

Your Voice In Europe: ROADMAP feedback for Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking

User's data:

- Domain: Non governmental organisation
- Name: Shruti Suresh
- Email: shrutisuresh@eia-international.org
- Country: United Kingdom
- Organisation: Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA)
- Headquarter: select
- Register: 03960197927-62
- Size: select
- Publication: can be published with your personal information

Related document: Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking

Feedback:

EIA welcomes the decision by the European Commission to develop a cross departmental EU Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking and the opportunity to submit comments on a European Commission Roadmap towards the adoption of such an action plan. EIA has submitted detailed comments (enclosed) on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking in April 2014 which describes our key concerns and recommendations and we request the Commission to take into consideration those detailed comments in developing an Action Plan. Therefore this brief response (enclosed) focuses on our recommendations on the options and other issues outlined in the Roadmap. In brief, EIA supports a combination of Option 2 and Option 3 with the objective that the non-legislative actions outlined in Option 2 are implemented expeditiously and that the legislative proposals outlined in Option 3 are developed simultaneously but this should not be allowed to delay the actions in Option 2. Thank you for your consideration of our comments.



Comments submitted by the Environmental Investigation Agency, UK (EIA): European Commission Roadmap Towards an Action Plan Against Wildlife Trafficking

November 13, 2015

EIA welcomes the decision by the European Commission to develop a cross departmental EU Action Plan against Wildlife Trafficking and the opportunity to submit comments on a European Commission Roadmap towards the adoption of such an action plan. EIA has submitted detailed comments (enclosed) on the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking in April 2014 which describes our key concerns and recommendations for EU action to combat wildlife trafficking and we request the Commission to take into consideration those detailed comments in developing an Action Plan. Therefore this brief response focuses on our recommendations on the options and other issues outlined in the Roadmap.

EIA submits the following comments for consideration under the EU consultation on the Roadmap:

Issue: Describe the reasons behind the initiative. What is the issue/problem(s) it is expected to tackle? Describe the size of the problem and its main drivers

EIA recommends that the role of organized criminal networks, lack of institutional investment in intelligence-led enforcement across relevant government departments in source, transit and destination countries, and corruption along the trade chain, should be acknowledged in this section as factors that enable wildlife trafficking.

Option mapping:

In brief, EIA supports a combination of Option 2 and Option 3 with the objective that the non-legislative actions outlined in Option 2 are implemented expeditiously and that the legislative proposals outlined in Option 3 are developed simultaneously but this should not be allowed to delay the actions in Option 2.

Option 1: EIA does not consider Option 1 as sufficiently comprehensive to effectively tackle wildlife trafficking.

Option 2: Unlike Option 1, EIA recognizes that Option 2 would not be limited to the enforcement aspect alone but will also contain a set of actions seeking to address the root causes of wildlife trafficking and prevent its continuation. EIA favours Option 2 as this includes a Communication from the Commission to the Council and the European Parliament with the objective of gaining endorsement of the Action Plan by the Council to ensure high-level political commitment from Member States' governments keeping in mind three priorities: (a) preventing wildlife trafficking, (b) strengthening enforcement and (c) building a global partnership against wildlife trafficking. As described in our April 2014 comments, EIA reiterates that under "preventing wildlife trafficking", where appropriate for certain species such as tigers and other Asian big cats, elephants and rhinos, the EU should support actions to reduce *all* demand for parts and products derived from these species and support a

precautionary policy that prohibits commercial trade in parts and products derived from these species, including domestic trade.

EIA notes that the impact of Option 2 is limited because it does not include any new legislative proposals. EIA suggests that all EU Member States should be encouraged to implement the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC) Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit, the results and recommendations of which could inform the implementation of Option 3 which does include legislative proposals.

