



House of Commons
Environmental Audit
Committee

**Environmental Crime:
Wildlife Crime:
Government Response
to the Committee's
Twelfth Report of
Session 2003–04**

Tenth Special Report of Session 2007–08

*Ordered by The House of Commons
to be printed 25 November 2008*

HC 1213
Published on 28 November 2008
by authority of the House of Commons
London: The Stationery Office Limited
£0.00

The Environmental Audit Committee

The Environmental Audit Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to consider to what extent the policies and programmes of government departments and non-departmental public bodies contribute to environmental protection and sustainable development; to audit their performance against such targets as may be set for them by Her Majesty's Ministers; and to report thereon to the House.

Current membership

Mr Tim Yeo, MP (*Conservative, South Suffolk*) (Chairman)
Gregory Barker, MP (*Conservative, Bexhill and Battle*)
Mr Martin Caton, MP (*Labour, Gower*)
Mr Colin Challen, MP (*Labour, Morley and Rothwell*)
Mr David Chaytor, MP (*Labour, Bury North*)
Martin Horwood, MP (*Liberal Democrat, Cheltenham*)
Mr Nick Hurd, MP (*Conservative, Ruislip Northwood*)
Mark Lazarowicz, MP (*Labour/Co-operative, Edinburgh North and Leith*)
Mr Ian Liddell-Grainger, MP (*Conservative, Bridgewater*)
Mr Shahid Malik, MP (*Labour, Dewsbury*)
Mrs Linda Riordan, MP (*Labour, Halifax*)
Mr Graham Stuart, MP (*Conservative, Beverley & Holderness*)
Jo Swinson, MP (*Liberal Democrat, East Dunbartonshire*)
Dr Desmond Turner, MP (*Labour, Brighton, Kempton*)
Joan Walley, MP (*Labour, Stoke-on-Trent North*)
Mr Phil Woolas, MP (*Labour, Oldham and Saddleworth*) [*ex-officio*]

Powers

The constitution and powers are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally Standing Order No. 152A. These are available on the Internet via www.parliament.uk.

Publication

The Reports and evidence of the Committee are published by The Stationery Office by Order of the House. All publications of the Committee (including press notices) are on the Internet at: www.parliament.uk/parliamentary_committees/environmental_audit_committee.cfm.

A list of Reports of the Committee from the current Parliament is at the back of this volume.

Committee staff

The current staff of the Committee are: Gordon Clarke (Clerk); Anne-Marie Griffiths (Second Clerk); Richard Douglas (Committee Specialist); Oliver Bennett (Committee Specialist); Susan Monaghan (Senior Committee Assistant); Jennifer Steele (Committee Assistant); and Charlotte Towerton (Sandwich Student)

Contacts

All correspondence should be addressed to The Clerk, Environmental Audit Committee, Committee Office, 7 Millbank, London SW1P 3JA. The telephone number for general inquiries is: 020 7219 6150; the Committee's e-mail address is: eacom@parliament.uk

Special Report

1. The Environmental Audit Committee published its report on **Environmental Crime: Wildlife Crime** on 7 October 2004 as the Twelfth Report of Session 2003–04, as HC 605.
2. The Government's Response to the Committee's Report was published on 17 March 2005 as the First Special Report of Session 2004–05, as HC 438. On 11 November 2008 the Committee received a further memorandum from the Government updating the original response. This updated response is reproduced as an Appendix to this Special Report.

Appendix: Updated Government response

Introduction

1. The Environmental Audit Committee published its report on *Environmental Crime: Wildlife Crime* on 7 October 2004 www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200304/cmselect/cmenvaud/605/60502.htm. The Government's response was published on 17 March 2005 www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200405/cmselect/cmenvaud/438/438.pdf. A list of the Committee's recommendations and conclusions is annexed to this report (Annex A). A number of them need no further comment as they were addressed in the Government's response. This report summarises the progress made in addressing the remaining conclusions and recommendations.

