



International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

SECOND GLOBAL MEETING OF THE WILDLIFE ENFORCEMENT NETWORKS



MEETING REPORT





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

Background

The Second Global Meeting of the Wildlife Enforcement Networks (WENs) was organized on 28 and 29 September 2016 at the Sandton Convention Center in Johannesburg, South Africa, alongside the 17th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES CoP17).

The meeting followed the 'First Global Meeting of Wildlife Enforcement Networks' hosted in Bangkok, Thailand, in 2013 and was convened by the International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)¹ to promote the sharing of information on best practices and lessons learned about the establishment and functioning of WENs, further strengthen networks, promote their operational effectiveness, and enhance cooperation and interaction amongst them. In addition, the meeting considered the feasibility of developing best practice guidelines for the establishment and strengthening of WENs, as well as for the development of targeted operational activities at the regional or global level.

The event was organized with generous funding support from the Department of State of the United States of America.

Participants

The meeting brought together representatives from existing WENs, including those recently established and those still under consideration, as well as other relevant networks, wildlife law enforcement officers, international organizations and other relevant partners from around the world. Participants included representatives from the following networks and regional enforcement bodies:

- Asset Recovery Inter-Agency Network South Africa (ARINSA)
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations Wildlife Enforcement Network (ASEAN-WEN)
- Caribbean Wildlife Enforcement Network (CaribWEN)
- Central African Forests Commission (COMIFAC) on behalf of Central Africa WEN
- Central America WEN (Red de Observancia y Aplicación de la Normativa Silvestre para Centroamérica y República Dominicana (ROAVIS))
- China National Inter-agencies CITES Enforcement Coordination Group (NICECG)

¹ ICCWC is a collaborative effort by the CITES Secretariat, INTERPOL, the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the World Bank and the World Customs Organization (WCO) to strengthen criminal justice systems and provide coordinated support at national, regional and international level to combat wildlife and forest crime. For more details, see <https://cites.org/eng/prog/iccwc.php>





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

- European Union Enforcement Working Group
- EUROPOL
- Horn of Africa WEN (HA-WEN)
- Indian Ocean Forum on Maritime Crime (IOFMC)
- INTERPOL Regional Bureaus of Nairobi and Harare
- Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF)
- North America Wildlife Enforcement Group (NAWEG)
- SADC Rhino and Elephant Security Group
- South America Wildlife Enforcement Network (SudWEN)
- South Asia Wildlife Enforcement Network (SA-WEN)
- Southern African Wildlife Enforcement Network (WEN-SA)
- World Customs Organization (WCO) Regional Intelligence Liaison Offices of Asia-Pacific (RILO AP) and Eastern and Southern Africa (RILO ESA)

Representatives from AFRIPOL, ASEANAPOL, the CITES Experts Group for West Asia, the European Network of Prosecutors for the Environment (ENPE) and EUROJUST were invited to participate in the meeting but were not able to attend.

Interested countries, international-, intergovernmental- and nongovernmental organizations were also invited to attend as observers. A total of 103 participants attended the event. A list of participants is included in Annex I.

Opening session

Welcome remarks were provided on behalf of ICCWC by John E. Scanlon, CITES Secretary-General. The meeting was opened by Ambassador Judith Garber, Acting Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America. During the opening session, the need for greater communication between WEN's, greater understanding of the way WEN's operate and work, and to enhance collaboration within and across networks was stressed.

Objectives of the meeting

The meeting was convened to strategically explore different types of networks that exist to combat wildlife crime and effective ways of supporting and enhancing collective law enforcement efforts at the regional and global level. The meeting focused on best practices and challenges and explored different types of networks and structures, and how to improve and strengthen them taking into account the different comparative advantages of the various types of networks. This was done through the lens of





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

established networks, but also based on experiences from networks currently under development and taking into account different approaches. The meeting also benefited from lessons learned from an NGO perspective, based on the experiences of a number of NGOs through their work supporting networks.

The meeting discussed how to improve regional cooperation and ensure regional cohesiveness by exploring the interaction between networks and regional and global law enforcement bodies, and how to create opportunities for enhanced communication and cooperation. The role of networks in promoting the use of existing tools and services, and in the mobilization of efforts to support the implementation of obligations and commitments under international agreements, was also considered.

To enable networks to expand upon these issues, three working groups were organized to consider among others: the feasibility of developing best practice guidelines on strengthening WENs, and for the establishment of new WENs; exploring solutions to enhance communication and cooperation between and within networks and opportunities to promote use of existing tools and services through networks, and; the development of targeted operational activities at the regional or global level. The sections below provide a detailed summary of the discussions held throughout the meeting.

Network information sheets, agenda and meeting materials

Participants were requested to complete a questionnaire with details on their respective networks before the meeting. Questionnaires received were developed into a network information sheet based on the information received and provided to participants as background documents during the meeting.

