

Questionnaire EUFJE Conference 2010 – Enforcement of European Biodiversity Law at national level

Answered by Anna-Lena Rosengardten, technical judge of the Environmental Court of Appeal in Sweden

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

This introduction describes general Swedish legislation that is applicable to habitat protection, species protection and international trade. It contains parts of the answers to the questions I.A.3, I.A.5, I.B.4, I.B.5, II.2 and II.3.

In Sweden, the legislation on biodiversity is compiled with other environmental legislation in the Environmental Code.

The Environmental Code – together with ordinances issued by the Government - covers different subject areas and implements most parts of the European Union environmental law. For example the directives on environmental impact statements and assessments, environmental quality standards, IPPC-industries, waste and chemicals are all implemented by the Code and its ordinances. The Code also contains regulation on the subjects of this questionnaire; that is the protection of areas and species and thus implements the habitat-directive and the birds-directive. Since the CITES-regulation has the form of a Council Regulation, it has not itself been implemented in the Code, but there is completing legislation to the CITES-regulation in the Code, concerning for instance supervision and penalties. The Environmental Code, together with the Penal Code, implements the Ecocrime-directive.

The Code consists of 33 chapters. Some of them cover certain subject areas (such as waste, chemicals, GMO:s, the protection of areas and the protection of species), whereas others contain procedural regulation common for most of the subject areas (such as the demands on an application, the handling of matters in the environmental courts, the measures that can be taken by a supervisory authority, criminal offences and penalties and compensation for environmental damages). Thus, it consists of different kind of environmental legislation; administrative and civil as well as criminal.

The sanction system is the same for all three areas that are subject to the questionnaire - habitat protection, species protection and international trade. The system contains all three kinds of sanctions mentioned in the questionnaire; administrative and criminal as well as civil. The principles of the regulation in these parts will be described here. Further details are presented under each question below.

Administrative sanctions

The supervisory authority has extensive means to act when rules set by the Environmental Code or its ordinances are violated. All of the administrative sanctions can be applied on legal persons as well as private persons.

Injunctions (chapter 26 of the Environmental Code)

By injunctions the supervisory authority can prohibit an activity that does not comply with the rules of the Code, or demand for measures to be taken so that the activity can be accepted according to the Code. The supervisory authority decides if an injunction should be combined with the penalty of a fine. The level of the fine is set individually in each case. Generally, the use of injunctions (with or without fines) by the supervisory authorities is the most common way to handle violation of the environmental legislation in Sweden. It is used in a lot of different situations. An example is when someone (for instance a private person, a company, a municipality or an organisation) carries out an activity without a permit when this is required according to the Code. Other examples are when the conditions of a permit are not followed, when an activity is carried out that is forbidden by the Code, or when an activity in some other way does not agree with the Code.

The possibility for a supervisory authority to issue an injunction is regulated in the following section of the Code:

A supervisory authority may issue any injunctions and prohibitions that are necessary in individual cases to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Code and rules, judgments and other decisions issued in pursuance thereof.

The measures taken must not be more intrusive than necessary in individual cases.

To fully understand the section it has to be explained that the area of application of the Environmental Code is directly linked to the promotion of sustainable development. The Code is applicable to all activities or measures that are of significance for this purpose to be achieved.

If an injunction is not complied with, the supervisory authority may request that the Enforcement Service enforces the decision. As an alternative, the supervisory authority may decide that the fault shall be corrected at the expense of the person at fault. The supervisory authority may also request an environmental court to enforce the penalty of a fine decided in an injunction.

Injunctions can be appealed to an environmental court.

Withdrawal of permits (chapter 24 of the Environmental Code)

When a permit is required according to the act, there are also other administrative sanctions than injunctions. If, for instance, the conditions of a permit are not followed, the supervisory authority can apply for the permit authority to withdraw the permit and prohibit further activity. The same procedure can be taken if the application for permit or the environmental impact statement that founded the permit were incorrect or misleading.

The withdrawal of a permit can be appealed to an environmental court.