Recommendations 3–7 and 26: wildlife crime and how it is recorded

2. The Government remains committed to tackling wildlife crime, and view it as deserving committed police resources. Defra and the Home Office both provide funding for the UK National Wildlife Crime Unit (NWCU), as the Government recognises the need for a centre of expertise and a coordinating point for intelligence and information to support law enforcement agencies. The National Wildlife Crime Unit was launched in October 2006 as a standalone police-led Unit, following the creation of the Serious Organised Crime Agency which took over many but not all of the functions of the former National Criminal Intelligence Service.
3. The UK now has in place a formal National Harm Reduction Strategy for tackling wildlife crime, which brings together all the statutory agencies involved in this area. Following a Strategic Assessment of wildlife crime across the UK, wildlife crime priorities have been agreed and are addressed through the Strategy, which has three distinct work streams; Prevention, Intelligence and Enforcement. As the Strategy develops there should

be noticeable improvements in the overall response to wildlife crime. An unclassified version of the Strategic Assessment is at Annex B¹.

4. Since April 2007, all police forces² have been recording wildlife incidents under the National Standard for Incident Recording (NSIR). The NSIR does not provide a comprehensive record of the extent of wildlife crime, but provides an overall picture and will enable trends and patterns to be identified. It should in the future substantially inform the NWCU's annual Strategic Assessment. Since April 2007, the NWCU has developed a database of all incidents of wildlife crime of which they are informed.

5. Some wildlife crime offences are 'notifiable' and as such are a part of police forces' regular and audited crime statistics that are supplied to and published by the Home Office.

Recommendation 8: internet trade

6. Global trade in wildlife is significant and, when carried out sustainably (and legally), plays a viable and important role in economies. However it is difficult to quantify the scale of the trade carried out via the internet and, in particular, how much of it is illegal. Given the nature of the internet, illegal trade in endangered species must be tackled internationally as well as domestically. Following a proposal put forward by the UK, decisions were made at the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) in June 2007 which seek to assess the nature and scale of the illegal trade on the internet and any measures or codes of conduct used in online sales. Defra is working with NGOs and the trade to agree such a code of conduct in an effort to minimise abuses and illegal sales. Defra also made a contribution of £15k to the CITES Secretariat to implement the relevant decisions agreed at last year's Conference.

7. The internet is an established means by which goods are traded, and although an acknowledged tool for facilitating criminality, is not routinely monitored. On the basis of the evidence available the assessment is that this would not be an effective use of intelligence resources as a stand alone priority. However the internet service providers, in particular E-Bay, have been made aware of CITES controls. The enforcement authorities actively investigate any illegal trade involving imports and exports and commercial activity on the internet where there is sufficient evidence, and these fall within the agreed NWCU enforcement priority areas.

Recommendation 9: Rights of Way

8. The Government has implemented its key proposals in "Use of mechanically propelled vehicles on Rights of way—the Government's framework for action", published in January 2005. Amongst other things it introduced legislation, through Part 6 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 (NERC), to extinguish, with certain exceptions, all existing, but unrecorded rights of way for motor vehicles over routes that are not part of the 'ordinary roads' network. This has the effect of reducing number of

1 Not printed. Wildlife Crime in the UK 2007/08 is available on Defra's website (see www.defra.gov.uk/paw/pdf/crime-assessment0708.pdf)

2 Except the MPS – not fully implemented due to technological constraints.

routes legally available to recreational, off-road motorists and removing much of the uncertainty about where rights for motor vehicles exist.

Recommendation 10: fish disease contingency plans

9. The contingency plan for Gyrodactylosis referred to in the Government response has been reviewed and was published on the Defra website in mid-March this year. Moreover, one of the requirements of the new aquatic animal health Directive—Directive 2006/88/EC—which comes into effect on 1 August 2008, is for Member States to draw up a contingency plan for emerging and exotic diseases. Work is ongoing on a contingency plan for these fish diseases. In the meantime, contingency plans for the serious fish diseases viral haemorrhagic septicaemia (VHS), infectious haematopoietic necrosis (IHN), and infectious salmon anaemia (ISA) have been developed and publicised. These, together with the contingency plan for Gyrodactylosis, will serve as models for the broader contingency plan for emerging and exotic diseases on which consultations with stakeholders will be undertaken.