The information sheets as well as all other relevant materials, including the meeting agenda and all presentations delivered during the meeting are available on:

https://cites.org/eng/prog/iccwc.php/Action/report_second_global_meeting_WENs

Session 1: Cooperation and coordination to combat illegal wildlife trade

The session was moderated by the World Bank. Presentations were delivered by representatives from UNODC and the University of New England, Australia.

An introduction to ICCWC was provided and the role of the Consortium was noted, with illustrations of some of the activities that had been conducted to date. Participants were introduced to the various tools and services available through ICCWC to strengthen criminal justice systems and provide coordinated support at national, regional and international level to combat wildlife and forest crime and to the support that is available to countries and networks.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

The findings of the World Wildlife Crime Report (2016), produced by UNODC in close cooperation with ICCWC, were presented to participants. The report includes an analysis of over 164,000 seizures of wildlife contraband from around the world and stresses the global dimensions of wildlife crime. The findings of the report suggest that at least 120 countries have seized wildlife contraband and over 80 nationalities have been detected among suspected traffickers and over 7,000 species of protected wildlife have been seized globally in the past 10 years. It also notes that traffickers have found ways of introducing illegal wildlife into legal supply chains, and that some markets are particularly vulnerable. A number of policy implications were elaborated relating to mutual recognition, victim assistance, capacity building, trade standards, and addressing corruption.

The University of New England provided an overview of different types of existing networks, based on academic research informed by practitioners. It was noted networks are based on three main aims - information, enforcement and harmonization - and that WENs are examples are all three: they focus on enforcement, to do so they exchange information, and from time to time they consider and engage in harmonisation activities. It was noted that Environmental Enforcement Networks (EENs) take three main forms: geographically-based networks, discipline-based networks and commodity-based networks. A detailed interpretation of the value of networks was elaborated, from immediate value to potential value, including applied value and realised value. Phases of network involvement were considered, with a recognition that WENs are at various stages of professional maturity and competence. It was stressed that in all types of enforcement networks it is important to start by establishing what is being done, why it is being done, and what it hopes to achieve. The presentation concluded with a call to document the history, challenges, and practices of WENs, in order to drive the change required to improve WENs – in terms of administration, operations and strategic outcomes. It was noted networks can be highly effective but are not cost-free and require work, effort and trust. In preparation for the working group discussions, participants were asked to reflect on how to use existing WENs, liaise with other WENs, plan for new WENs and explore how they can be more effective.

Session 2: Supporting and enhancing collective law enforcement efforts

The session was moderated by UNODC, with presentations from representatives from UNODC and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Office of Law Enforcement.

Requirements for successful and effective secondments, mentoring and twinning programmes were described, based on the experience of the UNODC. It was emphasized these cannot be one-off trainings, but that they should be a long term investment that is developed and coordinated in a structured and coherent manner. It was noted experts involved must be familiar with the relevant environment, should be very experienced and that the work should be hands-on. It was noted twinning and secondment programmes should be made with agencies with similar structures to maximize the impact of the





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

activity. It was stressed it can take a number of years to implement efficiently and sometimes requires significant support.

The USFWS regional law enforcement attaché programme was introduced to participants and it was noted that 12 experienced officers will be placed in strategic locations across the world in coming years. The attachés will assist countries and regions with, among other things, capacity building and support to WENs. It was noted support investigating wildlife crimes was also available by the USFWS forensic laboratory and digital evidentiary technical support unit. A case study was presented on support provided for an investigation in Tanzania where information from recovered emails, videos, mobile phones, and laptops were used. It was noted that digital analysis support will be increasingly useful now that wildlife crime is increasingly listed as a predicate offence for money laundering convictions.

Session 3: The NGO perspective: Lessons learned in supporting networks

The session was moderated by the CITES Secretariat. A joint presentation on key lessons learned from the NGO perspective through their work supporting regional networks was delivered by TRAFFIC and Freeland Foundation on behalf of a number of NGOs involved in supporting networks in various regions in the world.

It was stated that many WENs were crucial to encourage higher level commitment to combating wildlife crime and that NGOs promote WENs and provide technical and coordination support to them (such as training, fundraising, communications, or logistics among other). It was suggested that many networks and organizations concentrate on iconic species but that other lesser known species are often not addressed adequately. It was stressed that 'one size does not fit all' and that attention had to be given to the sustainability of WENs, and that WENs need greater access to resources, technical assistance and political support. It was noted that there is a need to address issues that are difficult for WENs and are often not tackled, such as corruption or interagency rivalry, and that resource allocation to WENs should be reviewed. It was also noted that WENs need to be reviewed to explore if they are working well or not. The importance was stressed of having appropriate focal points and for WENs to be well coordinated with relevant regional enforcement bodies such as ASEANAPOL, INTERPOL and WCO regional offices in Asia.

