation of the *Analyses*. Some delegates expressed the need for more clear cut recommendations. Another requested that the *Analyses* be made shorter, if this could be achieved without losing important content. It was also suggested by several delegates that it might be useful to give the national status and summary of national information where applicable.

Format of the *Analyses*

The vast majority of delegates found the tabular format of the *Analyses* very helpful and easy to follow. However, several difficulties were outlined and a number of improvements were suggested. One delegate suggested that a key might be useful, and another requested that an even clearer separation of information from the Supporting Statement and the Additional information sections would be useful. One delegate suggested that there is too much information on each page but acknowledged that this is a difficult issue to resolve.

Regarding possible improvements to the format, most respondents were happy with the current format. However, a couple of delegates suggested including an illustration of the species in question. Other suggestions include the need for a better explanation of format, a bigger font size and the inclusion of Resolution Conference 9.24 in the document (currently only a summary of the numerical guidelines is included). Several delegates expressed a preference for the provision of a shorter version as well as the longer one. It was also suggested that keeping the references under the individual proposal analysis would be more convenient for printing, photocopying and quick reference. Translation into Arabic was also suggested.

In September 2002, prior to CoP 12 hard copies and a CD version of the *Analyses* were sent to all Management Authorities, and a CD version was sent to Scientific Authorities. When questioned, 60% of respondents believed that enough copies of the book and CD were distributed, although 34 % thought that insufficient copies were distributed, and 6% didn't know. When asked which format was more useful, 39.5% believed both the book and CD were very useful, whilst 39.5% preferred the CD and 21% said they preferred the book.. A number of delegates commented on the usefulness of the book for delegations lacking in computer access, and also for quick access. The CD was useful for making additional copies, for printing, for wider distribution and for mobility. A number of delegates suggested that distributing the CD alone prior to the CoP could save on paper and distribution costs and that copies of the book could then be distributed at the CoP. Many commented that additional copies of both would be useful, especially as many countries have more than one Management and Scientific Authority.

Web usage

The website was used by 62% of respondents, of these, 82% had no problems accessing it, though 7 users did experience difficulties. One delegate commented on the delay in web-posting of the Spanish version of the *Analyses* in comparison, with the posting of the English version. The *Analyses* on the SSC website was viewed 1755 times in September, 1358 times in October, 465 times in November and 35 times in December. The average length of time that the page was

viewed was between 4 and 6 minutes. The *Analyses* were accessed via the link on the CITES website 397 times in October and 197 times in November.

Distribution of the Analyses

To the best of their knowledge, 54% of respondents thought that copies of the *Analyses* were distributed to the appropriate Management and Scientific Authorities. However, 52% of delegates had suggestions as to additional groups or organisations that should be sent copies of the *Analyses* (see Table 4).

Table 4. A summary of the main suggestions of groups or people that should also receive a copy of the *Analyses*

4.2a Are you aware of any other groups of people who should also receive a copy of the <i>Analyses</i> ?
A summary version should be sent to IGOs.
Extra copies to Management Authority to distribute to appropriate sections.
Ministry of the Environment
Central Management Authorities through which correspondence goes. Are 9 other relevant authorities in my country
National NGOs
Other agencies eg fisheries which have input into decisions
Customs officers, police officials and ecological inspectors
International NGOs
Weblink should be sent to parliaments and ministers
Scientists at universities, museums and othersd. Also NGOs.
Should also be sent to the minister responsible for science and any other relevant government departments
Enforcement people depending on their level of involvement
Everyone with relevance to CITES decision making
Fisheries officials
Local NGOs
Depends on the structure of government in different countries – there may be many departments covering CITES issues Foreign Ministry could receive one
Other state agencies eg Parks and Wildlife
Internet should suffice
Customs – they may not participate at CoP but they often have input
National accredited/recommended NGOs as recommended by the management authorities
Sufficient hard copies sent already
Electronic copies should be sent to NGOs, IUCN Members etc
Forest department, Fisheries department, Dept of Agriculture Also there may be more than one Magement Authority
Politicians – the head of the relevant departments involved in CITESThe top people may not actually be aware of the importance of CITES
All registered participants (Parties and obserevrs) through the Secretariat.

A number of suggestions were given by delegates when asked how the distribution could be improved or made more cost effective. Many suggested that email notification of the *Analyses* on the web should be sent to as many people as possible. It was generally believed that the Internet is the most useful tool to reach a wide target audience. In addition summary versions or CD version could be more widely distributed by mail. Another suggestion was to have a shorter version in the native languages of a wider range of countries. It was also suggested that distribution be channelled through local or regional IUCN offices to ensure that the correct people in the Management and Scientific Authorities are targeted. Alternatively a focal point in each government could be located and charged with distributing copies to the appropriate people. It was often suggested that it would be useful to have the *Analyses* as early as possible.

Other suggestions

Delegates were also asked whether they had any suggestions concerning the *Analyses* that were not covered in the interview. The main sugestions can be seen in Table 5.

Table 5. A list of delegates' comments on aspects not covered by the interview questionnaire

Are there any other comments you would like to make concerning the <i>Analyses</i> that we have not covered in the interview?
It would also be useful to have an analysis of decisions and resolutions.
Website was good – good to have individual proposals and in batches for printing.
Good to have the link from CITES website
It would be good to receive them earlier as the EU makes their positions early on but he understands the time frame involved
The <i>Analyses</i> are objective and very focused notwithstanding its volume
Could include a section on Enforcement problems.
Should try to have the best information as the information in the <i>Analyses</i> is not as accurate as it could be.
More details would be good but realise that that may not be possible
The <i>Analyses</i> are the main source of independent assessment
Keep 'em coming!
Should work with other people, eg Interpol and compare information with other organisations
Continue producing them
Would have read it had it been timely
In general, there are too many documents at the CoP
May be better to have in a small booklet(s) eg all elephants could be in one
The analyses provide good information and they used it to discuss proposals with the Minister, NGOs etc
Continue!!
Its a key role of IGOs to highlight information for Secretariat, Range states and proponents to help prepare everyone for the discussion.
In Poland, the SA is a Member of IUCN
Need to have as soon as possible, if too late, they lose a lot of value.
Tend not to use them as much – most of their utility is in the preparation of positions.
Thanks to IUCN!!
Need to distribute effectively and make sure that each delegation has a copy
Make the CD a bit more user friendly so that you can print individual proposals.
Very nice document
Continue the work!
Keep producing
Also CITES a conservation tool was very useful. All IUCN publications and documentation are very useful, helpful and well respected by more senior government figures who decide by politics as well as science
Congratulations
I am concerned that it is the case for most Parties that they receive a copy of the analyses after they normally make decisions on their position. I never received a hard copy of an English version and was unable to find one at the CoP. Should there be such a document in future
The inflexibility of the Analysis process was shown by a lack of comments on the Madagascar proposals. The main flaw of the document remains its lack of any clear conclusion. The purpose of collating the views of a number of SSC members on the proposals is unclear and of little help. An analysis of proposals can be made quicker and more cost effective by a few IUCN/TRAFFIC experts.
IUCN should be prepared to translate the scientific names and terms of reference in a proper manner from the original in English with the help of experts of the SSC
Maybe a closer link with TRAFFIC assessment, the same format in order to be able to merge information on same proposal
Well done!!

