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Opening remarks & introductions

John E. Scanlon, AO
Session 1

Maria Ivanova
UNEP and MEAs - past, present, and future

Amy Fraenkel
From Stockholm to the present – the relevance of the Convention on Migratory Species to today's global challenges

Martha Rojas Urrego
Contributions of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands to achieve global environmental commitments

Carolina Caceres
Special comments: A perspective from a State Party
Session 2

Daniel Kachelriess
How marine issues can be embedded in MEA’s - CITES, a case study

Patrick Tiefenbacher
Country-level pooled funds as a tool for programmatic coherence and their relevance for MEAs

Hossein Fadaei
MEAs and the UN system
How marine issues can be incorporated into MEAs - CITES, a case study
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Daniel Kachelriess, Sea Shepherd Legal
CITES in a nutshell

- CITES regulates international trade (incl. *Introduction from the Sea*) for species listed on its Appendices by putting in place a system of permits and certificates. Appendix I = threatened species. Appendix II = species that require regulation in order for them not to become threatened.

- Many of these permits and certificates (e.g. export permit & IFS) require a:
  - Non Detriment Finding (NDF); and
  - Legal Acquisition Finding (LAF) or the equivalent process under IFS

- CITES Parties are required to report annually on international trade in species listed on the Appendices

- The Convention requires its Parties to implement its provisions through domestic legislation

- CITES decision making: Voting
• Decisions to add species to the CITES Appendices are taken by the CoPs.
• Listing proposals to add “commercially exploited marine species” were controversial in particular, with opponents arguing that CITES has no role in fisheries management.
• But drafters of CITES clearly had marine species in mind as evident by the inclusion of e.g.: “Introduction from the Sea” (Art I c, e), special consultation procedure for listing of marine species (Art XV 2 b) and not prejudging UNCLOS (Art XIV 6).
Article XIV, paragraph 6 of the Convention states:

Making IFS work in practice: While IFS was a trade transaction regulated under the Convention since 1973, it was not operationalized until CITES CoP16 (2013, Bangkok)

Resolution Conf. 14.6 (Rev.CoP16) operationalizes the provisions and foresees three scenarios:
CITES at Its Best: CoP16 as a ‘Watershed Moment’ for the World’s Wildlife

John E. Scanlon

The sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP16) has been hailed as a ‘watershed moment’ for the Convention, with key decisions being taken on capacity-building, enforcement, financing and synergies. Significant decisions were also taken to bring many new species of precious fauna and flora, including commercially valuable timber and marine species, under the Convention. CITES parties demonstrated unprecedented levels of international cooperation to combat increased levels and types of wildlife crime, especially with regard to the poaching of African elephants for their ivory and rhinos for their horn. The great success of CoP16 reflects the increasing relevance of a four-decades-old convention to the conservation and sustainable use of wildlife.

CoP16 also saw unprecedented levels of international cooperation to combat increased levels and types of wildlife crime, and parties heeded the call from the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (or ‘Rio+20’) to recognize the important role of CITES as an international agreement standing at the intersection between trade, the environment and development.²

SHARKS AND MANTA RAYS

The meeting reached a climax on its final day after a request in the closing plenary, to reopen the debate on four shark species, failed to obtain the required support from one-third of the parties. With this and other actions, CITES parties confirmed decisions taken
FIGURE 4.2
The number of marine species listed in CITES over time, with the key listing events and number of species listed by taxonomic group detailed

- Source: Pavitt et al., 2021, CITES and the Sea

Volume of trade by species, where reported in kg
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Advancing Implementation:
“Socialising” CITES in fisheries

Implementing the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) through national fisheries legal frameworks: a study and a guide
Successes
• Dedicated funding for implementation support and capacity building helps!
• Identify challenges and deliver needs-driven capacity building.
• Partnerships are key (!)

Challenges
• Balancing reach (regional approach) vs precision (national level) – (Partnerships are key!)
• Overcoming “old” enmities and bridging different cultures between fisheries & environment
• National level coordination
• Introduction from the Sea
• It takes time...
General recommendations

• Consider marine context & species when drafting laws & regulations (see e.g. Draft UNTOC Protocol on Wildlife Crime)

• Aim for complementarity (see e.g. FAO Port State Measures Agreement)

• (Create incentives to) Overcome silos (see e.g. CITES capacity building projects)

• Build partnerships (!)
Country-level Pooled Funds

A tool for programmatic coherence and their relevance for MEAs

Patrick Tiefenbacher, Global Goals Consulting
What are country-level pooled funds?

• Multi-partner arrangements with several donors and UN entities.
• Flexible mechanism centered on a shared theory of change
• Started in 2002: Joint UN/WB Afghanistan Reconstruction Trust Fund
• Currently: ~40 funds under UN RC leadership
• Complemented by global and regional multi-donor trust funds

Goal: Access, combine & sequence funds for shared results; Reduce fragmentation and duplication; Increase accountability, transparency & predictability
Relevance for MEAs

• UN Secretary-General’s reform agenda: **target of 15%** in pooled funds
• Currently $3 billion/year or 9%
• Trend is going up (pre-2022)
• Influence country-level programming
• Direct link to country-level implementation
Relevance for MEAs
Recommendations & final thoughts

John Scanlon
Legacy Webinars
Thank you, and please register to join our upcoming events!

Webinar 7: **Science & the Environment** *(date TBC)*
&
‘The Peoples’ Environment Narrative’
An Online Stakeholder Consultation in the run-up to Stockholm+50

**May 18 2022:** 5 PM–9PM EAT • 4 PM–8 PM CET • 10AM–2PM EDT