Session 4: Best practices and challenges: Lessons to be learned from established networks

The session was moderated by INTERPOL. Representatives from IOFMC, LATF, COMIFAC, NICECG, SA-WEN, NAWEG, ROAVIS and the EU Enforcement Working Group delivered presentations, by region.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

It was apparent that each network is different – with different skills, different perceptions of what a network should be and what it should do. Most contributions outlined the background and institutional settings of the networks including their formation, structure, mandate, political influences, management and coordination as well as key activities implemented since the first global meeting of the WENs. Reported activities ranged from capacity building workshops and trainings, development of action plans and databases, producing annual reports and annual meetings, efforts to standardize laws and policies, to joint operations and investigations such as COBRA II and III.

As a best practice, it was generally agreed that WENs should be inclusive and multi-disciplinary, with broader membership which should include law enforcement agencies. It was stressed that WENs should incorporate everyone from the front line officer to those involved in court proceedings. The importance of building relationships, developing trust, strengthening alliances and being held accountable were stressed. It was noted good will is required to allow other organisations to take the lead.

Mechanisms for sharing information and intelligence were discussed and the need for each network to have access to secure communication platforms was emphasized. It was noted that developing sustainable cooperation mechanisms is a priority for most networks.

Monitoring and evaluation was raised as an important issue to further focus upon. It was noted that some networks maintain monitoring systems and share best practices, but that this is not a common practice. It was stressed that accountability is also essential.

One common challenge identified included gaps in legislation in participating countries. It was noted that WENs could play an important role to encourage the harmonization of legislation at the regional level.

During discussions it was noted that existing networks are very different, and range from regional platforms to more targeted enforcement networks or groups, but that their overarching goal is the same: to combat wildlife crime. It was stressed that if networks are intended to have an operational focus, enforcement officers should have a leading role.

Session 5: Experiences in establishing new networks and taking different approaches

The session was moderated by LATF. Presenters included representatives from ASEAN-WEN, the Caribbean (on behalf of an emerging network: CaribWEN), HA-WEN and South America WEN.

Participants learned about experiences of WENs at different stages of development: from CaribWEN that is in the process of being established, to ASEAN-WEN, which was established in 2005 but that is in the process of being merged with the ASEAN Experts Group on CITES to become the AEG CITES-WEN.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

The use of informal and formal communication tools was highlighted as an essential first step in establishing new networks. The importance of building relationships and having a strong leadership were also stressed. Established WENs emphasized that partnerships can be very beneficial and should be fostered, for example, with ICCWC and with civil society organisations.

Funding was noted as an essential requirement for the development and sustainability of networks. It was highlighted that without adequate long-term financial support, it was very difficult for networks to be sustainable. It was noted that the efforts of most capacity building activities will erode in time without long term sustainable funding sources and that it should not only be donors, but also member countries that contribute to the networks.

It was stressed mobilizing support, and political will and awareness, are key to the success of new networks. The approach proposed included capitalizing on existing structures and garnering support from national stakeholders. The involvement of prosecutors in all WENs was encouraged based on positive examples of the involvement of prosecutors in a number of networks.

Challenges facing new and existing WENs included a lack of awareness, treatment and prioritization of wildlife crime as a serious crime. The growing demand for illegal wildlife products and the increase in online trading and cyber-crime were also noted as complex issues to address. It was also emphasized that weak coordination and communication can hinder the development of networks.

It was also suggested that, when seizures are made, the lack of knowledge regarding animal welfare, care and handling are sometimes challenging for front line officers. In addition species identification was often stressed as a challenging issue that can hinder investigations. The limited use of wildlife forensics and coordination with appropriate forensic labs was also noted.

Session 6: Interaction between networks and regional bodies, and regional cohesiveness

The session was moderated by EUROPOL and included presentations from representatives from Southern Africa WEN; the SADC Rhino and Elephant Security Group of Southern Africa and ARINSA.

Participants were reminded of the roles a network can fulfil at national and regional levels: a multi-agency, intergovernmental law-enforcement network made up of multiple countries within one region, designed to combat the illegal wildlife trade at a regional scale; a platform for regional collaboration between national law enforcement agencies, CITES authorities, customs, police, prosecutors, and specialized wildlife enforcement group; and/or a mechanism for countries to monitor wildlife crime, share information, strengthen enforcement and investigations capacity, and share best practices.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

It was noted that WENs should take a proactive regional response. Factors considered critical for success include network ownership by its member states, good communication and coordination at the regional level, effective national committees, and the inclusion of multiple agencies at national level. Participants were also urged to use existing tools at regional, national and sub-national levels.

