

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

First Session: 4 March 1992: 09h05-12h10

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli G. van Vliet
Rapporteurs:	T.A. Mulliken K.B. Stansell

The Chairman opened the meeting at 09h05 and reported that the Credentials Committee had accepted the credentials of a further seven Parties.

The Chairman of the working group formed during the fourth plenary session (to discuss documents Doc. 8.48 to 8.51) was invited to comment on participation in that working group. He noted that the Chairman of the Meeting had suggested that the group be open to all interested participants. Many had expressed interest in participating and the Chairman of the working group was concerned that it might become too large to be effective. He recommended that delegations not invited to participate refrain from attending, and that the EEC be the only observer to participate in addition to those named during the plenary session. The Chairman of the working group noted that the "Kyoto criteria" would not be discussed in detail and that additional observers would be invited to attend as needed.

The Secretariat announced that Argentina had withdrawn its proposal to include *Conepatus* spp. in Appendix II, and had requested that the Animals and Nomenclature Committees resolve taxonomic questions regarding this genus. Argentina had also withdrawn its proposals to include *Gymnocharacinus bergi* in Appendix I and *Schinopsis* spp. in Appendix II. With respect to the latter, a Memorandum of Intention had been signed by Argentina's national and relevant provincial Governments to establish a plan to manage the resource sustainably, and it was hoped that regional management plans would be developed with the Governments of Bolivia and Paraguay.

The Secretariat also announced that Denmark and the Netherlands had withdrawn their proposals to include *Gonystylus bancanus* in Appendix II.

XIII Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

8. Exports of Leopard Hunting Trophies and Skins

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 8.20 and noted a number of problems in compliance with Resolution Conf. 7.7, primarily related to the submission of periodic reports and the recording of tag numbers on export permits. It suggested that the Conference of the Parties consider whether it was appropriate to adopt special measures to ensure better compliance with reporting requirements. However, it had not noted any evidence of significant abuse of Resolution Conf. 7.7. The delegation of Germany supported the Secretariat and suggested that importing Parties refuse to accept any hunting trophy if it is not properly tagged, and the tag number noted on the export permit. The observer from Safari Club International concurred.

In response to a question, the delegation of Ethiopia stated that their export quota was realistic and that the requirement that import permits be issued before the export of leopard trophies had limited the number of skins that were exported.

The Committee concluded that:

- a) the Conference of the Parties should urge all Parties to be scrupulous in observing Resolution Conf. 7.7;
- b) all trophies and skins must be tagged and tag numbers put on the export documents; and
- c) the appropriateness of the quotas should be reviewed later during the meeting.

9. Exports of Cheetah Hunting Trophies and Skins

Opening the discussion of document Doc. 8.22, the Chairman noted that it contained no information. The Secretariat explained that it had been requested to place the issue on the Agenda, but had not been provided with a working document.

In response to a question from the delegation of Germany, the delegation of Namibia noted that they held a reservation on *Acinonyx jubatus* and had submitted a proposal to transfer their country's population to Appendix II with quotas.

Noting that without documentation it was not appropriate to discuss further the issue of cheetah hunting trophies, the Chairman proposed that the discussion be closed, the Namibian position being considered when their proposal for transfer with quotas was considered. This was agreed.

10. Trade in Specimens of Species Transferred to Appendix II Subject to Annual Export Quotas

Opening discussion on document Doc. 8.21 the Chairman noted that related information was contained in documents Doc. 8.25, Doc. 8.43 and Doc. 8.45. The Secretariat stated that this report had been prepared by the Secretariat in accordance with Resolution Conf. 7.14. It noted reporting problems by a number of Parties with export quotas, and stated that the failure to submit periodic reports, and in particular annual reports, was an infraction of Article VIII, paragraph 7. The Chairman noted that a number of Parties cited in the Secretariat's report were taking steps to improve compliance. The delegations of Australia and the United Republic of Tanzania supported the Secretariat's report.

The Secretariat noted that copies of export permits were voluntarily sent to the Secretariat by the Management Authorities of several countries with populations subject to export quotas, and that this facilitated trade monitoring and authorization of export permits. It urged all Parties to provide the Secretariat with copies of export permits issued. This was supported by the delegations of Australia and Zimbabwe but the latter noted that this was not a requirement and that Parties that did not choose to forward copies of permits to the Secretariat should not be penalized.