Environmental sanction charges (chapter 30 of the Environmental Code)

According to the Environmental Code and an ordinance under the Code, there is a special charge - the environmental sanction charge - that should be paid by those who neglect to comply with certain rules in the Code or rules issued pursuant to the Code. The supervisory authority decides on environmental sanction charges. The infringements that should result in a decision on an environmental sanction charge are stated in an ordinance, where the level of the charge in each

specified situation is set, too. The minimum environmental sanction charge is 1 000 SEK (about 100 €) and the maximum 50 000 SEK (about 5 000 €).

Only infringements that easily and clearly can be specified are considered to be suitable for environmental sanction charges decided by the supervisory authority, while infringements that are more complicated are criminalized and are prosecuted within the general court system. Typically, the environmental sanction charges concern formal matters, like having neglected to submit a prescribed application, notification or report to an authority.

Decisions on environmental sanction charges can be appealed to an environmental court.

Criminal sanctions (chapter 29 of the Environmental Code)

The Environmental Code contains a special chapter on environmental criminal offences and penalties. Most of the offences are only criminal if they have been carried out deliberately or through negligence. Insignificant offences are not punished.

The criminal offences described in the Environmental Code are applicable on natural persons. By a regulation in the Penal Code, there is also a fine penalty for business activities when criminal offences described in the Environmental Code are committed within the business activity. This kind of fine penalties range from 5 000 SEK (about 500 €) to 10 000 000 SEK (about 1 000 000 €).

Matters concerning environmental criminal offences are handled like other criminal offences within the general court system and not by the environmental courts. Within the Prosecution Authority, there is however an organisation with specialised environmental prosecutors.

The environmental criminal sanctions in general are used to a less extent than the administrative sanctions described above. A common opinion is that they are necessary to fortify the administrative sanctions, but that they are less effective in the specific case. The regulation on species protection and the CITES-regulation might however be an exception from this general conclusion.

There are no statistics on the use of neither administrative nor criminal sanctions applied to infringements concerning area and species protection and CITES-regulation. In a report from the Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention from 2007, the total number of reported criminal offences concerning the Environmental Code and its ordinances were around 4 000 per year. Of these, at the most 200 referred to area and species protection and the CITES-regulation. The statistics are very rough since they refer to an earlier legislation. The last figure is probably much smaller in reality since other kinds of criminal offences than what is covered by this questionnaire also are included.

The chapter 29 of the Environmental Code, which regulates the environmental criminal offences and their penalties, was rewritten and came into force the 1 January 2007. The regulation on the fine penalty for business activities came into force in 2006. The Ecocrime-directive is considered to be fully implemented by these regulations, and no further changes are planned.

If a supervisory authority reveals circumstances that might constitute a criminal offence, it is obliged to report this to the Prosecution Authority. The prosecutor decides if there is sufficient reason for prosecution.

Civil sanctions (chapter 32 of the Environmental Code)

The Environmental Code includes a regulation of compensations for environmental damages, which applies to damages caused by the pollution of water (including groundwater), changes in the groundwater level, air pollution, land pollution, noise, vibration and similar disturbances. The regulation includes rules about class action.

Although the regulation in this part also applies to matters concerning protection of areas, animals and plant species it has hardly any significant importance in the system for protection of these natural resources. So far, there are no known examples at the Environmental Court of Appeal, where civil sanctions have had a role in the protection of areas, animals and plant species. There have however - in connection to crimes committed according to the hunting legislation – been cases where persons that have killed animals of protected species, besides of imprisonment because of the crime, also have been ordered to pay damages to the state of Sweden. The first such case was judged by the Supreme Court in 1995 (before the Environmental Code came into force), and concerned the killing of two wolverines. In this case the damages amounted to 20 000 SEK (about 2 000 €) per animal. In another case, where a wolf was killed, the damages amounted to 40 000 SEK (about 4 000 €).

ANSWERS TO THE QUESTIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Natural habitats and their fauna and flora

A. Habitat protection

I.A.1. Are there general habitat protection measures, applicable to all special areas of conservation and special protection areas in your country, or are they site specific, or is there a combination of general and site specific measures?

There are general rules that forms the system for protection of Natura 2000-areas (the special protection areas and special areas of conservation), but the real measures of protection are set out in each case individually.