Option 3: EIA believes that Option 3 provides the most comprehensive set of deliverables including legislative proposals. This Option would seek to address major shortcomings and gaps with the EU legislative framework and in some Member States. For example, the levels of criminal sanctions applicable to wildlife trafficking vary significantly within the EU and in some Member States maximum sanction levels are less than one year's imprisonment. EIA also recommends that at the EU and Member States levels there should be a ban on all commercial trade in ivory and parts and derivatives obtained from captive bred Asian big cats.

However, while important, the legislative proposals contained within Option 3 should not be allowed to delay the development and implementation of the non-legislative aspects detailed in Option 2.

Timelines:

The Roadmap should clearly indicate how and when further public consultation with all stakeholders on the EU Action Plan will take place.

Funding:

There is an urgent need for effective, sustainable and substantive financing mechanisms to be established to reduce wildlife crime in partner countries. The EU should use various financing mechanisms to ensure greater protection of wildlife in Africa based on the findings of the EU Wildlife Conservation Strategy for Africa. In addition, EIA urges the Commission to ensure that the protection of wildlife in Asia is also treated as a priority by the EU and that a similar conservation strategy for wildlife in Asia be developed with appropriate financing made available by the EU for protecting Asian wildlife and tackling organised crime and corruption associated with wildlife crime in Asia. EIA also recommends that greater resources are made available to support civil society actions to address poaching, trafficking, crime and corruption across Africa and Asia to support activities for improving legislation and strengthening good governance and the criminal justice response to wildlife crime.

Enclosed: Environmental Investigation Agency – Response to EC Communication to the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking – COM (2014) 64 final (April 8, 2014)



Environmental Investigation Agency – Response to EC Communication to the EU Approach against Wildlife Trafficking – COM (2014) 64 final

April 8, 2014

The Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) is a UK-based international non-government organization committed to investigating and exposing environmental crime and campaigning for more effective enforcement. EIA's current scope of work includes documenting illegal logging in SE Asia and timber trafficking to China, Viet Nam and the EU, and illegal trade in ivory, tigers and other Asian big cats. EIA investigations and analysis have illustrated the role of organized criminal networks, and reveal how a lack of institutional investment in intelligence-led enforcement across government departments in source, transit and destination countries has enabled wildlife criminals to persist in their activities.

EIA submits the following responses for consideration under the EU stakeholder consultation on combating wildlife trafficking. Comments are based on ten questions listed under the conclusion section of the EC document COM (2014) 64 final:

1. Is the policy and legislative framework currently in place in the EU against wildlife trafficking adequate?

Regarding terminology, the Communication defines wildlife trafficking as “illegal cross-border trade in wild fauna and flora. EIA's comments on this and the other nine questions relate to illegal trade in fauna and flora listed under the UN Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). EIA believes that illegal trade in timber is already adequately addressed through the FLEGT Action Plan, and specifically the EU Timber Regulation.

EU Council Regulation 338/97 provides the legal basis for implementation of the CITES across the EU Member States. A welcome facet of the Regulation is that it provides the EU Member States with a framework that has stricter import controls than CITES. The Committee (of CITES Management Authorities) and Scientific Review Group provide mechanisms to suspend imports of specimens from exporting countries with inadequate non-detriment findings.

In relation to penalties for wildlife crime, the EU Communication notes that the levels of criminal sanctions applicable to wildlife trafficking vary significantly within the EU and that in some Member States maximum sanction levels are less than one year's imprisonment. EIA recommends a review of EU laws and policy on applicable penalties for wildlife crime taking

into account the minimum sanction of four years identified by the UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) in its definition of “serious organized crime.”