Evaluation from the Secretariat

Although the main focus of the evaluation was on the Parties use and perception of the *Analyses*, comments from the Secretariat were also received. They noted that the distribution of the *Analyses* may often be too late and that many Parties probably receive the *Analyses* after they have made their decisions. They also suggested that the views obtained from SSC are often biased and felt that an analysis of proposals could be made quicker and more cost effective by compiling the views of a few IUCN/TRAFFIC experts rather than the more extensive process that is undertaken at the moment. Although it was acknowledged that the tabular format helps evaluation of the proposals by focusing on the criteria and the content is generally correct, the overall usefulness of the document was rated as medium and it was not felt that the content was displayed in a readily accessible manner. In addition, they believed that the lack of analyses of the Madagascar proposals (which were publicly available after the completion of the *Analyses* as a document) demonstrates the inflexibility of the *Analyses* process. The Secretariat experienced difficulties accessing the electronic version of the *Analyses* on the IUCN web page. Overall, the need for the *Analyses* was questioned.

Discussion and recommendations

Limitations of the study

The fullness the COP agenda significantly limited the opportunities to interview delegates and also the time that could be spent with delegates.

Difficulties were encountered in targeting specific members of delegations. As a result, interviews were conducted with delegates from Management and Scientific Authorities as well as heads of delegation.

Although a couple of interviews were conducted in Spanish, the vast majority of the interviews were conducted in English. More detailed responses may have been received had the native language of several delegates been spoken.

Discussion

Although the overall feedback regarding the utility of and need for the *Analyses* was positive, there are a number of issues that require further thought and improvement if the project is to continue.

It was noted by many delegates that an independent review of proposals is important to delegates, and is particularly important for countries that do not have the resources themselves to carry out such an assessment. The highest percentage of people that had not received the *Analyses* prior to the CoP were from Africa, Central and South America and Asia. Many countries in these regions do not have the resources or the capacity to independently assess the proposals themselves and so it is imperative that methods to improve distribution be examined. Although courier mail was used to distribute all copies of the CD and book, the presence of more than one Management and Scientific Authority in many countries is undoubtedly a factor in the number of delegates that hadn't seen the *Analyses* prior to the CoP.

At CoP 12, the *Analyses* was only distributed as one copy per pigeonhole, rather than copies for all delegates. This may have been a significant factor in explaining why many delegates had not seen the *Analyses*.

60% of delegates said that they used the website to view the *Analyses* and analysis of website statistics indicate high viewing numbers of this page. In October, 29% of the times the page was viewed, it was accessed through the CITES website, and 42% of the time in November indicating the importance of this weblink in distributing the *Analyses*.

Maximum value and utility of the *Analyses* can only be achieved if they are perceived to be objective and scientifically accurate. This evaluation found that the *Analyses* are considered to be impartial or generally impartial, and accurate, by the majority of delegates from all regions. The credibility and positive perception of the *Analyses* indicates that it is used as an important source of scientific and technical information by a large number of delegates. In addition, the majority of delegates found the *Analyses* helpful in assessing the proposals against the relevant CITES criteria and also believed that the *Analyses* have an effect on the quality of CITES decision making. This is important as one of the key purposes of the *Analyses* is to serve as an objective and independent review of the proposals that can provide accurate scientific and technical information to the parties.

The format of the *Analyses* was generally considered to be clear and easy to follow. However, a number of delegates had suggestions of possible improvements. In particular, several delegates noted that it would be useful to have shorter summary versions available as well as the complete document. A number of delegates suggested that it might be useful to have an illustration of the species under consideration.

The majority of delegates interviewed were satisfied with the content of the *Analyses*, believed they were a very useful tool to aid decision making at CITES CoPs and were satisfied that IUCN and TRAFFIC were suitable organisations to produce such a document. Many expressed strong support of the production of the *Analyses* and 95% of respondents believe that the *Analyses* should be available at the CoP along with other information.

IUCN and TRAFFIC were generally seen as the organisations most suitable to prepare the *analyses*. However, the role of TRAFFIC may need to be further clarified to avoid confusion.

Recommendations

Recommendation: That methods to significantly improve the distribution of the *Analyses* be investigated, particularly with regard to Africa, South and Central America and Asia. This includes targeting all Management and Scientific Authorities within each country where possible.

Recommendation: That more copies of the CD version of the *Analyses* be distributed to all Management and Scientific Authorities. To minimise expense, copies of the book can be distributed more conservatively.

Recommendation: That email notification of the *Analyses* on the SSC website be sent to all Management and Scientific Authorities as well as to other government departments, to international NGOs, and to any other bodies or organisations considered appropriate.

Recommendation: That more hard copies of the *Analyses* be available at the CoP. If possible, the distribution of the *Analyses* to each Party delegate, in the official documents folder of the Secretariat should be confirmed.

Recommendation: That the *Analyses* continue to be placed on the website and that the link via the CITES website be maintained. Opportunities to link from other websites should also be identified.

Recommendation: That the reviewer/expert information system and compilation methods used in the *Analyses* be continued, and that an effort is made to ensure that information from both sides of the argument be included where scientifically accurate and appropriate.

Recommendation: That a number of changes to the format of the *Analyses* be made.

- Make the CD more user friendly so that individual analyses of proposals can be printed,
- translate the scientific names and terms of reference in a proper manner
- keep the references under the analysis in question for easier reference and printing,
- consider compiling the summary/analysis boxes of each analysis into a separate chapter/document
- consider the inclusion of a picture of the species.

Recommendation: That production of the *Analyses* be continued, with improvements where necessary in the distribution to ensure that they are of maximum use.