The delegation of Indonesia was asked to explain discrepancies between data in the 1991 annual report of their country and those contained in their ranching proposal for *Crocodylus porosus* and stated that they would provide this information in writing to the Secretariat for circulation at a later date (see Annex).

The Secretariat, in response to a question from the delegation of Costa Rica, noted that determination of appropriate measures to take in cases of non-compliance was the responsibility of the Conference of the Parties.

The observer from TRAFFIC commented that there had been problems with Indonesia's implementation of the quota for *Sceloporus formosus* and suggested that the Indonesian population of this species be transferred to Appendix I. He suggested that Indonesia consider submitting proposals to export this species under Resolution Conf. 3.15 or Resolution Conf. 7.10. The Chairman said that, while this comment would be noted, discussion of the issue should take place under the Agenda item on ranching and changes to the appendices.

The delegation of Kenya noted that the 1989 export figure for live specimens referred to in the Secretariat's report in fact related to 1987.

Concluding the discussion, the Chairman emphasized:

- a) it is most important that Parties are punctilious in reporting. Failure to submit reports, or to do so in time, is a serious breach of Article VIII, paragraph 7;

- b) none the less, the quota system has clearly had significant benefits;
- c) Parties should be encouraged to send copies of export permits to the Secretariat; and
- d) some individual cases would be considered by Committee II (under infractions) or Committee I when quotas were reviewed.

13. Detrimental Trade in Sea Turtles

The Chairman noted that no document had been submitted on this subject. The delegation of the United States of America, having proposed the Agenda item, stated that encouraging progress had been made in marine turtle conservation, particularly noting Japan's agreement to withdraw all but one reservation on marine turtles, and to ban imports of *Eretmochelys imbricata* in December 1992. The withdrawal of the reservations was applauded by the delegation of the United Kingdom, on behalf of the EEC.

Both the delegation of Mexico and the observer from Greenpeace thanked the United States of America for their efforts on behalf of marine turtles.

Japan was urged, by the delegation of the United Kingdom on behalf of the EEC, immediately to withdraw its reservation on *E. imbricata*. The observer from Greenpeace asked how the Government of Japan would be able to enforce a ban on imports without performing an inventory of existing stocks of marine turtle parts and products. The delegation of Japan responded that, although it intended to ban imports, it needed sufficient time to reorganize the industry reliant upon marine turtle parts and derivatives, and that removal of the reservation would send a very negative message to that industry.

The delegate of Mexico reported a number of steps to protect sea turtles in their country, including a ban on exports effective 30 May 1990, but that these were being undermined by continued illegal trade, including imports into Japan. The delegations of Brazil and El Salvador and the observer from Greenpeace expressed their support for Mexico's marine turtle conservation efforts.

Concluding the discussion, the Chairman noted that the numerous new measures by Parties to protect sea turtles were welcome, and that it was important that these were not undermined by continuing trade. The actions by Japan to ban imports of Ridley turtles, and to ban hawksbill imports at the end of 1993 were welcome. It was noted that Japan would lift its reservation on the hawksbill in 1994.

26. Guidelines for Evaluating Marine Turtle Ranching Proposals

The Secretariat's report (document Doc. 8.40) noted that IUCN had been unable to develop the guidelines. The observer from IUCN stated that a resolution had been passed at the 1990 IUCN General Assembly calling upon IUCN not to support any proposals for marine turtle ranching, and therefore it was not appropriate to work further on the guidelines.

The delegation of Suriname stated that Suriname had been developing a ranching programme for several years and that it was difficult to pursue ranching proposals without adequate guidelines. The delegation of Cuba proposed that the Animals Committee be directed to develop such guidelines, and this was agreed. The observer from IUCN said that the IUCN/SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group was preparing a global action plan, and suggested that the Animals Committee consult with the Group when developing guidelines for marine turtle ranching. This was also agreed.

19. Return to the Wild of Confiscated Live Animals of Species Included in Appendices II and III

The delegation of the Netherlands introduced document Doc. 8.56 and noted that there were a number of problems associated with returning confiscated live animals to the country of origin and to the wild and that reintroduction to the wild might not be the most appropriate solution in terms of either biology or the welfare of the animals confiscated. Furthermore, it was noted that the text of the Convention indicated that specimens were to be returned to the State of export or sent to a rescue centre or other place considered appropriate by the Management Authority holding the species and not necessarily the country of origin. The draft resolution annexed to document Doc. 8.56 was designed to address a number of these concerns.