Recommendations 13–16 and 31: legislative changes

10. The recommendations concerning legislative matters were considered at the same time as the analysis and evaluation of views received in response to the review of Part I of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (WCA). With reference to the Government's response to the report, in February 2007 the European Commission published its final guidance on the meaning and interpretation of key terms concerning the protection of species in the Habitats Directive. This has been a very helpful and important document to which the Government contributed, and covers the scope of our obligations as regards article 12 of the Directive and the issue of derogations from species protection provisions. Defra and Natural England have published a range of materials for stakeholders which draws upon the interpretation contained within the European Commission's guidance document.

11. The possibility of adding the element of “recklessness” to offences in Part I of the WCA was also considered and included in the public consultation exercise. It generated a variety of views. These were carefully considered during the passage of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act 2006 and on balance it was concluded that it posed a risk of criminalising many legitimate activities carried out without the intention of harming wildlife.

12. In August 2007, amendments were made to the Habitats Regulations to better reflect the terms of the Habitats Directive in relation to species protection. In particular, the majority of the defences originally put into the Regulations were removed. This included the “incidental result defence” which applied to acts which could constitute an offence but were the incidental result of an otherwise lawful activity and could not reasonably have been avoided. The species protection provisions contained within the 2007 Offshore Marine Regulations are consistent with this approach.

13. Although the timetable was demanding, adequate resources were provided to enable a number of important measures to be taken forward through the NERC Act, including improved protection for birds and new powers to help address the issue of invasive non-native species.

Recommendations 12 and 17: Marine Bill

14. Defra published the draft Marine Bill on 3 April 2008 for pre-legislative scrutiny. The draft Bill contains a range of measures designed to improve our ability to make long-term strategic decisions about activities in and protection of the UK's marine area. They include a new planning system for the marine area, streamlined arrangements for licensing marine development, improved ability to protect the marine environment and biodiversity and greater access to the English coast. The draft Bill also includes updated enforcement powers that will enable the Environment Agency to effectively enforce legislation managing migratory and freshwater fisheries; including the Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 and byelaws made under the Water Resources Act 1991.

Recommendations 19 and 20: role of Natural England

15. The Government made a number of improvements to the SSSI legislative regime in the NERC Act. It includes new mechanisms to help Natural England to better address damage to sites caused by third parties; a new offence of intentional or reckless destruction, damage or disturbance to the interest features of an SSSI without a reasonable excuse was specifically designed to assist Natural England in tackling unlawful off-road driving. Importantly the former requirement of knowledge that the land affected was a SSSI was removed. Connected with this, a new provision relating to the power for Natural England to erect signs and notices on and relating to SSSIs was matched by an offence covering their damage, removal or obstruction.

16. The NERC Act also provided enforcement powers for Natural England and Countryside Council for Wales wildlife inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State (in relation to England), or the National Assembly for Wales (in relation to Wales). These powers include entering and inspecting premises to ascertain whether certain offences have been committed; to check information or documents provided in support of an application for certain licences; or to check that a licence is held and that any conditions attached to it are being complied with. The Act also provides inspectors with powers to examine specimens, and to take samples in certain circumstances and for specified purposes. These powers are also extended to the Destructive Imported Animals Act 1932, the Conservation of Seals Act 1970, the Deer Act 1991, and the Protection of Badgers Act 1992.

Recommendations 21–24: role of local authorities

17. PPG 9 'Nature Conservation' was replaced by Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation' in August 2005. A guide to good practice on planning for biodiversity and geological conservation was published in March 2006. As indicated in the earlier Government response, the PPS recognises the importance of networks of natural habitats and states that local authorities should aim to maintain them by avoiding or repairing the fragmentation and isolation of natural habitats through policies in plans. Such networks should be protected from development, and, where possible, strengthened by or integrated within it.