ANNEX I - QUESTIONNAIRES

IUCN/TRAFFIC Analyses Evaluation, 2002 - Interview Questionnaire



Interviewee Name: _____ Date _____

Title: _____ Phone: _____

Interviewer: _____

- | | |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Head of delegation | <input type="checkbox"/> Delegation Member |
| <input type="checkbox"/> MA staff | <input type="checkbox"/> SA staff |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Donor | <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |

Introduction:

As you know, IUCN and TRAFFIC produce the *Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* to assist the Parties in their deliberations at the biennial Conference of the Parties. Currently IUCN is in the process of evaluating this. As a delegate, you are a key informant in the evaluation process and we value your participation in this short interview. Thank you for having agreed to help in this way.

1. General Background Questions

	Not read them yet but plan to	Not read them, do not plan to	Scanned them	In the process of reading them	Read them or pertinent section of them
--	-------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------	--------------------------------	--

1.1 How well have you read the <i>Analyses</i> to date?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------

Comments on reading plans _____

1.2 Did you receive/see a copy of the *Analyses* before the CoP?

- Yes No

2. Valuing and Utility of Analyses

	Critically Important	Important	Not particularly important	Not important at all
2.1 How important do you believe it is that an independent review of the proposals be made available to delegates to the COPs?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.2

2.3 Why is the information in the *Analyses* important/*not important* to delegates?

	Very impartial	Generally impartial	Somewhat biased	Very biased
2.4 How impartial do you consider the information contained in the <i>Analyses</i> to be?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2.5

2.3a In what way do consider the information to be biased? _____

2.6 Did you find the content of the *Analyses* to be accurate?

Yes No

2.7 Did you find the *Analyses* helpful in assessing the proposals against the relevant CITES criteria?

Yes No

2.8 Do you see any major advantages/disadvantages of IUCN and TRAFFIC being the organizations to prepare the *Analyses*?

Yes No

2.9 Do you think that the *Analyses* have an effect on the quality of CITES decision making?

Yes No

2.10 Is it important/not important the IUCN *Analyses* be available at the CoP as well as any other information ?

Yes No

2.11 Do you have any other comments on the type and quality of the information contained in the *Analyses*? _____

3. Format of the Analyses

3.1 How helpful was the tabular format in helping you access the key decision making information that you needed? Was it easy to follow the layout and assess the proposals?

3.2 What improvements would you like to see made to the way in which the information is presented in the *Analyses*?

3.3 Do you think enough copies of the book and CD were distributed?

Yes No

Which format do you think is more useful ? _____

3.4 Did you use the web version of the *Analyses*?

Yes No

3.5 Could you access it easily?

Yes No

PIGEONHOLE QUESTIONNAIRE

EVALUATION OF IUCN AND TRAFFIC ANALYSES OF PROPOSALS



As you know, IUCN and TRAFFIC produce the *Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices* to assist the Parties in their deliberations at the biennial Conference of the Parties (COP). The *Analyses* are circulated as an Inf Doc. Currently IUCN is evaluating this activity. As a delegate to the COP, **your opinion on the *Analyses* provides important information for this evaluation so that we can make improvements in the future. Please take 5 minutes to respond to the questions below.**

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

Please return all completed questionnaires as soon as possible to the registration desk, or to IUCN staff or the IUCN office in El Centro de Extension.

5. Background information

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

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Head of Delegation | <input type="checkbox"/> Party Delegate |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Management Authority | <input type="checkbox"/> Scientific Authority |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | |

5.2

1.2 Country that you represent _____

1.3 Did you have access to the Analyses before the CoP?

Yes No

1.4 Could you access the Analyses on the Internet?

Yes No

6. Value of the IUCN/TRAFFIC Analyses

	<i>Critically Important</i>	<i>Important</i>	<i>Not particularly important</i>	<i>Not important at all</i>
6.1 Rate the importance of making an independent review of the proposals available to COP delegates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>		
6.2 Is your Party able to review all proposals without outside assistance?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

	<i>Very impartial</i>	<i>Generally impartial</i>	<i>Somewhat biased</i>	<i>Very biased</i>
6.3 Rate the degree of impartiality of the <i>Analyses</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6.4	<i>Excellent</i>	<i>Good</i>	<i>Acceptable</i>	<i>Needs Improving</i>
6.5 Rate the overall quality of the <i>Analyses</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7. Presentation of the Analyses

	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>
7.1			
7.2 Please rate how helpful the tabular format was in helping you access key information	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.3	<i>Very helpful</i>	<i>Helpful</i>	<i>Not very helpful</i>
7.4 Please rate how helpful the <i>Analyses</i> were in assessing the proposals against the relevant CITES criteria	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

Thank you for your cooperation

ANNEX II

The comments and suggestions received by Party delegates and the Secretariat. Pertinent points or those mentioned in the report are highlighted in bold.

ID	Country	2.2 Why is the Information in the Analyses important/Not important to delegates?
1	UK	It provides independant information and many countries don't have the resources to review the proposals separately themselves
3	Norway	It lists in an easy and accessible way the main pro and contra arguments
4	Mauritius	Decisions are influenced by IUCN, analyses provides scientific informtation, and IUCN is used as a very good guideline.
5	Philippines	It provides techical background and is objective. It is very useful especially the 'additional information' for informed decision making
8	South africa	The Analyses provide information/ideas about issues which delegates may be uncertain about.
13	Denmark	IUCN has a good knowledge of issues, especially useful for smaller countries.
15	Slovenia	Some countries dont have specialists for all taxa therefore the analyses makes it easier.
16	Netherlands	Independant data – proposal may not be Quality of information
17	Bangaldesh	.2 Important to have an independant review but difficult to achieve independance
18	Dominican Republic	Is important to have as many points of view or sources of information as possible
20	New Zealand	Is technically complementary to proposal supporting statements
21	Italy	Helps to formulate decisions
24	Bahamas	People don't have information on many of the subjects being considered
25	Kenya	Because we need to have peer reviewed information
26	Ghana	Helps to focus and make judgements
27	Zimbabwe	IUCN is a scientific organisation with a good reputation in management and conservation and is objective eg African Elephant Specialist Group
28	Israel	.3 Important only if sent in time and before decisions are taken
29	Guatemala	Helps give a good basis to understand the arguments
30	USA	Many countries look to such information
31	Comoros	Represent an independant position
32	Iran	The IUCN is considered a neutral body Most parties haven't time or may not be aware of appropriate methods Analyses combine data of species.
35	Argentina	Provides an informed view of he Analyses
39	Uganda	They provide other information besides the Secretariats recommendations and are useful if rational and use technical information based on science
42	Botswana	Gives good background information and helps clarify what to expect
43	China	Use SSN recommendations in the belief that they are SSC recommendations
46	Bulgaria	The CoP 11 Analyses were used more
48	Peru	It supports other document
50	Thailand	For further decisions to be made accordingly
54	Bolivia	Are important as they compile information from opposing sides
56	Fiji	For small delegations with no/little resources, its ery important
57	Iceland	It is important because of systemised and standardised analysis of the proposals and provides good overview of the major issues concerning the proposals
58	Germany	IUCN has specialists and expertise that are not available in many countries, so the analyses are an important vehicle
59	Malta	Facilitate and highlight the important pints. Are objective