The system for protection of Natura 2000-areas is based on a demand for permit for every activity or project that is likely to have a significant effect on such an area. Normally, it is the regional authority that issues the permit. If it concerns plans or projects described in article 6.4 of the habitat-directive, it is the government that decides on permit. An application for permit shall include an environmental impact statement of the same kind as is required by the EIA-directive. The procedure for the permit is the same as for EIA-projects, and includes for instance public participation. If a permit is given, there are conditions connected to it. The conditions are set individually for each activity.

So the decision about an activity or a project can consist of two steps. In the first place it has to be decided if the activity or project is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000-area or not (that is if a permit is required or not). If it is considered likely to have a significant effect, it is in the second place decided – after an environmental impact assessment – if a permit should be granted or not.

The regional authority is responsible for establishing a description of the aim of the conservation of each Natura 2000-area individually. This description shall facilitate the decision on whether a permit is needed for different kinds of activities, and – if that is the case - if a permit can be given and on which conditions.

All authorities involved in matters that can concern Natura 2000-areas are responsible to watch that favorable conservation status is maintained or restored, but the regional authority has the main responsibility. In many cases this is done by deciding that a Natura 2000-area also shall constitute a Natural reserve. Such a decision is made by the regional authority or the municipality. In a decision about a Natural reserve, a number of rules are set out that applies to everybody; for instance the landowner, other authorities and the public. The rules are set individually for each Natural reserve. A plan for the maintenance of the Natural reserve is also set individually for each reserve by the authority that has made the decision.

I.A.2. Who supervises habitat protection measures in your country? Are there (also) specialized inspectorates supervising them?

The regional authority supervises the regulation on Natura 2000-areas. At the authority, there is a staff that is specialized in these matters.

If the Natura 2000-area is also a Natural reserve, the regional authority or the municipality (depending on which of them that made the decision) is responsible for the supervision of the rules set up in the reserve-decision.

I.A.3. If habitat protection measures are infringed, what type of sanctions can be imposed by whom? Are these sanctions administrative, criminal or civil in nature? What is the level of sanctions? Are those sanctions often applied and considered to be effective? Can those sanctions be applied on legal persons?

(See introduction.)

The supervisory authority, that is the regional authority, can impose administrative sanctions by issuing injunctions with or without fine. This can be done for instance if someone (a natural or a legal person) is carrying out (or is planning to carry out) an activity or a project that is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000-area without a permit. It can also be done if an existing permit or the conditions of the permit are not obeyed. The level of the fine is set individually in each case. Normally it is set so that it is less expensive to obey the injunction than to pay the fines.

If there is a permit with conditions that are not obeyed, the regional authority can also apply for the permit authority (the regional authority or in some cases the environmental court) to withdraw the permit and prohibit the activity or project.

There are no environmental sanction charges for this kind of infringements.

It is a criminal offence to carry out an activity without a permit if that is required. The level of the penalty is fine or up to two years imprisonment.

I.A.4. What type of sanctions can be applied if a plan or project as referred to in art. 6.3. of the Habitat-directive is carried out without an appropriate assessment? Makes it a difference if not only an appropriate assessment is lacking, but also a permit for the project or an approval of the plan?

To carry out a project or a plan without an appropriate assessment is in Sweden the same as doing it without a permit. The sanctions for this are described in the answer to question I.A.3 above.

Since the assessment process and the permit process are the same, the situation where an assessment is made but a permit is lacking would hardly exist.

I.A.5. Conduct falling under article 3(h) of the Ecocrime-directive shall, at the latest on 26 December 2010, be qualified as a criminal offence and be punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties. Has these provision already been implemented in your country, as the case may be, by pre-existing legislation? How is this conduct described in your legislation: copy- and past or a specific national description? What are the minimum and maximum penalties? Is there a difference between penalties for natural and legal persons? If such an infringement is reported, is it still possible not to prosecute such an offence before a criminal court and to apply other types of sanctions or to simply drop the case?

(See introduction.)

The conduct falling under article 3 (h) is not described by copy-and-past, but by a specific national legislation.

According to the chapter 29 of the Code, it is a criminal offence to deliberately or through negligence cause a significant nuisance in the environment, unless this is permitted by the competent authority. This regulation applies not only to Natura 2000-areas, but in general. The crime can be punished by fine or up to two years imprisonment.