18. The Government Circular 'Biodiversity and Geological Conservation—Statutory Obligations and their impact within the planning system' (ODPM Circular 06/2005 and Defra Circular 01/2005) was published in August 2005. It provides administrative guidance on the application of the law relating to planning and nature conservation and complements the national planning policies set out in PPS9 and the accompanying good practice guide

19. The most recent statistics on Development Control performance from October-December 2007 are:

- 70% of major applications were determined in 13 weeks
- 77% of minor applications were determined in 8 weeks; and
- 87% of other applications were determine in 8 weeks.

20. Within the new local authority performance framework authorities will be required to maintain these standards. Also the new national indicator 157 will require authorities to reach Development Control targets which will take into account current performance.

21. Planning Delivery Grant has been replaced by Housing Planning Delivery Grant for 2007/8. HPDG is worth £510 million over the CSR period split between Planning £194m and Housing £316m. HPDG is an incentive grant aimed at speeding up the production of core strategies, 5 year housing allocation sites, joint working and increasing the housing completion rate. Unlike PDG it is not aimed so much at capacity building in local authorities although as the money is unringfenced, it still can be used for this purpose.

22. In terms of capacity building since 2004/5 PDG provide 513 postgraduate bursaries for planning students, to help alleviate the shortage of qualified planners in the UK at present.

23. The Development Control element of PDG was worth £60m in the final year and this is not present in HPDG. However, the amendment to the Town and Country Planning fees regime which, came into effect from 6th April 2008, is estimated to raise an additional £65m per annum for local authorities which should cover the loss of PDG and help to maintain development control standards.

Recommendation 25: Control of Trade in Endangered Species (Enforcement) Regulations 1997

24. Defra updated the Regulations in 2005 to increase penalties for certain offences and are currently reviewing what further changes are required to reflect the most recent amendments to the Commission Regulations implementing CITES in EU Member States.

Recommendation 27: Police Wildlife Crime Officers

25. Decisions on how police forces' resources are deployed, including the number and training of police wildlife crime officers, are a matter for Chief Constables, who are accountable to their local communities and their Police Authorities.

Recommendation 28: Memoranda of Understanding

26. A Memorandum of Understanding has been drawn up between Natural England, the Countryside Council for Wales, the Association of Chief Police Officers and the Crown Prosecution Service. A number of regional partnerships exist between the Police and Natural England, which are currently being reviewed.

Recommendations 29, 34 and 41: the Home Office, Defra and the NWCUC

27. The decision taken by Defra and the Home Office to each contribute £150,000 per year for the three years beginning in 2008/09 demonstrate their level of engagement with this crime. This level of funding should enable a higher degree of enforcement activity flowing from the coordinating work of the NWCUC. Government officials will be working closely with the Association of Chief Police Officers (ACPO) and the NWCUC to develop better measures of outcomes achieved by the NWCUC, and the police service as they make use of NWCUC intelligence products—as the Home Office expects the police to consider properly a tactical response to NWCUC intelligence products and enforce the law on wildlife as with any other crime.

Recommendation 30: measurement of HMRC outcomes

28. HMRC's overall strategy is to deliver its enforcement role on the basis of risk and intelligence. In this regard HMRC actively monitors the level of seizures that are being made at the frontier to improve the overall effectiveness of customs checks.

29. HMRC has also, in collaboration with Defra and the NWCUC, drawn up a Service Level Agreement (SLA) which sets out roles and responsibilities for each of the Parties in relation to controls on goods covered by CITES legislation. The purpose of the SLA is to ensure closer working and collaboration to deliver an overall enforcement framework that is both efficient and effective.

30. HMRC is the lead agency to deliver the objectives of the UK's National CITES Priority Plan and is working closely with the NWCUC to develop intelligence profiles needed to identify potential targets. In addition, HMRC has allocated a dedicated post to the CITES Team based at Heathrow Airport to ensure that information flow and targeting is coordinated effectively within HMRC. In the financial year 2006/07 there were 446 seizures of specimens of CITES species (including derivatives).

Recommendation 33: Secondments

31. There are currently seconded police officers working with the Environment Agency, Countryside Council for Wales, the Forestry Commission, Natural England and Animal Health on wildlife and habitats issues.

Recommendations 36 and 37: communications

32. It is important to ensure that businesses and the travelling public are aware of the controls governing the import, export and trade in wildlife species of conservation concern.