Further, EU environmental policy is founded on the precautionary principle and provides the Member States with grounds and opportunity to take action beyond CITES, to better protect species threatened by illegal trade. A recent notable example is the Guidance issued to Member States on the export, re-export and intra-EU trade in rhino horn. Parallel legal trade for wildlife can provide a cover for illegal wildlife trade, undermine enforcement, send a confusing message to consumers and negate demand reduction campaigns. This is demonstrated with the examples of the ivory trade and captive bred tigers:

Ivory trade:

EIA recommends that the EU clarify and announce its current position on commercial trade in ivory both at the international and EU levels. **In this regard, EIA urges the EU to adopt a moratorium on all commercial trade in ivory within the EU and imports and exports into and from the EU.**

At the international level, **EIA recommends that the EU support a complete ban on international commercial trade in ivory and reject any proposals for down-listing elephant populations and trade in ivory under CITES. In particular, EIA recommends that the process to develop a Decision Making Mechanism for a process of trade in ivory (DMM) (CITES Decision 14.77) be suspended and then deleted in its entirety at the next CITES Conference of the Parties, on the grounds that the rising levels of poaching have significantly altered the situation applicable when the Decision was originally adopted as a compromise in 2007.**

There is compelling justification for unequivocal support by the EU for an ivory trade moratorium within the EU and at the international level, including:

- the escalating elephant poaching crisis in all sub-regions across Africa,
- the decline of forest elephants in Africa by 62% between 2002–2011,¹
- demand for ivory has been widely recognized as a key factor driving the illegal killing of elephants;
- the role of organized crime in the ivory trade, and
- the fact that the two CITES authorized auctions of ivory that took place in 1999 and 2008 have not stopped the escalation of the current elephant poaching and ivory trade levels and have instead facilitated the laundering of illegal ivory as “legal” and created a perception that it is acceptable to purchase ivory thereby stimulating demand for ivory, particularly in China.

Further, the scope for abuse of legal trade in ivory has also been flagged by expert UN bodies such as the UN Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) which states: “*The trade in illicit ivory*

¹ Fiona Maisels *et al.* (2013), *Devastating Decline of Forest Elephants in Central Africa*, PLoS ONE 8(3):e59469.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0059469,<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0059469>.

is only lucrative because there is a parallel licit supply, and ivory can be sold and used openly.”²

Moreover, such an announcement from the EU in support of prohibiting ivory trade would also **likely prevent speculation** amongst traders as well as proposals for ivory trade and down-listing under CITES in the future. Investigations by EIA have found that criminals dealing in ivory are not ignorant about CITES discussions and negotiations.³ Over the course of several ivory trade investigations, ivory traders in China have provided EIA unique insights into the tenacious illegal ivory trade, including about the exploitation of loopholes in the legal ivory trade system and their awareness of CITES negotiations and decisions. Illegal ivory traders anticipate how CITES will impact their business. In 1999, Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe were permitted through CITES to sell ivory to Japan; in 2000, when engaged by EIA, illegal traders in China referenced that sale, stating: *“We have been longing for this opportunity”*. One illegal trader described the anticipated impact on his business by the CITES down-listing of African elephant populations: *“Since the last few years, the African ivories have been flooding everywhere like a disaster ... its protection has been downgraded from category one to two. In this trend, the relaxation will get more and more ... If the ‘relaxation’ continues, the ivory market, especially for craft items like what we have, will bloom vastly. It is almost impossible that our products will be stagnated in market.”*⁴ The EU must take into account how those engaged in the legal and illegal trade react to international decisions, particularly when issues are kept on the table such as the discussion on DMM.

In sum, EIA recommends that the EU unequivocally and publicly announce its full support for a continued ban on international commercial trade in elephant ivory and adopt prohibitions on commercial trade in ivory within the EU.

Captive tiger trade:

In light of the highly endangered status of tigers in the wild, Parties to CITES decided that any trade in tiger parts and products poses a serious threat to the survival of the species. CITES Resolution Conf. 12.5 (Rev. CoP16) and Decision 14.69 recommend that Parties prohibit all international and domestic commercial trade in all parts and products from wild and captive tigers. Decision 14.69 was adopted by consensus, with Parties, including the EU bloc, voting specifically in favour of stressing that “trade” prohibitions in this context apply not only to international trade but also to domestic trade in parts and products of captive tigers.⁵

Contrary to CITES requirements, international and domestic trade in parts and products of captive tigers is ongoing, particularly in China, Laos, Thailand and Vietnam. Further, EIA has documented the commercial legal trade of skins sourced from captive tigers in China.⁶

² UNODC (2010), *The Globalization of Crime: A Transnational Organized Crime Threat Assessment* at 278, <http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/data-and-analysis/tocta-2010.html>.