60	Slovenia	They give you the main information and they are independent
82	Estonia	Are not able to review all proposals without outside assistance
83	Mexico	Although the information presented is critically important, Mexico is able to review all proposals without outside assistance
86	Canada	Additional scientific information may be missing from proposals

ID	Country	2.3a In what way do you consider the information to be biased?
2	Chile	The information is mostly impartial but not 100%
3	Norway	Some of the reviews are biased by not including relevant information on favour of "non conservation"
4	Mauritius	Not biased
11	Indonesia	Depends on the reviewer
18	Dominican Republic	Some analyses are biased, some impartial , but he did not give specific examples.
21	Italy	.4 Is about 90% impartial but you can read between the lines that there is a position
25	Kenya	Are some contradictions eg in 1997 the elephants weren't reported upon.
42	Botswana	Re: review of elephants, the Kenyan proposal wasn't properly done
55	Switzerland	Difficult to measure as there is so much information
84	Tom de Meulender	Depends on the SSC membership. The summaries and Analysis sections (which could be merged) are useful and balanced
86	Canada	Information tend to show that species is endangered and little information is provided when a species is "doing well" even in some areas or populations

ID	Country	2.4 Did you find the content of the Analyses to be accurate?
25	Kenya	Need to refine the information gathering process
29	Guatemala	.5 Information may vary throughout range states as quality of science varies
41	Belgium	Difficult to assess
44	Costa Rica	Yes referring to proposal 16 on <i>A. auropalliata</i>
52	Venezuela	Don't know as need to be a specialist to know that

ID	Country	2.5 Did you find the Analyses helpful in assessing proposals against the relevant CITES criteria?
5	Philippines	Analyses used to create positions.
25	Kenya	Provided background information but not all information was included
41	Belgium	Yes but in EU procedure have to take position very early, therefore many positions adopted by the end of July, therefore need the analyses asap
45	Namibia	.6 Would like more concrete recommendations
86	Canada	Somewhat helpful

ID	Country	2.6a Do you see any major advantages/disadvantages of IUCN and TRAFFIC being the organisations to prepare the Analyses?
1	UK	Yes, these organisations are the most independent.
6	Republic of Korea	Mostly advantages
7	Russian Federation	IUCN is advantageous as it is an established scientific body
8	South Africa	IUCN more so, as having IUCN offices in countries means they have more influence
11	Indonesia	Are no disadvantages
14	Ireland	IUCN are demonstrably objective
16	Netherlands	IUCN on its own

17	Bangladesh	.7 Is advantageous to have IUCN doing them, not so much TRAFFIC
18	Dominican Republic	Not specific advantages as such but IUCN/TRAFFIC should do these analyses.
19	EU	Advantages - Independance of both organisations. TRAFFIC is an excellent source of trade data.
21	Italy	IUCN as an intergovernmental org is very good to do these. TRAFFIC as an NGO its less clear
22	Cameroon	IUCN are advantageous. Who are TRAFFIC?
24	Bahamas	Theses organisations are more impartial than others
25	Kenya	Advantages of IUCN– its a good idea to get the Specialists Groups involved
27	Zimbabwe	IUCN has credibility
28	Israel	Advantages to IUCN producing them but don't know if TRAFFIC should be involved as they have a specific mandate
31	Comoros	Yes as IUCN's position on governance is very interesting and good
32	Iran	They are neutral bodies
33	Australia	Advantageous
35	Argentina	IUCN has a good knowledge – they have the scientific, technical and CITES background also
36	Saudi Arabia	IUCN yes TRAFFIC perception in region is negative and hence there is some unease about TRAFFIC's involvement
37	France	Advantages – good to have information from IUCN and TRAFFIC as well as from other sources
39	Uganda	IUCN as an IGO has its own provisions and mechanisms, has an insight into CITES and has regional representation. They also have a technical focus
40	Poland	IUCN, yes, but TRAFFIC is more like Greepeace!
41	Belgium	The Analyses and the TRAFFIC recommendations are considered to be the best documents.
44	Costa Rica	Confused by the fact that the Analyses and the TRAFFIC recommendations are both authored by TRAFFIC. Analyses differ fundamentally hence the role of TRAFFIC is unclear
48	Peru	Doesn't want to comment
50	Thailand	Yes as MA has not sufficient time to do it
51	Viet Nam	Don't know but the idea of the Analyses is good. Would prefer guidelines but also look at other reviews
52	Venezuela	Yes, as good bodies to monitor trade and issues
53	Sri Lanka	Both are independant and have experience with countries and issues
54	Bolivia	IUCN and TRAFFIC have a lot of conservation expertise. Opinion of IUCN and TRAFFIC in CITES, in political decisions etc is that they are trustworthy
56	Fiji	IUCN is a well known organisation and has a reputation and more clout than NGOs. Hence IUCN is the best organisation.
58	Germany	Yes, are unbiase which is very important. Many NGOs are biased. These organisations are fair representation
60	Slovenia	They have a strong background in CITES
86	Canada	Its a good source of reliable information but it is good to have also other analyses from other sources

ID	Country	2.7a Do you think that the Analyses have an effect on the quality of CITES decision making?
2	Chile	It sometimes has an effect but not always
3	Norway	In particular for countries where there is little infrastructure/administrative staff dealing with CITES regularly
8	South Africa	In some cases
11	Indonesia	It does influence decision making and is used as a reference document.