After an extensive discussion of the difficulties of reintroduction of specimens to the wild and of the relative costs and benefits, it was agreed that the issue was too complicated to be resolved during the current meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The delegation of the Netherlands withdrew their proposal, and requested that the issue be referred to the Animals Committee which should consult with the IUCN/SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group and prepare a draft resolution for submission to the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. This was agreed.

15. Trade in Plant Specimens

b) Nursery Registration for Artificially Propagated Appendix-I Species

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 8.28 which had been prepared by the Secretariat at the request of the Plants Committee. The attached draft resolution and draft notification were intended to provide a nursery registration system that would facilitate trade in artificially propagated specimens of Appendix-I species. It added that the criteria included in the draft notification were preliminary, and that it was intended that the Plants Committee would further develop these criteria. An informal working group had met the previous day, and had developed suggested amendments to the text of the draft resolution.

The delegation of India supported the draft resolution. The delegation of the United States of America noted the complexity of the issue, suggested that there was insufficient time to discuss it fully in Committee I, and suggested that the draft resolution be referred back to the Plants Committee. They noted that the draft resolution would transfer some authority from the Parties to the Secretariat.

The delegation of Mexico and the observer from IUCN noted that it was important that a nursery registration system encourage, rather than discourage, artificial propagation.

There was some discussion of the appropriate schedule for the consideration of this issue by the Plants Committee and the Chairman adjourned the debate until the following session of Committee I.

The session was closed at 12h10.

STATEMENT FROM THE DELEGATION OF INDONESIA

In reply to the question raised by the delegation of Germany on the discrepancies in the data presented in document Doc. 8.21 on the export of *Crocodylus porosus* skins from Indonesia, we would like to explain the following:

1. The number of skins bearing 1989 tags exported in that year was lower than the total numbers of skins exported during the same year.
2. The difference between the export data presented in the 1989 annual report from the proposal might be due to the different sources cited. The 1989 annual report was likely citing the data from PHPA (the Management Authority) which is located in Bogor and Jakarta, while the data cited for the proposal were taken from FAO/PHPA Project, which was based in Jayapura. In the past, this caused some communication difficulties and created some confusion in the data management. However, nowadays, with the right direction from the Crocodile Specialist Group and the assistance of experts from Australia, the management of crocodiles is improving. The establishment of the Indonesian Crocodile Conservation Task Force will hopefully further improve this management.
3. Indonesia submitted its 1990 annual report last month. We hope that this explanation answers the question. Thank you.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Second Session: 4 March 1992: 14h00-15h45

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
Rapporteurs:	J.G. Barzdo K. Sundseth

XIII Implementation and Interpretation of the Convention

15. Trade in Plant Specimens

b) Nursery Registration for Artificially Propagated Appendix-I Species

In light of the discussion during the first session of Committee I and subsequent consultation, the Chairman proposed the following procedure. Firstly, the draft resolution in document Doc. 8.28 would be amended to take account of the comments made by the delegations during the first session and then circulated, together with a covering note of explanation, for discussion at a subsequent session of the Committee. Secondly, the criteria outlined in the Annex to document Doc. 8.28 would be referred back to the Plants Committee for further elaboration during its first meeting after this meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Thirdly, the criteria would be sent to the Secretariat once the Plants Committee had finalized them. The Secretariat would then submit the revised draft resolution with the revised criteria to the Parties for a postal vote. With support from the delegations of Japan and the United Kingdom, this procedure was agreed.

d) Plant Nomenclature

Opening discussion of document Doc. 8.29, the Chairman indicated that Committee I was required only to advise Committee II on matters related to nomenclature. The Chairman of the Plants Committee pointed out that the Nomenclature Committee had several taxonomic comments to make and would report these directly to Committee II. There being no further observations, the Chairman closed the discussion.