33. Information on CITES requirements is available through the DirectGov and Animal Health websites. Defra are currently developing a coordinated communications strategy aimed at ensuring the travelling public is better informed about controls on the import, export and trade in wildlife species of conservation concern.

34. HMRC has been engaged in a number of publicity initiatives in relation to providing information to the travelling public. LCD screens in the new baggage hall at the new Terminal 5 at Heathrow Airport contain information about CITES controls. CITES controls are also included in the Importers and Exporters Guide and the UK Tariff that are kept up to date and managed by Business Link.

35. The PAW Roadshow travels to a number of country fairs and shows during the summer months reaching a potential audience of 1,000,000. The Roadshow has proved to be popular with members of the public. PAW has also produced a number of information leaflets about wildlife crimes.

Recommendation 39: horticulture (non-native species)

36. Government has recently concluded a consultation on the first proposed use of the power taken in the NERC Act to prohibit the sale of specified invasive non-native species and the responses are being analysed. With the support of key stakeholders, the three GB administrations have also developed an Invasive Non-Natives Species Strategy Framework for Great Britain which was published on 28 May 2008. As part of implementing that strategy the three administrations intend to raise awareness of the risks, and where appropriate, this will include the use of codes of practice such as that for the horticultural sector.

Police powers: further update

37. NERC strengthens police powers under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Police officers now have a power to enter any premises, other than a dwelling without a warrant where they suspect with reasonable cause that an offence under Part 1 of the WCA has been or is being committed.

38. NERC also extended the powers available under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 to police officers to apply for search warrants for the purposes of obtaining evidence, to the Destructive Imported Animals Act 1932, the Conservation of Seals Act 1970, the Deer Act 1991 and the Protection of Badgers Act 1992.

39. The Serious Crime Act 2007 provides for the Courts to issue serious crime prevention orders for certain environmental offences including COTES offences, and offences under section 14 of the WCA (introduction of new species etc.).

Other recommendations

40. A number of the Committee's recommendations and conclusions are not specifically addressed in this report (1, 2, 11, 18, 32, 35, 38 and 40). Some require no comment, others were covered in the Government's response of 17 March 2005.

Defra

June 2008

ANNEX A

House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee

Twelfth Report of Session 2003–04: Environmental Crime: Wildlife Crime

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The absence of an accepted definition of wildlife crime has, we believe, had a direct and negative impact on the public's perception of wildlife crime. (Paragraph 6)
2. It is unacceptable that those entrusted with the enforcement of our current legislation do not have a clear and agreed definition of the crime they are to police. Without an agreed definition of wildlife crime, which is shared and acted upon by all of those who work in the wildlife arena, we believe it is impossible for any real headway to be made in the fight to reduce the incidence of such crime. We call upon DEFRA, through the Partnership for Action against Wildlife crime (PAW), to lead a cross Government group to establish an agreed definition of wildlife crime, reporting back within the next twelve months. (Paragraph 8)
3. The Government must re-state its commitment to tackling wildlife crime. (Paragraph 9)
4. We see this refusal to accept wildlife crime as an issue deserving of committed police resources as especially short-sighted given the many links made between wildlife crime and serious and organised crime. (Paragraph 10)
5. Wildlife crime must be classified as recordable by the Home Office so that police forces across England and Wales know that sufficient priority needs to be given to tackling wildlife crime and so that they can allocate the necessary resources to this work. We accept that within this classification system there will probably need to be some form of grading of wildlife crimes to reflect the level of gravity of each crime. (Paragraph 11)
6. We believe that a centrally managed, national database which records all incidents of wildlife crime, as well as the details of all successful and unsuccessful prosecutions mounted, must be established as a matter of priority. The location of the database would seem to most naturally sit in the National Wildlife Crime Intelligence Unit (NWCUI) within NCIS. (Paragraph 13)
7. We understand that, at the present time, the NWCUI does not have sufficient staff or funding to allow them to take on responsibility for the creation and maintenance of a national database of wildlife crime. This must be reviewed by the Home Office and DEFRA as a matter of urgency. (Paragraph 14)
8. Given the advent of illegal internet trade, the links to serious and organised crime, and the threat posed by those who use this method to trade in endangered species, we believe that the level of resource allocated to this work by DEFRA is simply not sufficient and must be reviewed as a matter of urgency. At the same time resources within the NWCUI must

also be reviewed and the monitoring of the illegal internet trade in endangered species must be central to the tasking for this unit. (Paragraph 18)