14	Ireland	Does have influence but in a convention with trade focus EU coordination may overrule Ireland's own position
17	Bangladesh	.8 The analyses certainly helps decision making
18	Dominican Republic	Sometimes
19	EU	No, as people still go their own way
20	New Zealand	It improves the quality significantly
21	Italy	Don't know
24	Bahamas	Yes as many people may not otherwise have sufficient information Secretariats recommendations may also have influence
25	Kenya	Provides information but not enough. Need to have extra information eg from MIKE
26	Ghana	No, because people look at it on a political level not necessarily only from a technical level.
27	Zimbabwe	For some less politicised species
28	Israel	Yes but they came with their decisions already made, months before.
31	Comoros	Yes in sovereign states. Analyses are considered independent and objective which is often the position of many countries anyway.
32	Iran	They provide information and policy people should use them
35	Argentina	Depends on the type of decision and interest
36	Saudi Arabia	Don't know
38	Finland	Yes as they are one of the basic reading documents
39	Uganda	Yes, have seen since 1994 that the Analyses have been taken into account
41	Belgium	Hope so. But in EU procedure have to take position very early, therefore many positions adopted by the end of July, therefore need the analyses asap.
42	Botswana	Not directly but they help delegates review proposals and assess
49	Malaysia	Yes but also have regional groups with their own opinions
52	Venezuela	Don't know but they are probably helpful in taking decisions
53	Sri Lanka	Don't know
54	Bolivia	Maybe not on the decisions themselves but certainly on the proposal assessment. Politics comes in to the decisions
57	Iceland	It improves the quality of the work and preparation of delegations/Parties for the meeting and decision making
86	Canada	Probably

ID	Country	2.8a Is it important/not important that the IUCN Analyses be available at the CoP as well as any other information?
17	Bangladesh	Important to have them as early as possible and at the CoP
18	Dominican Republic	Should strive to have more accurate and impartial information available at the CoP
19	EU	Yes its important but by the time of the CoP its very political
32	Iran	Yes and before
59	Malta	Especially for delegates that come to the CoP for the first time
86	Canada	Or rather before the CoP

ID	Country	2.9 Do you have any other comments on the type and quality of the information contained in the Analyses?
4	Mauritius	More brief if possible though that would involve losing content.
10	Madagascar	It would be useful if the problems of individual countries were understood.
15	Slovenia	The Analyses are better and more neutral than TRAFFIC's recommendations
16	Netherlands	Could it be more concise without omitting important information?
18	Dominican Republic	Overall is good but in some cases information is not accurate and could be improved or updated.
20	New Zealand	Would be good to get an electronic copy as well
21	Italy	Put in a picture of the species in question

28	Israel	Distributed too late
29	Guatemala	Simplifies information in proposal which is useful for non-range states
31	Comoros	They represent information from developing countries
43	China	IUCN has a big influence
50	Thailand	Its good enough already
51	Viet Nam	Would prefer guidelines but also look at other reviews
59	Malta	They're excellent – facilitate coming to conclusions
60	Slovenia	Well prepared, conclusion are helpful to understand the proposals. Background is important to go back to the history of the proposal Gives other information that they might not know
84	Tom de Meulender	No need to insert comments by individuals. A synthesis of information and new facts and figures is all that is required with a conclusion as to whether to reject or accept the proposal

ID	Country	3.1 How helpful was the tabular format in helping you to access the key decision making information that you needed? Was it easy to follow the layout and assess the proposals?
1	UK	.9 Layout was fine
2	Chile	Layout was good.
3	Norway	Very helpful, and yes it was easy follow.
4	Mauritus	Format was good
5	Philippines	Format was useful
6	Republic of Korea	Format was good
8	South Africa	Was fine
10	Madagascar	Format is fine
11	Indonesia	Format is fine
13	Denmark	Could be confusing. It wasn't always clear whether the SS was from the proposal or part of the Analyses.
14	Ireland	Format is fine
16	Netherlands	Very good
17	Bangladesh	Were well presented
19	EU	Fine
20	New Zealand	.10 Not always easy, perhaps needed a key
21	Italy	Good
24	Bahamas	Makes it easy to follow
25	Kenya	Good
27	Zimbabwe	Tabular format is the best way of presenting it
29	Guatemala	Presentation is fine. The Supporting Statement v additional info layout is good.
30	USA	Fine
31	Comoros	Good
32	Iran	Useful
33	Australia	Fine
34	Portugal	Helpful
35	Argentina	Fine
36	Saudi Arabia	Fine
37	France	Fine
38	Finland	Fine, easy to follow

39	Uganda	Fine, provided a quick guide and complements the official documents
40	Poland	Fine – easy to understand and use
41	Belgium	Clear
42	Botswana	Good
44	Costa Rica	Very helpful
45	Namibia	Good
46	Bulgaria	The landscape format of the CoP11 analyses was easier to follow and check things
47	Singapore	Fine
48	Peru	Difficult to understand
49	Malaysia	Fine
50	Thailand	Very helpful, yes it is easy to follow the layout and assess the proposal
52	Venezuela	Fine and easy to manage. Good font size
54	Bolivia	Good but maybe a brief point of view is neccessary – an actual recommendation
55	Switzerland	Sometimes there is too much information on one page – this is difficult to resolve but could be improved
57	Iceland	The tabular format and whole layout of the Analyses are very helpful and easy to work with
58	Germany	helpful
59	Malta	Easy to follow
60	Slovenia	Prefer to have a summary table in addition
82	Estonia	The tabular format was very helpful
83	Mexico	The tabular format was very helpful
84	Tom de Meulender	It was not displayed in a readily accessible manner No need for this too long document
86	Canada	Would prefer even more clear separation of information supporting a proposal versus information showing weaknesses of a proposal

ID	Country	3.2 What improvements would you like to see made in the way in which the information is presented in the Analyses?
3	Norway	The best improvement would be if both the “in favour” and “against” Parties trust the review. More confidence can possibly be achieved if you always include two “pro” and two “contra” experts in your panel of external reviewers (as you did in CoP 12 prop4)
4	Mauritius	None, happy already
5	Philippines	.11 None
12	Rep of Moldova	It would be nice to illustrate a bit
14	Ireland	The Analyses are quite big although understand its necessary
15	Slovenia	Shorter version as well as the longer version should be available. More bullet points etc
16	Netherlands	None
17	Bangladesh	None
19	EU	Difficult to read on the computer
20	New Zealand	A better explanation of format
21	Italy	Bigger font size
24	Bahamas	Put Res Conf 9.24 in
25	Kenya	Improve upon data collection, get information reviewed, Presentation is fine
27	Zimbabwe	None
28	Israel	.12 For some species, give national status and summary of national information .13 Also useful to expand on IUCN category
30	USA	None
31	Comoros	Maybe provide more information

32	Iran	None
36	Saudi Arabia	.14 Translate into Arabic
37	France	None
38	Finland	None
43	China	Good to have as a solid book Good to have different colours
44	Costa Rica	Would rather have references under each proposal – makes it more quickly accessible and is easier to photocopy
45	Namibia	A paragraph on assessment or recommendation
53	Sri Lanka	Good to mention the status of species in a regional context eg conservation in Asia is totally different to conservation in Africa. Good to have regional analysis
57	Iceland	No suggestions
58	Germany	Are good now
59	Malta	Good as they are now
60	Slovenia	Large document – a brief summary at the end of the proposal if it meets the criteria or not.