It was noted that WENs should assist their member states to combat wildlife crime and not replace any existing working structures. They should complement existing structures by fostering enhanced cooperation and collaboration between agencies and countries. It was emphasized that networks should recommend the use of existing processes and structures wherever possible and provide a link to donors to ensure support is well targeted and coordinated. It was strongly suggested that any coordination unit should limit its bureaucratic processes and that WENs should seek sustainable funding from the outset.

It was stressed that minimizing overlap was crucial and that new networks should be avoided where possible when there are overlapping mandates or parallel structures or networks. Amalgamation could be considered, for example, in the case of Southern Africa where there is a WEN under development, the SADC Rhino and Elephant security group and ARINSA.

It was noted that efforts should also focus on asset recovery. It was stressed that the 'follow the money' approach should be promoted through WENs, encouraging the implementation of financial investigations. It was suggested that networks should encourage their member states investigators to look for financial documents and seize financial documentation. It was noted that networks such as ARINSA could facilitate informal information requests, which are often faster and less bureaucratic than the MLA process.

Overall it was agreed that networks must work across countries and regions and that personal relationships and knowing who to contact for assistance are essential to successfully tackle the illegal wildlife trade.

Session 7: The role of regional and global law enforcement bodies and opportunities for enhanced cooperation

The session was moderated by the World Bank. Presentations were delivered by representatives from EUROPOL, WCO RILO AP and ESA, the INTERPOL Regional Bureaus of Harare and Nairobi and the INTERPOL Wildlife Crime Working Group.

Representatives from various relevant organizations provided information on the role of regional and global law enforcement bodies and the support available through them, including the use of secure communication systems to exchange information.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

It was noted that for traditional crime types, communication channels are well known and relatively easy to access, whereas for environmental crime, such channels and the related personal relationships are not well established. Additional challenges faced, in particular by Customs officials, included that front line officers are not wildlife experts and require continued capacity building and support, for example for the repatriation of seized items.

Networks were encouraged to strengthen their collaboration and engage in relevant regional bodies such as EUROPOL, AFRIPOL or ASEANAPOL as well as the Regional Bureaus and RILOs. At global level, it was suggested the INTERPOL's Wildlife Crime Working Group (WCWG) could offer the opportunity for networks to continue to coordinate and cooperate on specific activities or projects identified. It was also suggested that networks should report the outcomes of relevant meetings to neighbouring countries and networks, in particular those not present in such meetings.

The presentations during this session further highlighted that different groups and agencies have different roles to play and the importance of strengthening ties with relevant organizations at the regional and global level as may be appropriate.

The differences in legislation were also noted during the session and it was suggested that without harmonized laws, a harmonized approach is not easy.

Session 8: Promoting the use of existing tools and services, and mobilizing support for the implementation of obligations and commitments under international agreements

The session was moderated by the CITES Secretariat. Presentations were delivered by the CITES Secretariat, UNODC, INTERPOL and TRAFFIC.

Participants were informed about CITES and encouraged to explore how networks can assist their member states with the implementation of a number of obligations and commitments under international agreements, such as for example the CITES Resolutions and Decisions, which were adopted by the 183 CITES Parties at CoP17. This included, for example, the Resolutions on enforcement matters or the proposed (and later adopted) Resolution on corruption, which recommends that networks incorporate anti-corruption activities into their work plans and undertakings. A number of tools and services available to support member states were noted, including the CITES Virtual College and the WCO's ENVIRONET.

The existence of UN Resolutions linking organized crime and corruption were highlighted, and the requirements of the United Nations Conventions on Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC) and Against Corruption (UNCAC) were outlined. It was noted UNTOC covers the criminalization of organized crime, money laundering and corruption. UNCAC requires the criminalization of corruption and the





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

establishment of institutional structures to prevent and combat corruption. It was stressed that both conventions provide significant provisions for mutual legal assistance and extradition and for the recovery of the instrumentalities and proceeds of crimes that they covered, with UNCAC going into significantly more depth in this area. On a practical level, UNCAC and UNTOC provide frameworks which require countries to combat TOC or Corruption and a number of tools are available² and could be used better to understand legal systems in countries that networks would like to work with.

Information was provided on the context to INTERPOL's involvement in environmental security and the five areas of work where support was available to networks such as: project EDEN (pollution and water quality); project SCALE (IUU Fishing); project PREDATOR (fauna, with a focus on big cats); project LEAF (forest crime), and; project WISDOM (ivory and rhino horn). An overview of relevant resolutions was provided, outlining to networks the importance of raising awareness within their member countries of wildlife crime, and the need to prioritize action and support in tackling it. Networks were encouraged to actively engage in the various projects and ongoing initiatives.

