Key points from the second meeting of the Conservation Assured | Tiger Standards (CA|TS) Support Group held at London Zoo in April 2019.

- The CA|TS Support Group agreed to work together to further the aims of CA|TS and the global targets on tiger conservation.
- A recent survey identified serious shortcomings in capacity and investment in tiger conservation over a considerable portion of the tiger range, leading to the need for a major funding push.
- Success in fundraising and the associated political commitments depends increasingly on precise information relating to what is needed and how funds are used, e.g. giving donors a plan with a clear baseline, identified targets and ways of measuring progress.
- CA|TS is well placed to provide data (and an associated robust and verified information base) needed to meet this increasing emphasis on outcome/impact monitoring.
- A collective ask is powerful and reassures donors. This could include joint proposals through the CA|TS partnership, particularly to governments, and possibly joint approaches to several donors.
- Ideally non-competing funds are needed and innovative funding models such as climate funds and initiatives such the Lion’s Share, which draws on a percentage of wildlife-based advertising revenue, should be explored.
- Pressure is also needed on governments to increase budgets and to feed tourism revenues back into conservation. In many countries funding has stagnated.
- Integration with existing initiatives and non-traditional partners might also be useful, such as ASEAN Heritage Parks, natural World Heritage sites and development agencies.
- Linking tiger conservation to wider aspects of human wellbeing, including ecosystem services from tiger reserves and habitats, is needed to further widen support for tiger conservation.
- There is a need to document and distribute best practices identified by CA|TS to help build capacity across the tiger range.

The CA|TS Support Group is made up of organisations and institutions (e.g. conservation NGOs and funding agencies) committed to supporting, promoting and implementing CA|TS and to working closely with government agencies responsible for supporting tiger conservation. The Support Group is part of the wider CA|TS partnership of all governments, organisations and individuals involved in CA|TS.
Welcome and CA|TS update
The Second Meeting of the Conservation Assured | Tiger Standards (CA|TS) Support Group was opened by Andrew Terry and Lobzang Dorji, who both stressed the role of CA|TS in helping reach the Tx2 targets and promoting conservation of wild tigers.

Mike Baltzer introduced the meeting objectives (Box 1) and Khalid Pasha gave a brief overview of CA|TS and noted the progress made in the governance (Fig. 1), institutionalisation and engagement of sites (Box 2). Sonam Wangdi provided an overview of tiger conservation and implementation of CA|TS in Bhutan.

Box 1: Meeting objectives
- Register key tiger conservation across TRCs for CA|TS
- Use CA|TS as a monitoring tool for tracking tiger conservation progress across sites
- Develop a plan for funding mechanism/s to support and incentivise registered sites to become CA|TS approved
- Strengthen site-based management across TRCs

Implementing CA|TS at scale
Sue Stolton introduced the CA|TS Business Plan which considers the technical and resource capacity needed to implement CA|TS. The biggest challenge is to more than double the number of sites registered; currently almost 70 sites are registered but CA|TS is aiming for around 150. The Plan also addresses how to provide support to registered sites and aid them to undertake the improvements needed to reach CA|TS Approved status.

Fig. 1: CA|TS Governance
Three scenarios are discussed (Fig. 2) in the Plan; emphasising the need for a more ambitious “Advancement Programme” given the continued pressures on wild tigers across their remaining range.

Sue also gave a summary of the Safe Havens for Wild Tigers: A rapid assessment of management effectiveness against the Conservation Assured Tiger Standards (CA|TS Lite) report which presented the results from 111 sites from the 11 TRC (representing roughly 70% of the global wild tiger population) to a questionnaire based on 40 strategic tiger management activities based on a simplified version of the CA|TS standards (Fig. 3).