16. Significant Trade in Appendix-II Species

a) Animals

The Chairman of the Animals Committee introduced document Doc. 8.30, noting that since the last meeting of the Conference of the Parties some 150 species in Appendix II had been reviewed, 26 in detail, and several proposals to amend the appendices had resulted. A number of follow-up actions had also been recommended and the Secretariat would be reporting these to the Parties, which were urged to respond. The Chairman of the Animals Committee particularly sought the comments of Committee I on the procedures proposed for continuing work on significant trade studies, outlined in document Doc. 8.30. The observers from WCMC and the IUCN/SSC Trade Specialist Group gave further details of the study and the proposed mechanisms for continuing the work, emphasizing that the identification of Appendix-II species subject to significant levels of trade effectively revealed a failure to implement the provisions of Article IV of the Convention. Subsequent speakers agreed with this point.

The delegations of Australia, Bolivia, Germany, the United Kingdom and Zimbabwe welcomed the report and strongly supported the recommendations for continuing the review. The delegation of the United Kingdom suggested however that the use of the output of this review might best be addressed in the draft resolution annexed to document Doc. 8.35. The delegation of the United States of America felt that emphasis should be put on the field studies, on developing appropriate sources of funding for such studies and on implementing remedial measures for deleteriously affected species.

The Chairman concluded that the report was noted by the Committee which agreed to the recommended procedures for future work. He highlighted in particular the need for ongoing significant trade reviews in order to alert Parties, through the Secretariat, to problems as they arise and the need for field studies on species for which there is little or no information on the impact of trade so that countries of origin could manage their resources effectively.

b) Plants

The observer from WCMC introduced document Doc. 8.31 and noted that this was the first time that a review of significant trade in plants had been made.

The Chairman of the Plants Committee invited representatives of the countries named in the report's recommendations to discuss them with him and reported that recommendations 6 b) and 6 c) from the report had been dealt with in a draft resolution prepared by the Nomenclature Committee. The Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee confirmed this.

In the discussion which followed, the delegations of Algeria, Botswana, Germany, India, Malawi, Mexico, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and Zimbabwe congratulated WCMC on its excellent report and welcomed the fact that more attention was being paid to plants in CITES. The main points which emerged and which were agreed were: that the report was valuable and was noted by the Committee; that much information about the status of species was lacking; that better monitoring and reporting of the trade in plants was necessary; that national institutions needed to be involved in monitoring plant trade; that greater co-operation between Parties was required to control the illegal trade; and that the Plants Committee and the Plants Officer of the Secretariat should take up the recommendations from the report as a guide to their future work.

21. Marking of Specimens

The delegation of Australia introduced document Doc. 8.33, which had resulted from discussions in the Animals Committee working in consultation with the IUCN/SSC Captive Breeding Specialist Group. They stressed the need to amend the draft resolution to indicate that a universally compatible system of electronic marking should be used. The observer from the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums suggested that, in the draft resolution, the words "captive-bred" in paragraph 4 of the preamble and in paragraphs a) and c) of the operative part be deleted and that the words of species identified according to advice from the IUCN/SSC Captive Breeding Specialist Group be appended to paragraph a).

The delegations of Belgium and New Zealand expressed concerns about the incompatibility of various electronic marking systems. The delegation of Portugal, on behalf of the countries of the EEC, echoed this concern whilst supporting the spirit of the draft resolution. The delegation of Switzerland concurred and drew attention to several practical difficulties, including the need for a system that would not be rapidly outdated, the expense of the apparatus required, the disagreement on the appropriate location in an animal to place a microchip and the problems of reading transponders implanted in dangerous animals. They suggested that further developments in the technology be awaited and that meanwhile other marking systems be used.

In agreeing, the delegation of Zimbabwe believed that the Australian proposal was more restrictive than envisaged by Article VI, paragraph 7, of the Convention, a view shared by the delegation of Algeria. The observer from the International Association of Falconry and Conservation of Birds of Prey was concerned that electronic marking of birds of prey would be more sophisticated and expensive than was warranted by the risks of fraud.

The delegation of El Salvador agreed that the cost of the apparatus was high and the delegation of the United States of America stated that they would recommend to the Budget Committee the provision of the necessary funds to purchase electronic readers for countries which could not otherwise afford them.