Since a permit is required for every activity that is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000-area, a conduct which causes a significant deterioration of a habitat within a protected site (article 3 (h) of the ecocrime-directive) is not allowed without a permit. As described above, it is also a criminal offence to carry out an activity without a permit when this is required, and this can be punished by fine or up to two years imprisonment.

B. Species protection

I.B.1. Are the fauna (including birds) and flora protection measures organized within one coherent legislative framework, or through a patchwork of legislations, or is there a combination of general and specific measures?

The fauna and flora protection measures are regulated by the Environmental Code and its ordinances. In this case the Species Protection Ordinance is of special importance. It contains provisions governing capture, killing, taking from the wild, trade and other actions involving specimens of animal and plant species in need of protection.

Beside the environmental legislation, the hunting and fishing legislations are of importance.

I.B.2. Who supervises fauna and flora protection measures in your country? Are there (also) specialized inspectorates supervising them?

The regional authority supervises the regulation of fauna and flora protection measures. At the authority, there is a staff that is specialized in these matters.

I.B.3. Do the enforcement efforts concentrate on a few types of fauna, birds or flora? Are there some topics that gather all attention, all enforcement efforts? Is there an evolution through time in the focus of enforcement efforts?

According to the Environmental Protection Agency, that plays a comprehensive and coordinating part when it concerns the supervision, all potential species protection crimes are enforced independent of types of species. The opinion of the agency is that there is probably not enough systematic supervision and enforcement.

I.B.4. If fauna and flora protection measures are infringed, what type of sanctions can be imposed by whom? Are these sanctions administrative, criminal or civil in nature? What is the level of sanctions? Are those sanctions often applied and considered to be effective? Can those sanctions be applied on legal persons?

(See introduction.)

In principle, the same administrative sanctions as for habitat protection can be used (see the introduction), although the system for species protection does not contain any extensive permit-regulation. So injunctions (with or without fine) can be imposed by the supervisory authority.

For criminal sanctions, see the answer to question I.B.5 below.

I.B.5. Conduct falling under article 3(f) of the Ecocrime-directive shall, at the latest on 26 December 2010, be qualified as a criminal offence and be punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties. Has these provision already been implemented in your country, as the case may be, by pre-existing legislation? How is this conduct described in your legislation: copy- and past or a specific national description? What are the minimum and maximum penalties? Is there a difference between penalties for natural and legal persons? If such an infringement is reported, is it still possible not to prosecute such an offence before a criminal court and to apply other types of sanctions or to simply drop the case?

(See introduction.)

The conduct falling under article 3 (f) is not described by copy-and-past, but by a specific national legislation.

Animals (including birds) and plants that are protected are listed in an appendix to the Species Protection Ordinance. By the ordinance it is prohibited to kill or destroy animals and plants of all stages of life, and to destroy their conditions for life (the text in the legislation is more specified than this).

According to the chapter 29 of the Code, it is a criminal offence to deliberately or through negligence kill, damage, capture or disturb animals, take away or damage eggs, spawn, roe or nest, damage or destroy the breeding areas or resting locations of the animals contrary to the ordinance. It is also a criminal offence to take away, damage or take the seeds or other parts of a plant contrary to the ordinance.

The crime can be punished by fine or up to two years imprisonment. If the crime is serious, it is punished by at least six months and maximum four years of imprisonment.

II. International trade

II.1. Who supervises compliance with the CITES-regulation in your country? Do the monitoring efforts concern as well the import into and export and re-export from the Community as the commercial activities and movements of life specimens within the Community, your country?

The regional authority supervises the compliance with the CITES-regulation.

There are many other authorities involved when it concerns the CITES-regulation. The Swedish Board of Agriculture is the administrative authority according to the Council Regulation, while the Environmental protection Agency is a scientific expert authority, assisted by the Swedish Museum of Natural History. The Police and the Customs have got important roles in the monitoring.

The reports in the appendix below show a bit about the extent of the monitoring.

II.2. If protection measures are infringed, what type of sanctions can be imposed by whom? Are these sanctions administrative, criminal or civil in nature? Do they include the possibility of seizure and confiscation of specimens? What is the level of fines and prison sentences? Are the sanctions often applied and considered to be effective? Can the sanctions be applied on legal persons?

(See introduction.)