ID	Country	3.3a Do you think the book or the CD is more useful?
1	UK	Both
4	Mauritius	More copies useful to distribute to different sections.
5	Philippines	Two copies should be sent to each of the management and scientific authorities
6	Republic of Korea	.15 CD was very useful and book was sent to Environment Ministry
8	South Africa	Many people on the delegation, would have been good to have more copies.
9	Czech Republic	Both have different purposes and are thus both useful.
13	Denmark	Book was more useful – he hadn't used the CD but it is useful to carry around or to give to others.
14	Ireland	Hadn't seen CD
15	Slovenia	Both as CD is smaller but book is necessary for those without computer access.
18	Dominican Republic	Should send an extra copy to the Scientific Authority
24	Bahamas	Could have more of both
25	Kenya	Book as may not have facilities for CD
28	Israel	Each have different purposes but generally would prefer a CD
29	Guatemala	Book is better – easy to lose the CD!
30	USA	CD saves expense Book more useful if have no internet access
31	Comoros	Both. Regarding the book, have too many documents already and most delegates won't be able to take with them from home country. CD would be better from this point of view but many people may not have computer access.
32	Iran	Both. CD for printing and hard copy if no computer Only received one copy in SA and none in MA
33	Australia	book
34	Portugal	book
36	Saudi Arabia	It would be good to send more CDs – he copied CDs for other delegation members.
37	France	Book
38	Finland	Book but didn't receive either
39	Uganda	Both. CDs are copiable and so delegations can make as many copies as they need
41	Belgium	Book, can photocopy if need extra copies
42	Botswana	Both, though didn't receive either
43	China	Books are good for meetings, and CD for before
44	Costa Rica	CD in order to save on paper especially for distribution prior to the CoP. Hard copied should then be provided at the CoP
45	Namibia	Book, but others on delegation prefer a CD

48	Peru	CD, but not enough copies sent out
49	Malaysia	Book but CD is more useful for multiple copies eg in Malaysia have 7 management authorities
50	Thailand	Both
52	Venezuela	Both. Printed matter is more useful as it can be easily accessed but CDs are better for wider distribution
54	Bolivia	Both but need more copies. Did send copies to relevant organisations but it would be great for them to have books also
55	Switzerland	Book but CD is fine too
56	Fiji	CD
58	Germany	Used the web version
59	Malta	book
60	Slovenia	Both are important but the paper version must pdf to allow to select proposals
86	Canada	CD/web with a document (easier for further editing) and PDF for easy printing

ID	Country	3.4 Did you use the web version of the <i>Analyses</i> ?
4	Mauritus	.16 No, as did not know about them
6	Republic of Korea	.17 Accessed through the CITES website
28	Israel	Had problems with the website
35	Argentina	Spanish version was too late
86	Canada	No because I had the CD before

ID	Country	4.1 To the best of your knowledge are copies of the <i>Analyses</i> distributed to the appropriate Scientific and Management Authorities in Member countries?
2	Chile	In Chile there are 3 authorities who should receive a copy, but only one copy was received.
11	Indonesia	Scientific authority didnt receive it in Indonesia
18	Dominican Republic	Scientific Authority didn't receive it in Dom Rep
38	Finland	Didn't receive any copies
42	Botswana	Didnt receive any copies
47	Singapore	Don't know
48	Peru	Not enough copies sent out
54	Bolivia	Don't know but need more copies to be sent out
55	Switzerland	Don't know

ID	Country	4.2a Are you aware of any other groups of people who should also receive a copy of the <i>Analyses</i> ?
1	UK	A summary version should be sent to IGOs.
2	Chile	Conaf, the Minister responsible, scientific authority, more copies needed.
4	Mauritus	Extra copies to Management Authority to distribute to appropriate sections.
6	Republic of Korea	Ministry of the Environment
8	South Africa	Central management authorities through which correspondance goes. Are 9 other relevant authorities in S. Africa
9	Czech Republic	.18 National NGOs
10	Madagascar	Everyone at the CoP should receive a copy
11	Indonesia	.19 Other agencies eg fisheries which have input into decisions
12	Rep of Moldova	Customs officers, police officials and ecological inspectors

13	Denmark	International NGOs
14	Ireland	Weblink should be sent to parliaments and ministers
15	Slovenia	Scientists at universities, museums and othersd. Also NGOs. Should also be sent to the minister responsible for science and any other relevant government departments
16	Netherlands	.20 Enforcement people depending on their level of involvement
17	Bangaldesh	Everyone with relevance to CITES decision making
18	Dominican Republic	Also send to local NGOs
19	EU	Fisheries officials
27	Zimbabwe	Local NGOs
30	USA	No, should be sufficient to advertise on the web
32	Iran	Depends on the structure of government in different countries – there may be many departments covering CITES issues Foreign Ministry could receive one
33	Australia	.21 Should notify people about website Related NGOs and othe rorganisations should receive copies though the web version should suffice Other state agencies eg Parks and Wildlife
34	Portugal	Internet should suffice
38	Finland	National NGOs although Finnish NGOs already seemed to have copies
39	Uganda	Customs – they may not participate at CoP but they often have input National accredited/recommended NGOs as recommended by the management authorities
44	Costa Rica	Sufficient hard copies sent already Electronic copies should be sent to NGOs, IUCN Members etc
45	Namibia	.22 Management authorities should inform other departments about the Analyses
48	Peru	Other scientific authorities of the country Overall needs a wider distribution
49	Malaysia	All other management authorities .23 Should advertise web availability
50	Thailand	Thailand has 3 Mas: Royal Forest department Fisheries department Dept of Agriculture
52	Venezuela	No as its easy to find on the internet
55	Switzerland	Politicians – the head of the relevant departments involved in CITESThe top people may not actually be aware of the importance of CITES
56	Fiji	Check addresses are correct
58	Germany	Web is important so that all can access
85	Spain	Everbody who wants it
86	Canada	All registered participants (Parties and obserevrs) through the Secretariat.