Khalid Pasha noted that despite substantial investment in tiger conservation, several countries have lost tiger populations in the last few years (for instance the loss of tigers in Cambodia). Building on the Safe

Fig. 2: Three scenarios outlined in the CA|TS Business Plan for the growth and development of CA|TS
**CA|TS Support Group 2019**

**Box 2: Conservation Assured | Tiger Standards**

**CA|TS** promotes management excellence in tiger conservation areas by agreeing best practice standards and using these to assess management. The **CA|TS standards** were developed over three years by many leading tiger experts, involving consultative workshops and field testing, with the **CA|TS Manual** (version 1) launched in November 2013. CA|TS assessments are made against 17 elements (all with associated standards and criteria) divided into seven “pillars” covering different management issues. Five (importance and status; management; community; tourism and protection) are applicable to species conservation management in general and represent the **Conservation Assured** aspect. Two final pillars (habitat management and tiger populations) focus specifically on the **Tiger Standards**. Areas first become **CA|TS Registered**, expressing an intention to reach CA|TS standards, and then go through an accreditation process to assess whether they meet the standards and can be awarded **CA|TS Approved** status.

Registration demonstrates commitment to achieve best practice and identifies strategies for managers and funding shortfalls for donors. Currently **seven** National/Jurisdictional Committees have been established (BD, BT, CN, IN, NP, MY, RU); **67** sites have registered for CA|TS across these countries; and **four** sites have reached **CA|TS Approved** status.

---

**Havens for Wild Tigers** report, a more detailed analysis of tiger population was made for 71 areas based on site data and peer reviewed papers. The results show that Southeast Asia in particular is falling behind the rest of the tiger range, even in relatively well-managed protected areas with supportive governments (although there are exceptions, see page 7). In particular in many sites there is a very low level of staffing on the ground (usually less than 10 people per park) and low government investment (Cambodia, Malaysia and Thailand invest between a minimum of approximately US$500,000 and maximum of US$10 million in tiger conservation compared to between US$10 million and US$70 million in Bhutan and India). However many of these sites cover large areas and with adequate protection, prey etc they could be very significant for the recovery of tigers in the wild.

Based on all of these assessments tiger conservation areas can be roughly divided into three categories (Fig. 4): a rapid tier which need very little investment and capacity building to reach CA|TS Approved status and increase tiger numbers, a middle tier needing more investment and time and a bottom tier of slow recovery sites, needing greater input to recover tiger numbers and reach CA|TS. Focussing funding and capacity building on those sites in the medium and slow recovery tier has the overall potential of increasing the tiger population by ≅ 700 individuals.

---

**Fig. 3: Average score for all participating sites in the “CA|TS Lite” report grouped regionally**

**Fig. 4: Estimate of percentage of sites across the tiger range within three categories of capacity**
WORKING TOGETHER IN THE TIGER RANGE

How can the CA|TS Support Group work together to safeguard wild tigers?

Midori Paxton. UNDP works throughout the tiger range, including eight sites in Bhutan (with GEF 6 and GEF 7 funding), four in India; four in Indonesia, five in Myanmar, three in Malaysia and three in Thailand. GEF financed projects are government-led which results in a greater chance of institutional buy-in but this requires working closely with governments. Integration of CA|TS into the work-plan and budget will accelerate CA|TS registration. Institutional and site-level capacity building actions aligned with CA|TS can also increase the number of CA|TS Approved sites – building collective motivation of partners. Midori also introduced UNDP’s new initiative, The Lion’s Share, which aims to raise funds from a small levy on advertisements that use images of animals.

Matt Linkie. Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) works in over 15 landscapes that contain tigers or have contained tigers. Country programmes have devolved management. In Russia support has been directly related to CA|TS; in Myanmar, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and China the country programmes are waiting to get some direction from the national government on when and how to engage in CA|TS.

Mike Appleton. Global Wildlife Conservation (GWC) is not working specifically on tiger conservation, but is working on Sumatran rhino conservation in tiger landscapes. GWC has been providing capacity building support to CA|TS and is helping formulate a training programme for CA|TS. GWC’s other interest is Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs) and the quality of management within KBAs; CA|TS may be useful a tool for these areas. GWC is also interested in developments in the jaguar range (see page 9).