The Species Protection Ordinance does not only implement the habitat- and birds-directives, but it also contains other national regulation concerning wild animals and plants. In these parts a notification to the regional authority is required for instance for a public show of wild animals. A missing notification results in an environmental sanction charge (2 000 SEK, about 200 €). In some cases a permit is requested, for instance for some types of trade with listed animals and

plants, some for types of preparation of listed animals and plants and for zoological gardens with wild animals. In these cases the permit holder is obliged to keep a list of the species involved in the activity. If such lists are missing, there are environmental charges (5 000 SEK, about 500 €), like if they are too late (1000 SEK, about 100 €).

For criminal sanctions, see the answer to question II.3 below. The criminal sanctions do include the possibility of seizure and confiscation of specimens.

II.3. Conduct falling under article 3(g) of the Ecocrime-directive shall, at the latest on 26 December 2010, be qualified as a criminal offence and be punishable by effective, proportionate and dissuasive criminal penalties. Has these provision already been implemented in your country, as the case may be, by pre-existing legislation? How is this conduct described in your legislation: copy- and past or a specific national description? What are the minimum and maximum penalties? Is there a difference between penalties for natural and legal persons? If such an infringement is reported, is it still possible not to prosecute such an offence before a criminal court and to apply other types of sanctions or to simply drop the case?

(See introduction.)

The conduct falling under article 3 (g) is not described by copy-and-past, but partly by national legislation and partly by references to articles in Council Regulation no 338/97 on the protection of species of wild fauna and flora by regulating trade.

According to the Species Protection Ordinance, it is prohibited to keep for selling or to sell, buy or exchange species of birds that appears in the wild in Europe, and animals and plants listed in an annex to the ordinance. The prohibition concerns all stages of life of the animals and plants, and also articles produced from such animals and plants. A permit is required for trading with other listed animals and plants.

According to the chapter 29 of the Code, it is a criminal offence to deliberately or through negligence to for example move, import, export, keep, show, sell, buy or keep for sell animals and plants contrary to articles 8.1, 8.5 or 9.1 in the Council Regulation or regulation in the Species Protection Ordinance. It is also a criminal offence to violate a condition that is decided in a specific case according to articles 8.3, 9.2 compared to article 11.3 in the Council Regulation.

The crime can be punished by fine or up to two years imprisonment. If the crime is serious, it is punished by at least six months and maximum four years of imprisonment.

Appendix

CASES AND REPORTS ILLUSTRATING THE ANSWERS

The Environmental Court of Appeal tries cases concerning administrative regulation from the entire country. The total number of environmental cases is about 500 per year. This includes not only sanctions, but also for example IPPC-permits. The Environmental Court of Appeal also gets in touch with environmental criminal sanctions, but only from the Stockholm region (about a 1/6 of the area, but almost 1/3 of the population). The number of environmental criminal cases that are handled is comparatively small; at the most five cases per year. During the last ten years, perhaps two or three criminal cases have had connection to the protection of habitats, species or the CITES-regulation.

Cases that can illustrate the answers above, concerns mainly habitat protection. A large share of the cases at the Environmental Court of Appeal involves in some way Natura 2000-areas. A common question that the court has to deal with is whether an activity or a project is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000-area. Some examples of this are the following:

1. In a certain part of Sweden, the low-lying parts of the river Dalälven, enormous amounts of mosquitoes of a certain species occurs in case of flooding. These parts are also breeding places for different species of birds, and constitute Natura 2000-areas. A question in two cases at the Environmental Court of Appeal has been if the spreading of a biological biocide by helicopter is likely to have a significant effect on a Natura 2000-area, and thus requires a permit.

In one of the two cases the court found that considering the small area that was going to be sprinkled, the short time that the sprinkling would last (one or two hours) and the presumed low toxicity of the biocide, no permit was needed (according to the Natura 2000-legislation).

In the other case, a larger area was at topic and the number of occasions when sprinkling would occur larger. In that case the Court decided that a permit (with a complete environmental impact assessment) was needed.