³ EIA (2013), *The Inside Story*, <http://www.eia-international.org/the-inside-story>.

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ CITES CoP14 Com. II Rep. 14 (2007), <http://www.cites.org/sites/default/files/eng/cop/14/rep/E14-Com-II-Rep-14.pdf>.

⁶ EIA (February 2013), *Hidden in Plain Sight: China’s Clandestine Tiger Trade*, <http://eia-international.org/hidden-in-plain-sight-chinas-clandestine-tiger-trade>; EIA (June 2013), *Briefing on the Manufacture of Tiger Bone Wine in China*, <http://eia-international.org/briefing-on-the-manufacture-of-tiger-bone-wine-in-china>.

EIA is concerned that information from the CITES Trade Database as well as from CITES Management Authorities in the EU and China shows that there continue to be exports from the EU of live tigers as well as tiger skins and carcasses to China and other countries. In light of the illegal trade in captive tiger parts and products, including China's non-compliance with CITES Resolution Conf. 12.5 and Decision 14.69, EIA recommends that the EU adopt a policy prohibiting all exports of tigers and other Asian big cats to China and other countries reported to be implicated in the illegal trade in captive tigers and other Asian big cats.

Further EIA recommends that the EU call for (a) the adoption and implementation of new laws in China that prohibit all trade in parts and products from captive tigers; and (b) the closure of commercial tiger breeding facilities and ending commercial trade in captive tigers and their parts and products across China and SE Asia.

Thus in accordance with the precautionary principle, exports of live as well as parts and specimens from captive bred tigers from EU facilities should be prohibited, and specimens of captive bred animals should be consolidated and destroyed along with confiscated specimens. This would set a positive policy example in the implementation of the CITES Resolution and associated Decisions on tigers and other Asian big cats.

2. Should the EU enhance its approach to wildlife trafficking by developing a new EU Action Plan, as called for by the European Parliament?

EIA supports the EU Parliament call for an EU Action Plan to facilitate a coordinated and consistent approach across Member States. EIA would recommend coordination with relevant EU Committees and institutions seeking to strengthen the EU response to organized crime, corruption and money laundering. Common and overlapping objectives might include:

- to strengthen the collection and analysis of data on organised crime;
- to strengthen partnerships between the criminal justice system and civil society;
- to review and improve the application of penalties at national level;
- to review the application of proceeds of crime acts, organised crime acts, anti-corruption acts against organised wildlife crime;
- to strengthen the investigation of organised crime;
- to strengthen Europol and Eurojust;
- to trace, freeze, seize and confiscate the proceeds of crime;
- to strengthen cooperation between law enforcement and judicial authorities nationally and within the EU;
- to strengthen cooperation with other international organisations, e.g. the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC);
- to increase financial aid to build national level enforcement in source, transit and destination countries; and

- to adopt a set of indicators of proactive (and thus more effective) enforcement actions / outputs.

3. How could the EU increase political commitment at all levels against wildlife trafficking? What diplomatic tools would be best suited to ensure coherence between different international initiatives?

EIA recommends that the EU encourage its Member States to support law enforcement liaison and the sharing of technical best practice at the invitation of other countries, for example, by dispatching wildlife crime enforcement officers to the countries concerned.

Further, EIA recommends that the EU encourage increased political will to combat wildlife crime through embassies, high commissions and UN permanent missions of the EU and its Member States. This could include for example:

- the posting of personnel with law enforcement backgrounds to engage with Ministers responsible for police, customs and other law enforcement agencies in-country, arrange round-tables for enforcement officials including INTERPOL NCBs and other members of ICCWC and identify areas for technical and financial support accordingly, and encourage use of the ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit; and
- instructing missions to the UN that participate in meetings of the UN Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice (UNCCPCJ), UNTOC and the United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) to pursue the implementation of relevant resolutions and provisions that would enhance enforcement against wildlife crime.