Sugoto Roy. IUCN’s Integrated Tiger Habitat Conservation Programme (ITHCP) works across six countries. The programme is funded by KfW and funding is focussed on livelihoods and communities; so tends to work in areas between protected areas. About 30 projects have been funded so far. The next phase will focus on the highest impact projects and project activities and will identifying gaps and funding needs. IUCN is particularly interested in transboundary areas – for example between India and Bhutan. There are opportunities to work with CA|TS in ensuring the standards can also be applied in corridors and connectivity areas.

John Goodrich. Panthera is working in 12 sites in five countries (Nepal, India, Thailand, Malaysia and Sumatra, Indonesia). In all these sites Panthera is working with partners and focusing on areas where tiger numbers are suppressed. The objective is to identify key pressures and react; this involves anti-poaching work, monitoring and evaluation. Community work is an increasingly important area of work. Panthera has just started to consider how it might work with CA|TS.

Mahendra Shreshtra. The Smithsonian is working in Bangladesh in the Sundarbans, providing support for research and SMART patrolling. There are limited prey species (spotted deer and wild pigs). With 6,000 km² of Sundarbans there is huge potential to rebuild tiger populations. The Sunderbans have registered for CA|TS, but progress developing the dossier has been slow.

Monica Wrobel. Zoological Society of London (ZSL) is committed to four tiger landscapes in Nepal/India, Thailand, Myanmar and the Russian Far East. ZSL has a roughly ten year lifespan in these areas with SMART monitoring, increasing community outreach, and has had some success in increasing tiger numbers in these areas. ZSL has been quite active in transboundary areas and would like to build on this area of work. Risks include reliance on project funding which makes it difficult to be a reliable partner over time – ZSL is looking at its funding model at the moment to address this issues. At a country level ZSL has worked with governments to help meet CA|TS standards.

Stephen Browne. Fauna and Flora International (FFI) works in two tiger landscapes. In Sumatra, Indonesia FFI has two decades of involvement, working with multiple partners. Approaches are based largely around monitoring and assessment, including SMART patrolling and working on law enforcement through development of community patrol groups. In Myanmar FFI works on the border with Thailand where transboundary poaching is the largest issue (there are seven times the number of poachers as tigers). FFI works mainly though small grants. These efforts are showing results, e.g. snare removal. CA|TS could be useful in bringing different parts of government together, and possibly working with religious leaders. Challenges include the fact that although traditional laws are strong some of the leaders are also involved in wildlife crime. There is also some reluctance to use too many tools in one landscape.
Mohnish Kapoor. The Global Tiger Forum (GTF) and CA|TS partnership has focused on the management effectiveness elements of the St Petersburg Declaration. GTF has supported CA|TS training and is directly implementing the CA|TS process in India – mainly outside the tiger reserves and is aligning the Tiger MEE and CA|TS processes. So far there are 41 registered sites, in India, two sites have achieved CA|TS Approved status and four more sites are shortly to be recommended to the international committee for approval. There is an urgent need to form a consortium for SE Asia to focus on tiger conservation issues; e.g. three tiger range countries have already lost their tigers and need reintroduction. GTF wants to use CA|TS as a monitoring tool; for example Malaysia still claims to have 500 tigers but actual numbers may be down to 150.

Heather Sohl. WWF works across 14 tiger landscapes in 12 countries investing and working towards CA|TS in 71 sites, including Cambodia and Kazakhstan for reintroduction, with governments and other partners. WWF hosts the CA|TS secretariat in Singapore, providing at least US$180,000 per year and WWF provided seed funding to establish the CA|TS Council. WWF has also been involved in Conservation Assured for other species including jaguars and freshwater dolphins.

How can the CA|TS Support Group work together to safeguard wild tigers?