2. A tower for the mobile telephone network was planned within a Natura 2000-area. Was this likely to have a significant effect on the area? In this case the court, after having visited the area, found that considering the size and location of the tower and the habitat that the Natura 2000-area aimed to protect, no permit was needed.
3. An association was planning to build a harbor for small boats in a Natura 2000-area and applied for a permit according to the regulation about building in water. The application did not contain an environmental impact statement that made it possible to assess if the harbor was likely to have a significant effect on the Natura 2000-area. The court found that the environmental impact statement would have to be completed at this point to make it possible to give a permit. However, instead of demanding for completing, the court applied

a rule in the Environmental Code that says that the environmentally best place should be chosen for each project. In this case the place could not be considered to be the best, since it was very important to protect the area. The application was rejected.

From the Swedish Board of Agriculture, the Swedish administrative authority according to the CITES-regulation, the following reports are fetched. They illustrate the quantity of seizures by the police and the customs, and the quantity of confiscations by the Environmental Protection Agency.

Seizures by the Police Authorities, 2008

Värmland	<i>Tridacna</i> spp (B)	81, unknown value	In an aquarium	Inspection, aquarium-shop
Värmland	<i>Euphyllia</i> SP, coral	20, unknown value	In an aquarium	Inspection, aquarium-shop
Värmland	<i>Catalaphyllia</i> , coral	11, unknown value	In an aquarium	Inspection, aquarium-shop
Uppsala	<i>Panthera pardus</i> (A)	10 packages, 25 euros in total	Plasters	Inspection, TAM-shop
Uppsala	<i>Hoodia</i> spp (B)	10 packages, 25 euros in total	Chewing gums	Inspection, Shop Alternative medicine
Uppsala	<i>Panthera pardus</i> (A)	8 packages, 20 euros in total	Plasters	Inspection, TAM-shop
Uppsala	<i>Hoodia</i> spp (B)	3 packages, 27 euros in total		Inspection, Shop Alternative medicine
Örebro	<i>Chelonia mydas</i> , <i>Soppsköldpadda</i>	One example, 40 euros	Mounted	Intelligence
	<i>Saussurea costus</i> (A)	Two packages, 3 euros/package	Part of plants	Inspection, shop
	<i>Saussurea costus</i> (A)	One package, 6 euros	Part of plants Part of animals, Traditional Asian Medicina	Inspection, shop
	<i>Moschus</i> ,	One package, 1 euro		Inspection, shop

Seizures by the Customs 2008

<i>Aquilaria</i> spp.	291	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
<i>Saussurea costus</i>	24	pcs	granular powder pack (MED)	
<i>Prunus africana</i>	60	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
<i>Panax quinquefolius</i>	0,25	kg	sliced root (ROO)	Airport
<i>Naja naja</i>	1	pcs	bottle with dead snake (BOD)	Airport
<i>Naja naja</i>	1	pcs	bottle with dead snake (BOD)	Airport
<i>Hoodia</i> spp.	80	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
<i>Panax ginseng</i>	0,526	kg	root (ROO)	Airport
<i>Hoodia</i> spp.	0,002	kg	tea-bag tea (EXT)	Airport

Hoodia spp.	300	pcs	pills (MED)	
Macaca spp.	2	pcs	ape skulls (SKU)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	90	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	120	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	60	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Hippocampus spp.	1800	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Scleractinia spp.	1	pcs	coral (COR)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	360	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	60	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	180	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Prunus africana	60	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Hoodia spp.	420	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport
Cibotium barometz	770	pcs	pills (MED)	Airport

Confiscations by Swedish Environmental Protection Agency 2008

2 clasp-knives with hafts made of ivory

1 Naja naja in liquor bottle

3 corals, Scleractinia spp.

180 capsules with Hoodia gordonii

1 wallet made of Python reticulatus

100 tablettes with Ephedra/hoodia

1 bag (246 gram) with ginseng roots

Above mentioned confiscated products have been placed at the Swedish National Museum of Natural History for information purposes. All products have been seized by the Customs.

1 coral, Scleractinita-Madrepোরaria

200 tablettes with Ephedra/hoodia

1 Naja kaouthia in liquor bottle

1 coral, Scleractinita-Madrepোরaria

1 coral, Scleractinita-Madrepোরaria

80 Hoodia-tablettes

526 gram ginseng roots

All these products have been seized by the Customs and been destructed.

1 skin of Eunectes murinus – placed at the Swedish National Museum of Natural History

1 Accipiter gentilis and 1 Accipiter nisus – decision for destruction