Through coordination between DG ENVI and DG HOME, the EU could convene a meeting of Member State police and customs commissioners to garner support from the national level decision-makers responsible for setting law enforcement priorities and actions. The EU should take steps to ensure that organized wildlife crime enforcement and anti-corruption are on the agendas of bilateral summits, or free trade agreement negotiations, with key strategic partner countries and regional blocks such as: India, China, Viet Nam, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Tanzania, Mozambique, South Africa, ASEAN, SAARC, G7 and G20.

In addition, in providing funding and bilateral aid to and in trade negotiations with countries implicated in wildlife crime, EIA recommends that such funding be made conditional to significant conditions such as the application of the ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit and addressing the challenges identified through the process.

4. What tools at international level should the EU focus on to enhance enforcement against wildlife trafficking and strengthen governance?

The ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit provides a practical tool for countries to analyse legislative, enforcement, judicial, information management and crime prevention needs to combat wildlife crime. The Toolkit enables a review of gaps and obstacles in infrastructure, capacity, training and jurisdiction required to address the entire criminal chain, from protection and anti-poaching through intelligence gathering and investigation, to prosecution and recovery of proceeds of crime.

EIA recommends that the EU support key source, transit and destination countries in using the Toolkit by providing financial support for law enforcement experts to assist countries with the analysis, and to develop time-bound national action plans to overcome those gaps and obstacles. The EU and other donors can then assist in implementing those action plans. The EU should promote use of the Toolkit, including among Member States.

The Senior Expert Group of ICCWC has launched a process to develop a set of enforcement indicators. EIA would recommend that the EU, in negotiations with ICCWC, and with CITES, should encourage in the first instance, the development of a set of indicators that will enable assessment of whether proactive (and thus more effective) enforcement measures are being applied by countries. For example, the indicators will facilitate “evidence-checks” on whether the following actions are taking place:

- proactive, covert, intelligence-led operations that build up a profile of wildlife criminals, and their local, national and international associations;
- the right kind of intelligence being generated to enable the mapping of associations within such networks, e.g., personal identifiable information, information derived from telephones and business transactions, vehicle records and travel histories;
- multi-agency and transnational collation, analysis and sharing of intelligence through swift and secure means;
- the development of national and transnational operations on the basis of intelligence;
- the use of controlled deliveries as an evidence-gathering tool to effectively disrupt criminal networks;
- the recovery of assets from wildlife crime through the use of proceeds of crime legislation; and
- increase in detection and prosecution rates.

CITES continues to be the primary international tool with the capacity to strengthen enforcement against wildlife trafficking through its compliance procedures and the Parties’ ability to apply trade suspensions. However, there is a lack of law enforcement expertise present among participating Parties at CITES Conferences of the Parties and meetings of the Standing Committee.

The EU should ensure that Member States appoint a law enforcement professional to their delegations who is actively engaged in CITES decision-making processes. The EU could also lead in calling for regular and targeted meetings of the CITES Enforcement Expert Working Group and / or consider the need for a CITES Enforcement Committee.

The UNCCPCJ, UNTOC and UNCAC are also international tools that can be used to strengthen wildlife crime enforcement and governance and the EU can ensure that wildlife crime is featured on the agendas of these bodies. The EU can host side events at future meetings of these bodies and call for the implementation of existing provisions and resolutions under those bodies. For example, EIA recommends that at the 2015 UN Crime Congress, the EU address the issue of wildlife crime and the urgent need for action to combat such crime.

5. What tools are most suitable for EU action to address international and EU demand for illegal wildlife products? What role could civil society and the private sector play in this regard?