9. The damage that mechanically propelled vehicles (MPVs), including 4x4s, can cause is not insignificant and we would encourage DEFRA to move quickly to close any loopholes created by the CRoW Act, either by amending CRoW or by means **of new legislation**. (Paragraph 22)

10. The Environment Agency and DEFRA are working towards publication of a contingency plan to tackle any outbreak of disease within the fisheries environment, and we welcome their stated vigilance with regard to fish imports and movements. We would like to see a firm commitment to publication of the plan as quickly as possible, at the latest by the end of this year. (Paragraph 24)

11. Any central record of wildlife crimes will only be as good as the information fed into it. It is vital, therefore, that all those who contribute to that database do so using consistent and comparable data. (Paragraph 26)

12. We support the work of the Environment Agency and DEFRA seeking long overdue amendments to current legislation which will enable the Agency to police waterways far more effectively. We urge the Government to ensure that sufficient parliamentary time is made available for these amendments. (Paragraph 27)

13. We believe it is essential that DEFRA, again working through PAW, and in conjunction with key partners across government, should establish clear and agreed definitions for those phrases in current legislation whose lack of clarity hinders effective policing and enforcement action. (Paragraph 28)

14. The number and variety of the suggested amendments to both the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, and other pieces of current legislation and regulation, prohibits us from referring to all of them in this report but we expect DEFRA to use the evidence provided to this inquiry in their review. (Paragraph 29)

15. DEFRA should re-examine all those sections of Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 which currently require intent to be proven and consider whether the word “reckless” can be applied when the Act is amended (Paragraph 30)

16. We would encourage DEFRA to include consideration of the issue of incidental killing or injury in the course of a lawful operation when it reviews Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. (Paragraph 31)

17. We look forward to seeing the draft UK Marine Bill currently being prepared by WWF-UK and would encourage DEFRA to work closely with WWF-UK on fine-tuning the draft and securing parliamentary time to take the Bill forward. (Paragraph 32)

18. This failure to recognise the true impact of a wildlife crime, and then apply a punishment commensurate with that impact, simply reinforces the notion that wildlife crime is “low risk and high reward” for offenders. (Paragraph 33)

19. We would support a review of the powers available to English Nature, and, at the very least, feel that it is vital that English Nature's officers should be able to stop and check vehicles they find on SSSI land. (Paragraph 35)
20. The move to an integrated agency provides an excellent opportunity for an essential review of the role, responsibilities and powers that at the moment sit with English Nature. (Paragraph 35)
21. The rate of disappearance of ponds from our countryside is a matter for concern and we would urge DEFRA to work with the ODPM and local authorities to halt this decline and, if necessary, provide adequate protection through new legislation. (Paragraph 36)
22. We believe that Local Authorities have a duty to ensure that any work they undertake is carried out only after due care and consideration has been given both to the possible impact on local flora and fauna, and in full compliance with their own legal responsibilities. (Paragraph 36)
23. Whilst we can appreciate the value of setting targets for the consideration of planning applications, they should not be so unrealistic as to rule out the possibility of proper consideration of all the pertinent facts, including environmental impact. The targets set for local authorities are now almost ten years old. The ODPM, in conjunction with local planning authorities, should revisit these targets and ensure that they allow sufficient time for all necessary checks to be made. (Paragraph 37)
24. The lack of resources to enable local authorities to fulfil their own statutory duties and responsibilities, in terms of conservation, preservation, planning and in tackling wildlife crime reflects at best a woeful ignorance on the part of those in charge and, at worst, neglect or absolute disdain. Local authorities still have a considerable amount of work to do to educate and train their own workforce on their roles and responsibilities. (Paragraph 38)
25. We urge DEFRA to ensure that no further time is lost and that the necessary amendments are made to COTES to allow the Police to deploy the additional powers provided by the Criminal Justice Act 2003. (Paragraph 39)
26. The absence of any clear, national view of the scale of wildlife crime has a direct impact on the ability of those charged with enforcing current legislation. If the scale and nature of the problem is not known it is unlikely that the correct level of resources can ever be allocated to deal with it. (Paragraph 41)
27. We believe that there must be at least one full-time Wildlife Crime Officer for each Police force. These officers must be fully trained in intelligence gathering. (Paragraph 42)
28. We would encourage Police Forces and those with enforcement responsibilities to consider developing Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) to enable them to work together for one off operations, identified through the use of intelligence, which will allow them to better target their limited resources. (Paragraph 43)
29. The apparent failure of the Police Service to take advantage of the NWCIUs work must be addressed by the Home Office and DEFRA. It is a nonsense to have the NWCIU expending time and resources on developing intelligence packages for police forces who have no intention of devoting any real resources to the crime themselves. This only serves