A working groups sessions focused on four main issues:
1. Registering tiger conservation sites across all TRCs for CA|TS
2. Using CA|TS as a monitoring tool for tracking tiger conservation progress in individual sites and projects
3. Developing a plan for funding mechanism/s to support and incentivise CA|TS Registered sites to become CA|TS Approved
4. Strengthening site-based tiger management across TRCs

Registering sites: A rapid practical exercise helped identify where Support Group members are working, potential CA|TS sites and, where possible, the status of these sites using the three tiers introduced in the morning (Fig. 4). Indicative results are given in Fig. 5.

Monitoring tool: CA|TS can help provide realistic analysis of management needs and can, for example, feed into management plans. The Support Group has brought together a huge amount of expertise, which can help to ensure that the standards are as effective as possible. One option being discussed is to have a technical committee within CA|TS to ensure ongoing input of expertise. It is important to get metrics for both outputs (e.g. number of patrols) and outcomes (e.g. population of tigers). Metrics will vary from place to place (e.g. poachers may use poison in one place and snares in another). To use CA|TS as a monitoring tool will need some modification; but this is being considered in the CA|TS software being developed (see page 7).

Funding mechanism: Complementary funding from existing programmes, including government budgets, is important. The CA|TS Partnership could also consider putting in for a substantial large grant as a collective effort. Existing GEF and Green Climate Fund sources
Plans are constant over time whereas managers change regularly in many countries. Aligning CA|TS closely with this process is important; as is inclusion in National Tiger Plans. A business model for the community is an essential part of this. There are few places that have self-contained tiger populations necessitating coordination and interchange between sites. Capacity building is a key part of the process, particularly if it is peer-to-peer, as is coordination between different tiger sites. Social media is important, for example WhatsApp groups swapping ideas. The younger generation of conservationists are very up-to-date with new technology and are applying this to monitoring. The new CA|TS software (see page 7) is primarily aimed at being a management tool. CA|TS is in a good position to develop and share best practices across TRC’s; perhaps through the Conservation Evidence team based in Cambridge.

**Funding tiger conservation**

**IUCN Integrated Tiger Habitat Conservation Programme:** Sugoto Roy provided more details on the ITHCP programme. KfW has contributed US$20 million for funding for tiger conservation projects in nine tiger range countries. All projects have to cover three issues: tiger populations, ecosystems and livelihoods. Experts are brought in to help the process, including selection of projects. Project preparation grants must focus on landscape level projects to obtain government endorsements, strengthening partnerships and carry out community assessments (ESMS). 104 partner organisations, each bringing their own brand of expertise and skills, are involved. The main focus is not protected areas but the spaces between protected areas. Projects range from HWC issues, fuelwood substitution, rapid response equipment, and training rangers in SMART, camera trapping and ecotourism.

A handbook on tiger funding is being produced and some research projects are included within the portfolio, for example looking at high altitude corridors in Bhutan, Nepal and India. There has also been a portfolio-wide study of HWC. The project is continuing with a further US $7.5 million.

**Bhutan for Life:** Dechen Dorji introduced the initiative. Bhutan has over half the country in protected areas and biological corridors. Bhutan for Life is a major step in building the effectiveness of the system and is part of WWF’s larger Project Finance for Permanence (PFP) programme. Between 2014 and 2018 almost US$43 million has been raised for this programme; which will be matched by US$30-35 million from the Government of Bhutan. This money is to be invested over a 14 year period as a transition fund to build a long-term conservation and financial plan. Donors put no restrictions on the funds. A TED talk given by the former prime minister, a charismatic speaker, was very influential in building support and showing the credibility of the fund. The largest source of funding is from the Green Climate Fund, then private donors, private foundations and the GEF. Donors were brought together, given profile and certificates. Donor funding will gradually be replaced over time by other sources including a long-term trust fund. Goals have been linked to key elements of the Sustainable Development Goals.