In order to effectively address demand, EIA recommends that the EU support a complete ban on commercial international and domestic trade in products derived from elephants, rhinos, tigers and other Asian big cats (including from captive bred sources). Demand reduction campaigns will be more effective where governments implement national legislation and policies to support the elimination of demand. As described above in our comments under Q.1, some species remain at great risk from illegal trade because of parallel domestic markets e.g. ivory and skins of captive bred tigers.

The EU can play a key role through CITES by insisting on more effective implementation of Resolutions, Decisions and action plans to eliminate domestic markets. For example, under CITES Resolution Conf. 12.5 (Rev CoP 16), relevant CITES Parties should have provided information on the status and purpose of stockpiles of tiger parts and derivatives, measures to consolidate and destroy those stockpiles, and actions taken to close down tiger farms. Most have failed to do so.

Additionally, under the EU Development Cooperation Instruments, such as the Environment and Sustainable Management of Natural Resources thematic programme, the EU could make funding available for NGO consumer outreach campaigns developed with guidance from consumer behavior experts.

6. How can the EU best add value to address the peace and security implications of wildlife trafficking?

The EU can support improved collation, analysis and sharing of intelligence on the individuals and organisations that are engaged in wildlife crime that is undermining socio-economic stability, financing terror and fuelling conflict.

This could be achieved by encouraging members of Europol, INTERPOL and the World Customs Organisation (WCO) to include wildlife crime as a core priority of their organisations work, securing resources and expertise at the national and international level dedicated to wildlife crime.

The EU could also advocate for wildlife crime specifically (as opposed to general environmental crime), to be considered a “predicate offence” under the Financial Action Task Force anti-money laundering provisions.

The UN Security Council has set a precedent in recognizing the role of wildlife poaching and trafficking in financing the proliferation of arms and part financing armed groups under two recent resolutions.⁷ In light of this, EIA would recommend that the EU take a leadership role in reflecting the severity of situation with a call for the closure of all domestic markets for

⁷ UN Security Council (Jan. 28, 2014), Resolution 2134 (2014), [http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2134\(2014\)](http://www.un.org/en/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/2134(2014)); UN Security Council (Jan. 30, 2014), Resolution 2134 (2014), http://www.securitycouncilreport.org/atf/cf/%7B65BFCF9B-6D27-4E9C-8CD3-CF6E4FF96FF9%7D/s_res_2136.pdf.

ivory. Further, the EU should also consider calling for similar Security Council actions in other areas where wildlife crime threatens national and international security.

7. How could the EU cooperation instruments better support the reinforcement of the capacities of developing countries for wildlife conservation and action against wildlife trafficking?

EIA recommends that the EU utilise cooperation instruments to:

- implement the ICCWC Wildlife and Forest Crime Analytic Toolkit,
- encourage implementation of CITES, UNTOC and UNCAC,
- garner support for indicators of proactive enforcement,
- support countries in their activities to centralise, inventory and destroy stockpiles of wildlife parts and products such as of ivory and tiger bones and skins, and
- provide specialist outreach and training to support capacities of developing countries, particularly priority source, transit and destination countries, with emphasis on investigative and enforcement cooperation capacity.

8. What measures could be taken to improve data on wildlife crime in the EU so as to ensure that policy-making can be more effectively targeted?

EIA recommends that the EU and its Member States collect, analyse and share information not just on seizures of wildlife contraband but other indicators of effective criminal justice response and proactive enforcement related to wildlife crime. The EU can strengthen the capacity of Europol to prepare an EU Crime Report on wildlife crime. Europol should also be enabled to sustain its analysis of organized wildlife crime, beyond the recent environmental crime threat assessment,⁸ and broaden the scope of research to look at the role of Asia as a source region, as well as a destination. Europol should have the capacity to proactively collate and analyse information from Member States, ICCWC, regional Wildlife Enforcement Networks, such as ASEAN-WEN, SAWEN and other sources. This will not only assist with law enforcement within the EU, but can also help inform law enforcement in key non-EU source, transit and destination countries.