ID	Country	4.3 In what way could the distribution of the <i>Analyses</i> be improved or made more cost effective?
1	UK	A summary version should be sent to as many people as possible.
2	Chile	By sending more CDs and advertising the Internet.
3	Norway	.24 By email (as current) and by CD
7	Russian Federation	Russian Federation has two scientific authorities, so if copies are sent to management authorities they can be distributed accordingly
9	Czech Republic	Send either a notification or the analyses themselves via email

11	Indonesia	.25 As early as possible. In Indonesia they received three weeks before the CoP
13	Denmark	Advertise the internet site more widely
14	Ireland	Internet is the best vehicle
15	Slovenia	.26 Keep on going!!
16	Netherlands	Advertise – put internet links on other websites
17	Bangladesh	Are IUCN offices all over the world – could send to the country representative who could distribute to the right person.
18	Dominican Republic	Send more, ensure goes to SA and MA
20	New Zealand	.27 Increase online and disk versions and reduce paper copies
21	Italy	.28 Concentrate more on countries with no access to internet Do a visual presentation – pre Cop workshop
22	Cameroon	Important to receive the Analyses at the CoP
24	Bahamas	Would be useful to email it also
25	Kenya	More copies and in advance
27	Zimbabwe	Could have a database of all experts and organisations of particular subject which would help in the production of Analyses
28	Israel	.29 As early as possible, when still in the decision making process
29	Guatemala	Send to the head of administration who will then send to the relevant MA and SA. For example in Guatemala the administration section is constant whereas the MA and SA may change.
30	USA	Make more use of web and CDs.
31	Comoros	Its good already. All relevant bodies in the Comoros received.
32	Iran	Use CDs and website more
34	Portugal	Distribution seems fine
36	Saudi Arabia	Send out more CDs
38	Finland	Should be able to reach targets ie get a copy to Mas and Sas. In Finland the administration is small and therefore should have been able to get copies to them.
39	Uganda	If proponent countries don't consult range states, IUCN should address this issue in the analyses if the proposals don't reflect all range states views.
42	Botswana	Send CDs Raise awareness of internet site
43	China	Take into meetings and give a copy to each delegation Needs to be easy to browse and select whichever proposals you want.
44	Costa Rica	Is 12 people in scientific authority – it might be worth asking how many copies are needed in order to distribute effectively
45	Namibia	Had already checked the internet before received hard copy Send CD before the CoP and distribute the hard copy at the CoP
47	Singapore	Need to get it in time
48	Peru	.30 Have a shorter version in native language to advertise on the radio – a short notice
52	Venezuela	Check that you have a correct list of addresses Promote the internet site more
53	Sri Lanka	Could channel through the local IUCN office– relevant bodies would definitely receive it then
54	Bolivia	Find focal point in every country and send 2 copies of document to one address and instructions to send to relevant agencies
55	Switzerland	CD is more cost effective but countries may not have proper computer access
58	Germany	Hard to say
59	Malta	One copy before the CoP is enough. Not repeat in CoP

60	Slovenia	By posting CD versions – its also OK as it was done this year
----	----------	---

ID	Country	Are there any other comments you would like to make concerning the <i>Analyses</i> that we have not covered in the interview?
2	Chile	It would also be useful to have an analysis of decisions and resolutions.
13	Denmark	Website was good – good to have individual proposals and in batches for printing. Good to have the link from CITES website It would be good to receive them earlier as the EU makes their positions early on but he understands the time frame involved
14	Ireland	Objectivity and very focused not withstanding its volume
16	Netherlands	Could include a section on Enforcement problems. Investigate how many people access the website and where they found out about it
18	Dominican Republic	Try to have the best information as it is not as accurate as it could be.
19	EU	More details would be good but realise that that may not be possible
20 24	New Zealand Bahamas	Main source of independant assessment .31 Keep ‘em coming!
25	Kenya	Should work with other people, eg Interpol and compare information with other organisations Should get feedback on information in analyses
27	Zimbabwe	Continue producing them
28	Israel	Would have read it had it been timely
31	Comoros	In general, there are too many documents at the CoP
32	Iran	 .32 May be better to have in a small booklet(s) eg all elephants could be in one
37	France	The analyses provide good information and they used it to discuss proposals with the Minister, NGOs etc
38	Finland	Continue!!
39	Uganda	Its a key role of IGOs to highlight information for Secretariat, Range states and proponents to help prepare everyone for the discussion.
40	Poland	In Poland, the SA is a Member of IUCN
41	Belgium	Need to have as soon as possible, if too late, they loose a lot of value. Tend not to use them as much – most of their utility is in the preparation of positions.
42	Botswana	 .33 Thanks to IUCN!!
43	China	Need to distribute effectively and make sure that each delegation has a copy
44	Costa Rica	Make the CD a bit more user friendly so that you can print individual proposals.
52	Venezuela	Very nice document
55 56	Switzerland Fiji	Continue the work! Keep producing Also CITES a conservation tool was very useful. All IUCN publications and documentation are very useful, helpful and well respected by more senior government figures who decide by politics as well as science
60	Slovenia	Congratulations
84	Tom de Meulender	I am concerned that it is the case for most Parties that they receive a copy of the analyses after they normally make decisions on their position. I never received a hard copy of an English version and was unable to find one at the CoP. Should there bne such a document in future The inflexibility of the Analysis process was shown by a lack of comments on the Madagascar proposals. The main flaw of the document remains its lack of any clear conclusion. The pupose of collating the views of a number of SSC members on the proposals is unclear and of little help. An analysis of proposals can be made quicker and more cost effective by a few IUCN/TRAFFIC experts.
85	Spain	IUCN should be prepared to translate the scientific names and terms of reference in a proper manner from the original in English with the help of experts of the SSC

86	Canada	Maybe a closer link with TRAFFIC assessment, the same format in order to be able to merge information on same proposal Well done!!
----	--------	---

ANNEX III

Summary of the tabular data for the IUCN/TRAFFIC Analyses Evaluation.