An overview of TWIX (Trade in Wildlife Information Exchange) was provided. It was noted that TWIX is managed by TRAFFIC on behalf of its partners and is an internet tool developed to facilitate information exchange and international co-operation between wildlife law enforcement officials (currently implemented in Europe and Central Africa). The components include a mailing list and a database of seizures. Key enforcement agencies are involved including Customs, police, environmental inspection services, prosecutors and judges, veterinary and phytosanitary inspection services, and CITES Management Authorities. International organizations are also involved including INTERPOL, UNODC, WCO, European Commission and EUROPOL among others. The mailing lists are access-restricted and allow for sharing of seizures news/alerts and can trigger seizures and facilitate investigations. Additionally, the mailing list can help with identification of seized specimens/products, or locating rescue centres. The seizure database allows countries to maintain control over and ownership of their data. No nominal information is included. It is simple and easy to use, connects wildlife enforcement officers across agencies and can be adapted to regional/specific needs.

Session 9 and 10: Working groups discussions, reporting to plenary and discussion.

Participants broke into three working groups with the following mandates:

1. Discussing the need to develop guidelines for the establishing of new networks and the strengthening of existing networks

² E.g. information on legal libraries SHERLOC and TRACK and summary reports on the status of implementation of UNCAC are available on www.unodc.org.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

2. Exploring solutions to enhance communication and cooperation between and within networks, opportunities to promote the use of existing tools and services, and to mobilize support for the implementation of global obligations and commitments under international agreements through networks.
3. Identifying possible regional and global operations along specific trade routes (closed group for government/IGO representatives).

Each working group nominated a representative to provide a summary of the discussions to plenary which is reflected below. After each presentation a Q&A discussion was held.

WORKING GROUP 1: Discussing the need to develop guidelines for the establishing of new networks and the strengthening of existing networks

During the meeting a number of different networks and structures were discussed. It was noted that new WEN's such as CaribWEN are seeking guidance following their establishment - for instance, if they are meant to be operational, should this be led by law enforcement, should they handle nominal data or should they be a mechanism or a platform to bring people together? If they are to be a policy making platform, who should lead and what benefit will it bring? If they are to be more specialized and operational what should they be targeting? What should be the size of the network?

The discussions of the working group highlighted that there is no clear guidance that networks can follow when developing a new network and that, due to the limited assessments of existing networks, there is no clear guidance on what existing networks could do to enhance their effectiveness.

It was noted that a variety of networks and types of networks exist and that each region has different requirements. The need to identify common principles and challenges in the work of WENs was also noted. It was stressed that the concept of WEN is understood in many different ways and that there is often a lack of clarity on fundamental issues about WENs. It was concluded that guidelines would therefore be useful. Potential guidelines could explore: a network's objectives (Is it an operational taskforce or a policy body?); geographic focus and size (How many countries does it include? Is it regional, sub-regional or inter-regional?); lead agencies; capacity building (Can regional mechanisms work without solid national units?); the secretariat (Is it needed? What should the role be?); enforcement role (Should it collect information/intelligence from all its members?); and its effectiveness (How to measure it?). It was suggested that the guidelines could also suggest compiling a comparative table to visualize differences and similarities among WENs.

The view of the working group was that guidelines are needed both to strengthen existing networks, and to guide new and developing networks. Such guidelines could include rules, protocols and working arrangements that could be adapted to the specific needs and issues of the different regions. It was noted that a clear definition of what a WEN should do would help standardize the different approaches, noting that they will work differently based on regional issues and specific legislation.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

WORKING GROUP 2: Exploring solutions to enhance communication and cooperation between and within networks, opportunities to promote the use of existing tools and services, and to mobilize support for the implementation of global obligations and commitments under international agreements through networks.

It was noted that there is sometimes limited cooperation between networks and limited knowledge and awareness of the work, successes and challenges of other networks. The development of the information sheets was welcomed and ICCWC was encouraged to make these materials available online and regularly seek updates to these documents. The working group also suggested that the Secretariat continue to update and circulate a network focal point directory on a biannual bases (available on the CITES website).

The working group discussed communication and cooperation gaps and how to enhance regional communication as well as communication between networks. The option of using a platform such as ENVIRONET to increase access to information and cooperation between networks was suggested and participants encouraged all networks and their members to join ENVIRONET. It was agreed a future meeting could explore additional needs for enhanced communication between networks as needed.

It was highlighted that it was crucial to increase regional cooperation. It was suggested that networks explore bilaterally how to enhance communication and cooperation in their respective regions using existing channels such as Whatsapp or similar applications for the sharing of non-sensitive data. For sensitive information exchange, networks were encouraged to liaise as appropriate with existing regional enforcement bodies and platforms such as the INTERPOL Regional Bureaus, WCO RILOs, ASEANOPOL, AFRIPOL, EUROPOL, among others. At the global level networks were encouraged to participate in the WCWG and to continue to liaise with relevant partners and organizations that could support and strengthen collaboration and coordination between WENs.