**UNDP:** Midori Paxton gave an overview a UNDP funded project in the Western Forest Complex of Thailand. This is a five year project covering three contiguous wildlife sanctuaries, 6,000 square miles of intact forest habitats and a refuge for half Thailand’s tiger population. The
vision is to improve management effectiveness through strengthening on the ground conservation by providing incentives for sustainable financing and also strengthening community interaction. Highlights include a regional training centre for tiger conservation run by WCS and an increase in tiger monitoring and research through camera trapping. A number of innovations are included, such as a prototype Network Centric Information System. With Biofin, the option of having a tiger conservation car license plate is being explored; this has worked well in other parts of the world. But it requires some legal changes, working with three different government ministries, and finding ways of collecting fees and building support from the population to buy the plates. Wildlife-based ecotourism is also being investigated – the first of its kind in Thailand. This involves many different agencies in the buffer zone with overlapping jurisdictions and needs to identify wildlife-compatible livelihoods that are viable in buffer zone villages. This element of the project has been challenging due to rapid staff turnover, and there is remaining uncertainty about whether or not it will work. Once proof of concept has been achieved there needs to be a quicker way of scaling up. There are a number of other challenges. Formalising partnerships between the government and NGOs can be a lengthy process. Landscape planning requires full consultations with local stakeholders to achieve collective landscape management systems. This includes the need to include full involvement of indigenous peoples groups with a rigorous safeguard system. Communication between state and federal governments is not always effective and

the powerful role of the state government can slow down the process. But tigers play a very important role in Thai society and capture the public imagination. A participatory process is needed including use of “champions” to carry the message. HWC remains a problem and a strong commitment to working with communities is essential. A can-do attitude is a must!

**Box 3: CA|TS and IUCN’s Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas**

An update was provided on the links between the Green List and CA|TS standards. A comparison between the standards has been made and reviewed by the Green List Standards Committee. It has been agreed that the two Standards are basically compatible. The next step is to work at a country level to assess and develop complimentary processes; this may be possible in Malaysia or Bhutan.

**Box 4: Site-based integrated management software**

Khalid Pasha introduced a new software package that has been developed to support CA|TS. It has been field tested in Bhutan and Nepal and will be launched in May 2019. It is an automated, quantifiable system for measuring progress towards CA|TS at a site level, which also allows users to assess gaps and identify investment opportunities for donors. Information is presented on a dashboard, making interpretation simple and also facilitating input and updating of information. Information modules cover CA|TS itself, budget, tiger populations and a site overview. The system could be adapted to other species. Accompanying discussion focused on the degree of training that might be required for site managers to be able to fill in the data; and it was noted that the system has been designed to be as accessible as possible. Site-based data can be made available to reviewers and the CA|T International Executive Committee; but additional software may be needed to allow CA|TS to perform all the functions laid out in the CA|TS Business Plan to aid the smooth running and monitoring of CA|TS.

**Box 5: Making progress in South East Asia**

Matt Linkie gave a short presentation on tigers in Sumatra; a good example of effective conservation in South East Asia. WCS is supporting 30 patrol teams in five protected areas covering 10,000 kilometres. This has lead to a 163% increase in patrolling effort and a 71% decrease in tiger poaching rates. In Leuser there have been no tigers killed in retaliation since 2012 and the tiger population is stable but at low density; however the landscape is not likely to support high populations. In Bukit Barisan in the south the tiger population is rising. There is improving law enforcement success, with more poachers being arrested and more people being punished. 420 prosecutors and 181 judges have been trained; as a result poachers are getting an average of three and a half years prison sentences. Also anti-money laundering operations are increasingly successful.
SECURING TIGERS INTO THE NEXT DECADE

New deal for living with tigers towards 2030

A panel session and discussion looked at practical steps to advance the CA|TS programme and tiger conservation. Discussion focused on three questions:

1. What further information do we need to take forward CA|TS?
2. What funding model do we use: for instance a joint project of several organisations working together or a set of individual projects with looser collaboration?
3. What other initiatives does CA|TS need to integrate with, both in terms of practical conservation and policy initiatives such as the post-2020 biodiversity targets from the Convention on Biological Diversity?

