

Relevant National Legislation	Description	Activities related to the use of wild animals in tourism covered by the legislation: (a) capture; (b) captivity; (c) handling and welfare (d) fines / processes to support a/b/c/d	Relevant Enforcement Agencies	Max Sentence (Years)	Max Fine (USD)	Max Fine (BRL)	Exceptions
Federal Law 6,938, of Aug.31.1981 15 (The National Environmental Policy Act) and Complementary Law 140, of Dec.08.2011	National Red List of endangered species. Establishes principles, guidelines and instruments, the PNMA also created the National Environmental System (Sistema Nacional do Meio Ambiente - SISNAMA).		Brazilian institute for the environment and renewable natural resources (IBAMA); Chico Mendes Institute for the Conservation of Biodiversity – Chico Mendes Institute (ICMBio), associated with the				

			Ministry of Environment				
<p>Federal Law 9,605/1998 (Environmental Crimes) and Federal Decree 6,514, of Jul.22.2008</p>	<p>Decree 6,514/2008 was enacted to rule sections of Federal Law 9,605/1998, also providing on administrative infractions and sanctions. It also establishes the federal administrative proceeding to assess such infractions. Section 24 presents the administrative infractions that may be practiced against the Fauna. Besides considering killing, pursuing, capturing, using wild fauna specimens, native or in migration route, without due permit, license or authorisation from the competent authority or in discordance with the one obtained as an administrative infraction, the Decree also considers as an infraction the action of collecting a wild fauna specimen.</p>	a/b/c/d	<p>IBAMA; police from the 'Environmental Battalion' (Batalhão Ambiental); at the state level relevant to Manaus: the Institute for Environmental Protection of Amazonas (IPAAM)</p>	0.5 years	1,50 1.50	5,000.00 BRL, (per specimen) N.B max fine is conditional to spp being on National Red List (incl. CITES)	<p>Paragraph 2 of section 29, in turn, provides that in case of domestic guard of a wild species that is not considered in danger of extinction, the judge may refrain from applying the fine, considering the circumstances. This is a case of judicial forgiveness. Such provision aims to not impose penalties to the domestic/family uses e.g. as pets without commercial or business intent related to the animal use, provided that it is not in danger of extinction. The animal would still be removed by authorities to the appropriate rehabilitation centres (CETAS) or returned to the wild.</p>

<p>Federal Law 5,197, of Jan.03.196 7 (The Hunting Act)</p>	<p>According to its section 1, animals of any species, in any development stage, which live naturally outside captivity, being part of the wild fauna, as well as their nests, shelters and natural nurseries are property of the Polity, and their use, pursue, destruction, hunting or capture is strictly forbidden.</p>	<p>a/b</p>	<p>IBAMA; Police authorities; The Army (inspections)</p>			<p>(1) the first paragraph establishes an exception to this rule, stating that if regional peculiarities accommodate hunting activities, the permit shall be established by a ruling act to be issued by the Federal Government (2) IBAMA Normative Ruling 3/2013 allows the controlled hunting of the “European-boar” (<i>Sus scofra</i>). (3) The Hunting Act also has other provisions dealing with the exceptional possibility of hunting permit being given by the Public Administration. Section 13 states that the performance of hunting activities demands an annual, specific and regional permit. In turn, section 20 imposes the payment of an annual fee to obtain the hunting permit, whereas its sole paragraph allows tourists to obtain hunting permits for 30 days, also upon the payment of a fee. (4) The law doesn't apply to Indigenous peoples living on official Indigenous Lands (N.B.!) Even with permits, hunting cannot occur in areas with fauna, flora and natural beauty protection, or out of the designated hunting period, even in private property, as established by section 10 of such Law.</p>
--	---	------------	--	--	--	--

<p>Normative Ruling IBAMA 26/2002</p>	<p>Establishes rules for the sustainable use of Brazilian non-endangered native wild fauna, conventionally used by traditional populations in Extractive Reserves. Brazil has an extensive 'National System of Nature Conservation Units' (Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação da Natureza, SNUC) comprised of twelve classes which broadly fall under two categories, reserves gazetted for the protection of wildlife and those where the sustainable use of natural resources is allowed. 'Extractive Reserves' falls into the latter.</p>	<p>a/b</p>	<p>IBAMA</p>				<p>(1) The Normative Ruling does not indicate what uses of wild animals are allowed to traditional communities of Extractive Reserves. Such silence of that rule gives place to a possible interpretation that allows, in theory, the use of animals for entertainment and/or tourism purposes, provided that the requirements above are met (that is, the existence of a Technical Project duly approved).</p>
<p>Normative Ruling IBAMA 07/2015</p>	<p>Created and rules the categories of use and handling of wild fauna in captivity, and defined, within IBAMA, the authorisation procedures for such categories.</p>	<p>c</p>	<p>IBAMA</p>				<p>(1) Section 5 provides for the cases exempt from obtaining the necessary permits, such as enterprises that use exclusively domestic fauna specimens. (2) Sections 19 through 22, in turn, present the cases of regularization of pre-existing animals. Notice that the Normative Ruling does not allow the regularization of animals without proof of origin, in order to avoid the regularization of animals resulting from smuggling.</p>

Ruling CONAMA 394/2007	Establishes the criteria to determine the wild species to be bred and commercialised as pets.	a/b	National Environment Council (Conselho Nacional de Meio Ambiente – CONAMA) /IBAMA				(1) Section 3 of such Ruling provides that CONAMA should publish a list of species that may be bred and commercialized as pets, 'IBAMA's Pet list'. However, such entity has informed us that despite having performed a public consultation to define the species that would be in such list, such list has not been published yet.
---------------------------------------	---	-----	---	--	--	--	---

Supplementary table 1: Relevant Legislation