It was noted that a variety of potential support that could be received, and tools available to support member states to implement relevant international obligations and agreements were available to networks, and that in many cases such information was not readily available to networks and their members. Partners were encouraged to send to networks relevant information on available support tools and services, so that networks could encourage their member states to utilize or implement them.

WORKING GROUP 3: Identifying possible regional and global operations along specific trade routes (closed group for government/IGO representatives).

The working group discussed possible regional and global operations along specific trade routes and encouraged ICCWC to organize and support a targeted operation that would be coordinated by regional networks and implemented at the global level. Networks were also encouraged to more actively raise awareness of their law enforcement successes and to liaise with relevant regional bodies more actively.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

It was also noted that there was no common understanding on what could be considered as an operational activity and that further support and capacity building would be welcomed by networks.

It suggested INTERPOL and WCO could, on a rotating basis and on behalf of ICCWC, organize a global two week operation before World Wildlife Day. The initial operation could be organized by INTERPOL on behalf of ICCWC and in close cooperation with the WCO, the INTERPOL WCWG, and regional networks and law enforcement bodies. ICCWC could provide guidelines and priorities for the networks to explore and the networks would coordinate the implementation of the operation with their member states. Member states or networks would do targeted activities based on their specific national and/or regional priorities and report back to ICCWC. The results of the targeted operation could be publicized on World Wildlife Day. The operations would make use of existing secure communication channels such as CENComm and i24/7.

Session 11: Next steps and agreement on outcomes of the meeting

The session was moderated by the University of New England, Australia. It was an interactive session where comments were taken from the floor and projected in plenary, common points were identified, were refined, and were agreed upon by participants as the next steps of the meeting. The text below shows the agreed next steps. Annex II includes all points discussed with the agreed upon points in bold.

Outcomes of working group 1:

- *Agreement on the need to follow-up on the development of guidelines to strengthen networks and guide the development of new networks:* they should be flexible, acknowledge that there are different networks and they have different forms and structures (noting the discussion points in Annex II should also be taken into account while developing the guidelines).
- *Development of the guidelines: ICCWC to agree upon a process to develop the guidelines:* Networks and relevant partners should be involved in the development and available materials should be considered and included in the process as appropriate.
- *Promote use of guidelines:* Once completed, networks should make use of the guidelines and promote the use of relevant tools and services with their membership.

Outcomes of working group 2:

- *Communication across existing networks should consider current communication technologies used:* (including availability, effectiveness and limitations in their respective regions) and develop specific regional communication strategies to improve communication within their respective regions.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

- *Encourage use of available and existing platforms:* and tools in order to obtain reliable information and to communicate regularly using these platforms and tools.

Outcomes of working group 3:

- *Greater clarity is needed on what is an operational activity.*
- *ICCWC to identify targeted operations that could be coordinated by networks and include capacity building and post-operational evaluation and building as appropriate.*
- *Networks to raise awareness of their successes more actively.*

Concluding remarks and closing

Concluding remarks were provided on behalf of ICCWC by John E. Scanlon, CITES Secretary-General and the meeting was closed by Ambassador Judith Garber, Assistant Secretary of State of the United States of America.

During the concluding remarks it was stressed that cooperation and coordination are essential to strengthen networks; collective efforts could be enhanced and supported through the use of mentorships, twinning programmes, secondments and attaches; addressing the sustainability of networks was essential and this had to include strong support from their respective member states; a number of partners available to support networks that should be called upon to provide support; best practices should be further identified and shared; and WENs are a good model and emerging networks should use existing frameworks and ensure cohesiveness with ongoing initiatives

Acknowledgements

ICCWC would like to thank all network representatives and participants of the second global meeting of the wildlife enforcement networks for their active participation and engagement in the meeting and for their strong support to combating wildlife and forest crime.

The Department of State of the United States of America is thanked for the funds generously made available to support this event.





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

ANNEX I:

List of participants (in alphabetical order)

| Family Name | First Name | Network/Organization/Country |
|---------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|
| ACOSTA | Karla | NAWEG |
| ADHIASTO | Dwi N. | WCS |
| AHLERS | Nick | TRAFFIC |
| BANGO | Julio | Angola |
| BEIRIGER | Paul | USFWS |
| BÖHMER | Franz | EU Enforcement Group on CITES |
| BROPHY | Sinead | UNODC |
| BROUSSARD | Giovanni | UNODC |
| BROWN | Theodore | Caribbean |
| BROWN | Don | USA |
| BROWN | Edwin | IFAW |
| CHAIWANNA | Soontorn | Thailand |
| CRAIGIE | Francis | South Africa |
| DAWSON | Christine | USA |
| DEL CASTILLO | Roberto | INTERPOL |
| DHAKAL | Maheshwar | SAWEN |
| DOAK | Naomi | United for Wildlife |
| EBAYI | Bonaventure | LATF |
| EMSLIE | Richard | SADC Rhino & Elephant security group |
| EPPEL | Jeremy | World Bank |
| FARROWAY | Lisa | UNDP |
| FELKER | Fort | USA |
| FOURNEL | Henri | INTERPOL |
| GALE | James | USFWS |
| GALSTER | Steve | Freeland |
| GALVEZ DURAND | Jessica | Peru |