The four panellists provided initial thoughts: Mike Baltzer (CA|TS), Sugoto Roy (IUCN and KfW), John Goodrich (Panthera) and Matt Linkie (WCS); then a general discussion followed. The discussion is summarised below.

Information: there was agreement that success in fundraising and political commitments depends on precise information relating to what is needed and how funds are used. This will ensure donors can be provided with a clear baseline, identified targets and ways of measuring progress. This should help in developing robust fundraising proposals.

Information needs include:

- Baseline information is still needed for some sites, covering habitat, tiger and prey populations and trends, ecosystem services and institutional capacity. CA|TS needs to be aligned with the GTF assessment of tiger numbers.
- Important areas outside tiger reserves such as key corridors and smaller areas.
- Existing funding per site, how funds are spent, whether conservation is successful, and if not, why not.
- Funding period; including where and when supplements to government funding are needed.
- Areas that may receive under-investment, over-investment, or duplicate investment, identifying funding gaps, mapping out high risk areas and developing detailed budgets.
- Where we need to invest; which places to focus on and how to prioritise. South East Asia is a likely priority.
- The focus of intervention, e.g. country or landscape level, individual sites or thematic areas (e.g. poaching, wildlife trade etc).

A rough figure developed drafting the CA|TS business plan was that US$200-300 million for the period between 2020 - 2022 was needed for about 150 key sites. Much of this funding is already in place but gaps and suitable interventions need to be assessed.

Funding model: a collective ask is powerful and reassures donors (e.g. as in the SMART partnership). This could include joint proposals through the CA|TS partnership, particularly to governments, and possibly joint approaches to several donors. The KfW model has shown the importance of coordinating investments across projects. The Government of Bhutan is currently Chair of the GTF and the CA|TS Council and can offer valuable experiences in the development of the Bhutan for Life funding model.

Ideally non-competing funds are needed and innovative funding models were discussed. This includes climate funds and initiatives such the Lion’s Share (see page 4). GEF 7 funding provides a good example of NGOs coming together to develop tiger projects. Privatisation of protected areas, following the African Parks model, is one area to explore. Pressure is also needed on governments to increase budgets and to feed tourism revenues back into conservation. In many countries funding has stagnated.

Integration with existing initiatives: The CA|TS Support Group members are willing to work together to further the implementation of CA|TS. It was suggested closer links with development organisation could also be useful (these might be invited to join the CA|TS Support Group). Working with existing bodies, such as ASEAN Heritage Parks and natural World Heritage sites, could be helpful particularly if these bodies endorse CA|TS and promoted sites registration. The new tiger centre in Bhutan could provide a vehicle for attracting and channelling funding.

The 4th Asia Ministerial Congress is being held in Malaysia in 2020. Coordinated by the GTF, the meeting provides an important opportunity for CA|TS to present achievements and future plans, perhaps at a separate session. A Green Investment Forum in Malaysia proved successful for snow leopards and something similar could be done for tigers.
Conservation Assured

Mike Balzer gave a short background on the evolution of Conservation Assured. Once the CA|TS process was launched, there was quite quickly interest in looking at the options for using a similar approach for other species, initially from ZSL regarding rhinos but latterly for other species, including jaguars, river dolphins and lions. Initial thinking was that IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) specialist groups might provide the conceptual thinking for this. Given the fact that CA|TS was still in development this was set aside for some time but has now re-emerged. Conservation Assured could also complement and link closely with the IUCN Green List, possibly as a subsidiary (see page 7), and/or the emerging IUCN Green List of species.

Various issues however need to be worked out including around governance of Conservation Assured standards, potential logistical problem if a site was registered for several species and how this would be worked out and capacity and funding to work on some kind of Conservation Assured umbrella programme.