The delegation of Australia proposed the following addition to the operative part of the draft resolution: urges all manufacturers of transponders to strive towards the production of compatible equipment that could be applied universally. At the suggestion of the Chairman, they agreed to consult with those who had made interventions and to propose an amended draft resolution to a subsequent session of the Committee.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 15h45.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Third Session: 5 March 1992: 09h10-12h15

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
Rapporteurs:	C.H. Folland R.A. Luxmoore

The Chairman opened the session at 09h10. The Secretariat, referring to the speech delivered in the fourth plenary session by Dr Tolba, drew attention to the immense support that the professional officers of the Secretariat received from the administrative and secretarial staff.

The Chairman, to applause from the Parties, expressed appreciation to the City and Prefecture of Kyoto for the magnificent hospitality accorded at the reception on the previous evening.

At the invitation of the Chairman, the delegation of Japan reported that a consignment of 372.3 kg of raw ivory had been seized on 28 February by the Japanese authorities, in goods declared to have been shipped from South Africa and that the matter was under investigation. The delegation of South Africa pledged their country's assistance.

XIII Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

24. Role of the Scientific Authority

The delegation of the United States of America, introducing document Doc 8.37, paid tribute to the Secretariat's success in urging the Parties to identify their Scientific Authorities. They said that only by the proper implementation of the responsibilities of Scientific Authorities could Article IV of the Convention be implemented successfully and that there were other functions which needed to be identified. Two amendments to document Doc. 8.37 were necessary: the insertion of ,3 after the second "2(a)" in line 2, paragraph 2, page 7; and the revision of the last line of paragraph i), on page 8, to read ...specimens to maintain each species throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystems in which it occurs and well above the level at which the species might become eligible for inclusion in Appendix I;

The delegation of Germany congratulated the delegation of the United States of America on producing an important document and emphasized the concern of the Convention with broader aspects of ecological systems. The Chairman believed it adequate to reflect this in the draft resolution without embodying it in the text of document Doc. 8.37.

The delegation of Kenya suggested that monetary savings could be made by several Parties sharing the same Scientific Authority, and they asked whether this was permissible under the Convention. The delegation of Switzerland confirmed that such an arrangement already existed between their country and Liechtenstein; Article IX required each Party to designate one or more Scientific Authorities but this did not prevent two Parties from designating the same Authority. The delegation of El Salvador suggested the creation of multi-disciplinary Scientific Authorities.

Although recognizing the value of some parts of the draft resolution, the delegation of Botswana requested that it be withdrawn. They expressed concern over the implications of paragraph d), believing it would burden the Secretariat

and that trade moratoria were inappropriate, and of paragraphs g) and h) on the grounds that they vested in the importing countries the responsibilities of the exporting countries. In this they were supported by the delegation of Zimbabwe who stressed the principle of adaptive management as practised in their rural communities. They regretted that the document appeared to reflect the frustration of developed countries with the shortcomings of the developing world.

The observer from Safari Club International echoed several of these sentiments and was further concerned that failure to notify the Secretariat of the appointment of a Scientific Authority was not an infraction, contrary to the implication of paragraph a).

The delegations of China and India and the delegation of Portugal on behalf of the EEC supported the draft resolution as presented.

The delegations of Bolivia and Mexico foresaw difficulties with paragraph f) because of the requirement to assess the ecological impact of the harvest; there were particular difficulties for countries, such as their own, with high biodiversity. They believed the Convention should be concerned primarily with species, not ecosystem conservation.

Adoption of the draft resolution would, in the view of the delegation of Guyana, cause their country to withdraw from the Convention. Although their wildlife trade was strictly controlled under a quota system, resources were not available to carry out the assessments that would be required.

The delegation of Algeria suggested that a working group be established in order to consolidate the text of the draft resolution. They felt it unnecessary to seek advice from a Scientific Authority in all cases, believing the views of the Management Authority to be sufficient in straightforward cases.

The Chairman cautioned against adopting any recommendations which would be contrary to the Convention. The Secretariat further highlighted a problem experienced in some Latin American countries where delays were caused by the need for ministerial decrees to establish Scientific Authorities.

The observer from IUCN welcomed the draft resolution and offered IUCN's support for its implementation. He was joined by the observer from TRAFFIC in feeling that several issues required resolution in a working group. The observer from Earthtrust hoped that mechanisms for assisting developing countries and guidelines for the education and experience necessary for Scientific Authorities would be taken into consideration.

The observer from the Zimbabwe Trust expressed the view that implementing paragraphs g) and h) of the draft resolution would be costly to rural communities.