Region	Number of Respondants *	Number of Respondants* that had read/seen Analyses and full interview was conducted
Africa	22	11
Asia	18	13
Central and South America	14	9
Europe	25	24
North America	3	3
Oceania	3	3
	Total = 85	Total = 63

* Includes four responses from postal/pigeonhole questionnaires

Region	Head of delegation	Delegation Member	MA staff	SA staff	Other	Total
Africa	3	1	4	5	1	14
Asia	5	2	6	2	0	15
Central and South America	1	2	4	5	0	12
Europe	5	4	6	9	0	24
North America	1	0	0	2	0	3
Oceania	1	0	0	2	0	3
Total	16	9	20	25	1	71

1. General Background Questions

1.1 How well have you read the *Analyses* to date?

Region	Not read them yet but plan to (%)	Not read them, do not plan to (%)	Scanned them (%)	In the process of reading them (%)	Read them or pertinent section of them (%)	Total
Africa	0 (0%)	12 (55%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	10 (45%)	22
Asia	2 (12%)	6 (35%)	0 (0%)	2 (12%)	7 (41%)	17
Central and South America	1 (8%)	3 (23%)	2 (15%)	0 (0%)	7 (54%)	13
Europe	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	19 (79%)	24
North America	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (100%)	3
Oceania	1 (33 1/3%)	0 (%)	1 (33 1/3%)	0 (%)	1 (33 1/3%)	3
Total	5	22	5	3	47	82

1.2 Did you receive/see a copy of the *Analyses* before the CoP?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know/Can't remember (%)	Total
Africa	6	15	1	22
Asia	10	8	0	18
Central and South America	6	8	0	14
Europe	22	3	0	25
North America	2	1		3
Oceania	2	1		3
Total	48 (57%)	36 (42%)	1 (1%)	85

2. Valuing and Utility of Analyses

2.1 How important do you believe it is that an independent review of the proposals be made available to delegates to the COPs?

Region	Critically Important (%)	Important (%)	Not particularly important (%)	Not important at all (%)	Total
Africa	6	3	2	2	13
Asia	9	4	0	0	13
Central and South America	7	2	0	0	9
Europe	19	4	0	0	23
North America	3	0	0	0	3
Oceania	3	0	0	0	3
Total	47 (74%)	13 (20%)	2 (3%)	2 (3%)	64

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

Region	Very impartial (%)	Generally impartial (%)	Somewhat biased (%)	Very biased (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	4	6	0	0	1	11
Asia	4	4			1	9
Central and South America	3	6	0	0	0	9
Europe	11	11	1	0	0	23
North America	0	3	0	0	0	3
Oceania	1	0	0	0	1	2
Total	23 (40%)	30 (53%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	57

2.4 Did you find the content of the *Analyses* to be accurate?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	9	0	2	11
Asia	8	0	1	9
Central and South America	8	0	1	9
Europe	23	0	0	23
North America	3	0	0	3
Oceania	1		1	2
Total	52 (91%)	0 (0%)	5 (9%)	57

2.1 2.5 Did you find the *Analyses* helpful in assessing the proposals against the relevant CITES criteria?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	8	2	0	10
Asia	9	0	0	9
Central and South America	9	0	0	9
Europe	22	0	0	22
North America	2	0	0	2
Oceania	3	0	0	3
Total	53 (96%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)	55

2.2 2.6 Do you see any major advantages/disadvantages of IUCN and TRAFFIC being the organizations to prepare the *Analyses*?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	9	0	0	9
Asia	10	2	1	13
Central and South America	7	0	7	14
Europe	19	3	0	22
North America	1	1	0	2
Oceania	2	1	0	3
Total	48 (76%)	7 (11%)	8 (13%)	63

2.3 2.7 Do you think that the *Analyses* have an effect on the quality of CITES decision making?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	5	3	1	9
Asia	9	0	2	11
Central and South America	8	1	0	9
Europe	18	2	2	22
North America	2	0	0	2
Oceania	3	0	0	3
Total	45 (80%)	6 (11%)	5 (9%)	56

2.4 2.8 Is it important/not important the IUCN *Analyses* be available at the CoP as well as any other information ?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	10	0	1	11
Asia	11	2	0	13
Central and South America	9	0	0	9
Europe	22	0	0	22
North America	2	0	0	2
Oceania	3	0	0	3
Total	57 (95%)	2 (3%)	1 (2%)	60

3. *Format of the Analyses*

3.1 3.3 Do you think enough copies of the book and CD were distributed?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	5	3	1	9
Asia	6	5	0	11
Central and South America	2	7	0	9
Europe	16	2	2	20
North America	2	0	0	2
Oceania	1	1	0	2
Total	32 (60%)	18 (34%)	3 (6%)	53

3.3a Which format do you think is more useful ?

Region	Book (%)	CD (%)	Both (%)	Total
Africa	4	0	3	7
Asia	2	3	5	10
Central and South America	2	2	4	8
Europe	1	12	5	18
North America	0	1	1	2
Oceania	1	1	1	3
Total	10 (21%)	19 (39.5%)	19 (39.5%)	48

3.2 3.4 Did you use the web version of the *Analyses*?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	5	5	0	10
Asia	7	6	0	13
Central and South America	5	3	0	8
Europe	17	6	0	23
North America	1	2	0	3
Oceania	1	2	0	3
Total	36 (60%)	24 (40%)	0 (0%)	60

3.3 3.5 Could you access it easily?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	4	2	0	6
Asia	4	3	0	7
Central and South America	5	0	0	5
Europe	15	2	0	17
North America	2	0	0	2
Oceania	1	0	0	1
Total	31 (82%)	7 (18%)	0 (0%)	38

4. Distribution of the Analyses

4.1 4.1 To the best of your knowledge, are copies of the *Analyses* distributed to the appropriate Scientific and Management Authorities in member countries?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	5	1	3	9
Asia	5	6	1	12
Central and South America	3	3	2	8
Europe	13	2	5	20
North America	1	0	1	2
Oceania	1	0	0	1
Total	28 (54%)	12 (23%)	12 (23%)	52

4.2 4.2 Are you aware of any other groups of people who should also receive a copy of the *Analyses*?

Region	Yes (%)	No (%)	Don't know (%)	Total
Africa	6	4	0	10
Asia	6	5	0	11
Central and South America	4	5	0	9
Europe	11	10	0	21
North America	1	1	0	2
Oceania	1	2	0	3
Total	29 (52%)	27 (48%)	0 (0%)	56