Valeria Boron presented WWF’s nascent work on Conservation Assured standards for jaguars. Jaguars are found 14 countries and are currently distributed across about 51% of their historic range. Almost half the global population are in protected areas; and about half the total population (which is estimated at over 170,000) is in Brazil. There are distinct jaguar populations in different parts of the range and at the northern and southern edges they are threatened with extirpation. Habitat loss, poaching and human wildlife conflicts are all issues impacting populations which have decreased by between 20-25% over the last 21 years.

WWF works on jaguar conservation in seven transboundary and 10 national landscapes. In March 2018 several organisations assembled 14 governments to agree The New York Jaguar Statement, which sets out a roadmap for securing 30 priority jaguar landscapes (the Jaguar Corridor) by 2030. WWF is forming a small team and engaging many other organisations to develop Conservation Assured for jaguars. The aim is to develop draft jaguar standards in 2019, identifying test sites, set up an expert committee and launch the standards at the Protected Areas Congress in Peru in October 2019.

Nigel Dudley gave an overview of ZSL’s Rhino impact bonds. The concept was developed to investigate if the growing impact investing market could be a source of upfront capital to boost site-based rhino conservation. Impact bonds represent collaboration between investors and donors, where investors risk their profits and some of their capital to ensure that donor contributions are only used for successful projects.

Mike Hoffmann gave an update on the bonds. Scaling up conservation funding to enter into new sources of finance, including harnessing the power of private finance, is driving a change in approach to conservation in particular with a greater focus on measuring impact. The development of the Rhino bonds has been challenging as nothing quite like this has been attempted before. The development of the concept has been funded by UNDP GEF and the Royal Foundation of the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge and the Duke and Duchess of Sussex, and involved working with multiple partners including the SSC African Rhino Specialist Group. ZSL is focussing on 17 sites in Africa with high potential for rhino conservation. Sites need to be brought up to a level of investment-readiness; i.e. ensuring systems can provide investors with some level of assurance that their money is being well invested. This implies good monitoring systems, understanding of management aims and developing capacity on the ground. The level of information needed represents a huge amount of work and at present makes further roll-out of the concept challenging. Conservation Assured could provide a shortcut to addressing the capacity and monitoring assurance required.
Planning for the future

The workshop concluded with a brainstorming session of key events over the coming two years as an initial contribution to developing further capacity building and wider interest in CA|TS. Key events include:

2019
- May: CA|TS training workshop, Bangkok
- May: CITES COP, Colombo
- July: ICBB, Malaysia
- Late summer: Tiger technical meeting, China?

2020
- 1st half of year: GTF Ministerial meeting, Malaysia
- May: CBD SBSTTA, Montreal
- June: IUCN World Conservation Congress, France
- Last quarter: CBD COP 15, China

PARTICIPANTS

Natasha Ali, IUCN Green List; Mike Appleton, Global Wildlife Conservation; Mike Baltzer, Chair CA|TS Int. Executive Committee; Valeria Boron, WWF UK; Stephen Browne, FFI; Esther Conway, ZSL; Lobzang Dorji, Chair CA|TS Council; Dechen Dorji, WWF Bhutan; Nigel Dudley, Equilibrium Research; John Goodrich, Panthera; Mike Hoffmann, ZSL; Mohnish Kapoor, GTF; Matt Linkie, WCS; Julian Matthews, TOFTigers; Khalid Pasha, CA|TS Manager; Midori Paxton, UNDP (by skype); Sugoto Roy, IUCN-KfW; Mitali Sharma, University College London; Mahendra Shreshtta, Smithsonian; Heather Sohl, WWF; Sue Stolton, Secretary CA|TS Int. Executive Committee; Andrew Terry, ZSL; Stewart Thompson, Oxford Brookes University; Sonam Wangdi, Bhutan CA|TS National Committee; Monica Wrobel, ZSL; Madeleine Xavier, WWF; SP Yadav, GTF.

For more information on CA|TS visit the website at: www.conservationassured.com
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