The EU can strengthen the capacity of Eurojust to undertake a review of implementation of national legislation and the application of penalties for wildlife crime in Member States. With strengthened capacity Europol and Eurojust could liaise with ICCWC partners to prepare some case studies of best practice in disrupting transnational wildlife crime networks.

By adopting indicators of proactive enforcement within the EU, and supporting Europol and Eurojust to collate information to assess progress against those indicators, the EU could pave the way in setting global enforcement standards.

⁸https://www.europol.europa.eu/sites/default/files/publications/4aenvironmental_crime_threatassessment_2013_-_public_version.pdf

9. What measures could be taken to strengthen enforcement against wildlife trafficking by environmental authorities, police, customs and prosecution services in the Member States and to reinforce cooperation between those authorities? How could awareness of the judiciary be raised?

EIA would echo the recommendations of ICCWC partners, especially CITES and INTERPOL, who have repeatedly advocated the establishment of multi-agency enforcement units or task forces at the national level. Seconding officers from different agencies to an operational unit is a more effective way of collating, analyzing and sharing information on wildlife crime. It will enhance capacity to undertake more specialist investigations on wildlife crime, overcome obstacles such as inter-agency rivalry and mistrust, minimise corruption and improve communication with intergovernmental bodies such as INTERPOL and WCO.

Incorporating wildlife crime into the curriculum of police and customs academies, as well as in the training for the judiciary and prosecutors in Member States would help raise awareness. A number of organisations are currently engaged in national and regional programmes to raise awareness among the judiciary of the serious nature of wildlife crime. The EU could convene a meeting of those intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to map out a coordinated way forward.

Specifically EIA recommends that the EU encourage its Member States to:

- implement the ICCWC Toolkit;
- support and implement indicators of criminal justice effectiveness including proactive enforcement;
- ensure that national steering committees on wildlife crime have an EU focal point and include representation from prosecution services and judiciary; and
- participate in international operations on wanted criminals such as Interpol Operation Infra-Red.

10. How could existing tools against organised crime at EU and Member States level be better used to address wildlife trafficking? What additional measures should be envisaged, e.g. regarding sanctions? What contribution could Europol and Eurojust make in that regard?

The UN Economic and Social Council recently adopted a resolution based on the recommendations by the UNCCPCJ requesting the UNODC to “undertake case studies that focus on organized crime networks involved in the illicit trafficking of specific protected species of wild fauna and flora, their parts and derivatives.”⁹ EIA recommends that the EU support countries to engage the UNODC and in cooperation with other competent intergovernmental organisations (such as CITES, WCO, INTERPOL, World Bank and

⁹ UN Economic and Social Council (Oct 2013), 2013/40, Crime prevention and criminal justice responses to illicit trafficking in protected species of wild fauna and flora (resolution adopted on 25 July 2013 on the recommendation of the UNCCPCJ (E/2013/30 and Corr.1)), http://www.unodc.org/documents/commissions/ECOSOC-Res-2010-20/ECOSOC-Res-Dec-2013/E_RES_2013_40.pdf.

UNEP), and relevant NGOs, undertake such case studies that focus on organised crime networks involved in illicit trafficking of specific wild flora and fauna.

Further, EIA recommends that cooperation and information and intelligence sharing between Europol and other international bodies dealing with wildlife crime, such as INTERPOL, be strengthened. This could include appointing a designated officer in Europol for liaising with INTERPOL on wildlife crime.

Ensuring that wildlife crime is on the portfolio of Member State agencies responsible for serious and organized crime, and anti-corruption is a first step to integrating the response to wildlife crime with the response to other forms of organized crime. Member State focal points on the Special Committee on Organised Crime, Corruption and Money Laundering¹⁰ should be approached to facilitate this.



Environmental Investigation Agency (UK)

62-63 Upper Street

London, N1 0NY

T: +44 (0)207 3547960

E: ukinfo@eia-international.org

<http://www.eia-international.org/>

¹⁰ <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/committees/en/crim/home.html>