to emphasise the need for wildlife crime to be re-classified as recordable so that police forces feel compelled to address these crimes. (Paragraph 44)

30. Whilst we accept that intelligence is the way forward if there is to be any hope of matching resources to activity, we are concerned that the move to an intelligence led approach is not being sufficiently well monitored to demonstrate the benefits of such a move. We would, therefore, like to see a much more robust method of measuring outcomes being devised by HM Customs (Paragraph 46)

31. We are concerned that DEFRA do not have sufficient resources allocated to the proposed review of Part 1 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, which is due to commence with the publication of a consultation document later this year (2004). As a result, there is a risk that it will extend far beyond a timescale that would be reasonably acceptable to those who depend on this legislation. DEFRA must review the resources assigned to the review and also look beyond the review to securing sufficient Parliamentary time to take through the necessary amendments. (Paragraph 47)

32. Although the UK is not a source country for most of this illegal trade, we are one of the key transit and recipient countries, which makes the international focus of the work of HM Customs, NWCIU and organisations like TRAFFIC, WWF and IFAW of as much value to the UK as it is to the source country. (Paragraph 48)

33. We commend the work of both the North and South Wales Police Forces and the Countryside Council for Wales as an exceptionally good example of how joint working can benefit both parties and better tackle wildlife crime. More secondments of this nature should be considered. (Paragraph 51)

34. The role of the Home Office has been shown to be absolutely crucial in the fight against wildlife crime but their commitment has been sadly lacking. The Home Office must re-engage with wildlife crime. (Paragraph 53)

35. The very fact that PAW has a membership of around ninety we believe can be problematic and suggests to us that there is a need to review and perhaps rationalise the number of agencies, bodies and organisations involved in this area of work. (Paragraph 53)

36. We believe that dialogue with the general public has been rather hit and miss and, for the most part, the Government and, to a certain extent, those working in the wildlife community, has failed to achieve effective communication. (Paragraph 54)

37. We cannot accept the travel industry argument that to hand out leaflets warning their customers of the consequences of purchasing illegal products whilst on holiday will somehow reflect badly on the travel industry itself. This is clearly nonsense. The Department for Trade and Industry should engage the travel industry in discussing how best to get this, and possibly other important campaign leaflets, into the hands of the travelling **public**. (Paragraph 55)

38. We were encouraged by DEFRA's willingness to consider using the popular media as a means of communicating with and educating the public and would urge them to encourage programme makers to include useful information about relevant current

legislation and the possible impact of certain behaviour within the body of their programmes. (Paragraph 57)

39. We urge DEFRA to ensure that the Code of Practice for the horticultural sector is not simply an information leaflet to be ignored but that it has some requirement for compliance built into it which is then backed up by **a proper monitoring process.** (Paragraph 58)

40. We believe the “Get Hooked on Fishing” campaign has benefits to both the environment, the individuals concerned and the community at large. We would encourage other local authorities and police forces to emulate this campaign in their own areas and to use the same principles for other areas of wildlife crime. We commend the Durham Constabulary for their excellent work. (Paragraph 60)

41. We believe that the link between wildlife crime and other serious crimes, the clear and growing involvement of organised crime, and the increased reliance on the internet for illegal trade in protected species makes the argument for spending time and resources on this area of crime compelling. (Paragraph 61)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

The reference number of the Government's response to each Report is printed in brackets after the HC printing number.