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| GARBER | Judith | USA |
| GARCIA | Junge | Panama |
| GARZON DE HERRERA | Elsa | ROAVIS |
| GASEITSIWE | Disikalala | WENSA |
| GOSLING | Justin | Independent consultant |
| GOWITZKE | Werner | EUROPOL |
| GUIDERA | Andrey | USFWS |
| HICKEY | Valerie | World Bank |
| HUBBARD | David | USFWS |
| ISAACS | Maurice | Caribbean |
| JEAL | Corey | Visitor |
| JONSSON | Pia | CITES |
| JORDAN | Sheldon | NAWEG |
| KAHATANO | Deborah | WENSA |
| KECSE-NAGY | Katalin | TRAFFIC |
| KISH | Christina | ROAVIS |
| KOO | Ashton | USFWS |
| KWENANE | Phatsimo | USA |
| LANGA | Anisio | WCO RILO ESA |
| LAWSON | David | WENSA |
| LEE | Chul-Hun | WCO RILO AP |
| LEGRAND | Jerome | France |
| LEVY-VALENSI | Eric | France |
| MAKURI | Sosthenes | INTERPOL RB Nairobi |
| MALKA | Rony | Israel |
| MASHINI | Cleo | TRAFFIC DRC |
| MENG | Xianlin | NICE-CG |
| MILLER | Grant | EU Enforcement Group on CITES |
| MONTANO | Javier | UNODC |
| NAWA | Mubita | INTERPOL RB Harare |
| NCHOUTPOUEN | Chouaibou | Central Africa WEN |





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

| | | |
|-------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|
| NELSON | Jean Herby | Caribbean |
| NEME | Laurel A. | National Geographic |
| NEWCOMER | Edward | USFWS |
| O'BRIEN-ONYEILA | Michael | Conservation international |
| PALACIOS | Thalia | ROAVIS |
| PARK | Sang Yong | WCO RILO AP |
| PAULOMIER | Elizabeth | Kenya |
| PAWLOS | Daniel | HAWEN |
| PHIRI | Edward | LATF |
| PHOCAS | George | USFWS |
| PINK | Grant | University of New England |
| POTTER | Rod | SADC Rhino & Elephant security group |
| PRIBADI | Achmad | ASEAN-WEN |
| RAXTER | Patricia | USA |
| RIHOVA | Paula | EU Enforcement Group on CITES |
| RIOS | Jorge | UNODC |
| ROBERTON | Scott | WCS |
| ROBERTS | Keith | Conservation International |
| ROBERTSON | Simon | World Bank |
| ROBINSON | Doreen L. | USAID |
| RON | Tamar | Independent Consultant |
| SANCHEZ FORERO | Maria Antonia | South America WEN |
| SHARMA | Kedar Nath | SAWEN |
| SMUTS | Sarah | Elephants alive |
| SOBREVILLA | Claudia | World Bank |
| SOONTORNPITAKKON | Somkait | ASEAN-WEN |
| SPRATT | Lisa | USA |
| STEED | Mathew | USA |
| STEELE | Tim | UNODC |
| STOLLER | Stacy | USA |
| SUAZO | Julian | ROAVIS |





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

| | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------------|
| TOBIASON | Andrew | USAID |
| TUGLIO | Vania | South America WEN |
| VAN ASCH | Edward | CITES |
| VAN NIEKERK | Charles | South Africa Revenue Service |
| VAN RENSBURG | Ben | CITES |
| VANEGAS | Fatima | ROAVIS |
| VENTER | Jaco | Conservation International |
| VENTO VALENCIA | Rosa | Peru |
| VIVAS PRADA | Jose-Manuel | Spain |
| WEISSGOLD | Bruce | USFWS |
| WILLEMSE | JP | ARINSA |
| WILLOUGHBY | Stephen | Caribbean |
| XI | Guijun | NICE-CG |
| ZAINI | Fazilah | Malaysia |
| ZHANG | Shanning | NICE-CG |





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

ANNEX II:

Detailed discussion points - Session 11: Next steps and agreement on outcomes of the meeting

As noted above the session was moderated by the University of New England, Australia. It was an interactive session where comments were taken from the floor and projected in plenary, common points were identified, were refined, and were agreed upon by participants as the next steps of the meeting. This Annex includes all points discussed with the agreed upon points in bold and all other items discussed below and is provided to guide the development of the next steps and future discussions.

Outcomes of working group 1:

- **Agreement on the need to follow-up on the development of guidelines to strengthen networks and guide the development of new networks:** they should be flexible, acknowledge there are different networks and they have different forms and structures (the discussion points below should also be taking into account while developing the guidelines)
- **Development of the guidelines:** ICCWC to agree upon a process to develop the guidelines. Networks and relevant partners should be involved in the development and available materials should be considered and included in the process as appropriate
- **Promote use of guidelines:** Once completed, networks should make use of the guidelines and promote the use of relevant tools and services with their membership

Additional discussions of the working group (as drafted during the plenary discussion):

- An analysis of the different types of networks should be explored.
- ICCWC should assist in creating networks or reinforcing networks – should look at available resources (political capital/sustainability/human resources) within the institutions of the member states and explore financial opportunities to support networks
- Do analysis of how much existing tools/services are used by different networks
- Legal frameworks: harmonization at regional level – national authorities have different sanctions/measures at the national level
- Consider a checklist-scoreboard to be able to measure and monitor performance (for new and established networks)
- Networks should take into account country/regional constraints and size of countries. Some regions might need regional or sub-regional networks.
- Importance of involvement of prosecutors/judiciary in networks
- Encourage use of associated laws/regulations
- Importance of high level support and commitment for network or planned development of networks
- Importance of political buy in (top-down) and practicability (bottom-up)





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC)

- Networks at various stages of development – functioning networks could provide advice and best practices, key players/organizations
- Ensure regional cohesion where various networks exist in the same region.
- Importance of strong national task-force to be able to sustain a regional network
- Policy body separate from enforcement/operational activities.

Outcomes of working group 2:

- **Communication across existing networks: networks should consider current communication technologies used** (including availability, effectiveness and limitations in their respective regions) and develop specific regional communication strategies to improve communication within their respective regions.
- **Encourage use of available and existing platforms** and tools to obtain reliable information

Additional discussions of the working group (as drafted during the plenary discussion):

- Communication strategy to increase awareness: need to encourage additional research on issues related to wildlife and in particular wildlife crime
- Communication between networks: networks to explore what they would need to be able to reach out to other WENs.
- Need increased political support and collaboration: need support to encourage network member states, partners and donors and increase the political will and commitment of resources at national level.
- How to facilitate communication between networks: could explore a way to communicate between networks through for example ENVIRONET or a similar closed user group.
- How to facilitate information exchange through alternative communication tools (for non-sensitive data) and complement secure information channels (CENComm, i24/7). Examples noted during the meeting included Whatsapp and or similar applications for non-sensitive information sharing between network representatives.
- Importance of building trust and consistency of participation and engagement with partners
- Could meet once a year to increase cooperation/build personal relationships: networks and network members were encouraged to participate in the WCWG meetings that were organized in between the Global meetings.
- Networks to participate and make use of existing communication channels
- Networks could compile and distribute at the regional level a list of relevant tools and services available to their member states and encourage the use of such tools to their member states (e.g. Indicator Framework, ENVIRONET, EU-Twix/Africa-Twix, etc). Partners were encouraged to send such information to the different networks directly.

Outcomes of working group 3:





International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICCWC)

- **Greater clarity is needed on what is operational activity.**
- **ICCWC to identify targeted operations that could be coordinated by networks and include capacity building and post-operational evaluation and building as appropriate.**
- **Networks to raise awareness of their successes more actively.**

Additional discussions of the working group (as drafted during the plenary discussion):

- Networks could seek support from ICCWC as may be appropriate for the planning and preparation of operational activities.
- Need to share technical information to take concerted action
- Regional networks to advise on what activities/projects can be developed
- Projects should focus on problems at their region within concerted projects/activities at the global level. They should target a common issue (i.e. general) and include all countries along the trade chain.
- National authorities should explore how to include innovative tactics/partners (e.g. transport sector) in their ongoing activities.
- Operations should be coordinated at regional level
- Capacity building is needed as part of ongoing activities and operations
- Judiciary and prosecutor support and involvement is essential.
- Member states involved in operational activities should bring targeted and practical information that can be actively used during operations and make use of existing tools and services available
- Networks should encourage the participation of their member states in relevant activities and projects
- Pre-operational briefing could be organized with relevant organizations involved with national focal points.
- Pre-meeting operational (virtual) meeting was recommended

Additional issues discussed not related to the various working groups:

- Networks could encourage non-parties to adhere to CITES and other relevant conventions (UNCAC/UNTOC)
- Could consider a letter to countries to highlight importance of combating wildlife crime as serious crime and take concerted action