Session 2007–08

| | | |
|-------------------|--|----------------------------|
| First Report | Are biofuels sustainable? | HC 76-I & -II (HC 528) |
| Second Report | Reducing Carbon Emissions from UK Business: The Role of the Climate Change Levy and Agreements | HC 354 (HC 590) |
| Third Report | The 2007 Pre-Budget Report and Comprehensive Spending Review: An environmental analysis | HC 149-I & -II (HC 591) |
| Fourth Report | Are Biofuels Sustainable? The Government Response | HC 528 (HC 644) |
| Fifth Report | Personal Carbon Trading | HC 565 (HC 1125) |
| Sixth Report | Reaching an international agreement on climate change | HC 355 (HC 1055) |
| Seventh Report | Making Government operations more sustainable: A progress report | HC 529 (HC1126) |
| Eighth Report | Climate change and local, regional and devolved government | HC 225 (HC 1189) |
| Ninth Report | Carbon capture and storage | HC 654) |
| Tenth Report | Vehicle Excise Duty | HC 907 |
| Eleventh Report | The Exports Credit Guarantee Department and Sustainable Development | HC 929 |
| Twelfth Report | Greener homes for the future? An environmental analysis of the Government's house-building plans | HC 566 |
| Thirteenth Report | Halting biodiversity loss | HC 743 |

Session 2006–07

| | | |
|----------------|--|---------------------|
| First Report | The UN Millennium Ecosystem Assessment | HC 77 (HC 848) |
| Second Report | The EU Emissions Trading Scheme: Lessons for the Future | HC 70 (HC 1072) |
| Third Report | Regulatory Impact Assessments and Policy Appraisal | HC 353 (HC 849) |
| Fourth Report | Pre-Budget 2006 and the Stern Review | HC 227 (HC 739) |
| Fifth Report | Trade, Development and Environment: The Role of FCO | HC 289 (HC 1046) |
| Sixth Report | Voluntary Carbon Offset Market | HC 331 (HC 418) |
| Seventh Report | Beyond Stern: From the Climate Change Programme Review to the Draft Climate Change Bill | HC 460 (HC 1110) |
| Eighth Report | Emissions Trading: Government Response to the Committee's Second Report of Session 2006–07 on the EU ETS | HC 1072 |
| Ninth Report | The Structure of Government and the challenge of climate change | HC 740 (HC 276) |

Session 2005–06

| | | |
|-----------------|---|----------------------|
| First Report | Greening Government: the 2004 Sustainable Development in Government Report | HC 698 |
| Second Report | Sustainable Timber | HC 607 (HC 1078) |
| Third Report | Sustainable Procurement: the Way Forward | HC 740 |
| Fourth Report | Pre-Budget 2005: Tax, economic analysis, and climate change | HC 882 (HC 195) |
| Fifth Report | Sustainable Housing: A follow-up report | HC 779 |
| Sixth Report | Keeping the lights on: Nuclear, Renewables, and Climate Change | HC 584 (HC 196) |
| Seventh Report | Sustainable Development Reporting by Government Departments | HC 1322 (HC 1681) |
| Eighth Report | Proposals for a draft Marine Bill | HC 1323 (HC 1682) |
| Ninth Report | Reducing Carbon Emissions from Transport | HC 981 |
| Tenth Report | Trade, Development and Environment: The Role of DFID | HC 1014 (HC 197) |
| Eleventh Report | Outflanked: The World Trade Organisation, International Trade and Sustainable Development | HC 1455 (HC 354) |
| Twelfth Report | Transport Emissions: Government Response to the Committee's Ninth Report of Session 2005–06 on Reducing Carbon Emissions from Transport | HC 1718 |