The delegation of the United States of America expressed gratitude for the helpful comments offered for the improvement of the draft resolution which, they hoped, would focus on paragraph c), making use of innovative solutions such as those suggested by the delegation of Kenya.

The Chairman summarised six points from the discussion:

1. There was wide support in principle for the need to clarify the role of Scientific Authorities, emphasizing that they were fundamental to the implementation of CITES;
2. Not all Parties have the necessary resources to establish Scientific Authorities, particularly those countries rich in biodiversity;
3. Administrative systems in some countries make it difficult to establish Scientific Authorities;
4. The Convention is concerned with trade in species but this is framed in the context of their role in the ecosystem, thus increasing the amount of information which needs to be considered;
5. Scientific expertise needs to be strengthened and the possibility of joint Scientific Authorities should be explored;
6. A working group should be established to reach a consensus on the draft resolution, paying particular attention to paragraphs d), f), g) and h) and taking care to ensure conformity with the Convention.

He suggested that the working group be convened by the delegation of the United States of America, with representation from the delegations of Algeria, Botswana, Germany, Kenya, Mexico, Zimbabwe and from IUCN.

The Chairman reported that the Credentials Committee had accepted the credentials of one additional delegation.

25. Proposals to Register the First Commercial Captive-Breeding Operation for an Appendix-I Animal Species

a) Format and Criteria

The delegation of Canada introduced document Doc. 8.38 on behalf of the Animals Committee, explaining that it had been requested at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties and represented a revision of Resolutions Conf. 2.12, Conf. 4.15, Conf. 6.20 and Conf. 7.10. They pointed out that the chief difference introduced by the draft resolution was that the approval for the first captive-breeding operation for a species would be given by the Secretariat rather than by the Conference of the Parties. There was also a new provision for returning profits to benefit wild populations.

The delegation of France, speaking on behalf of the countries of the EEC, was grateful for the clarification provided by the draft resolution as the existing controls were becoming increasingly difficult to implement. They requested that the requirement for approval by a two-thirds majority be retained and noted that the requirements for marking imposed by Resolution Conf 6.21, paragraph h), should be re-inserted, possibly at paragraph b) of Annex 4. They considered that the title of Annex 4 should be changed to "Role of the Parties" and that a new annex on the role of the Conference of the Parties might be required. The observers from the World Society for the Protection of Animals and Greenpeace agreed.

The delegation of Germany suggested appending to paragraph g), on page 2 of document Doc 8.38 Annex, the words or other adequate marking techniques, for example microchips and adding to the first line of paragraph j), after "involves", the words under exceptional circumstances.

The delegation of Mexico was concerned that the draft resolution contained no requirement that breeding facilities should be established in consultation with the country of origin nor that founder stock should have been legally acquired. They observed that non-range States would have an unfair advantage in that they would bear no responsibility for conserving the wild habitat. These concerns were echoed by the delegations of Cuba and the Dominican Republic who observed that the benefits of captive-breeding often accrued to countries other than those where the species originated.

The observer from the Center for Marine Conservation agreed that the draft resolutions required modification, adding that document Doc. 8.38 did not provide sufficient oversight and that the process for the removal of species from the register should be comparable to that for their inclusion. She suggested that the Secretariat should be notified of each request and that, if any Party objected, the decision should be made at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The observer from the International Association for Falconry and the Conservation of Birds of Prey drew attention to the differing provisions of the Convention relating to animals bred for commercial purposes and those bred as a hobby. He suggested reflecting in the preamble of Doc. 8.38 Annex that most birds of prey are bred as a hobby, and that the words except when the operation is non-commercial be added to paragraph b) in Annex 4.

The observer from TRAFFIC indicated the need to cross-reference the main draft resolution and its annexes.

The delegation of Zimbabwe was concerned that the draft resolution did not reflect the requirements of particular species groups, notably crocodiles.

The delegation of Australia was anxious that this draft resolution be adopted at the present meeting. They proposed the deletion of the last three words of paragraph j) on page 2 of document Doc. 8.38 Annex, to recognize that the survival of several very rare species depended on captive breeding.

A number of amendments were suggested by the delegation of Algeria, who questioned the exemption granted to existing operations by paragraph e) on page 2 of document Doc. 8.38 Annex, and who identified a greater need for the marking of products.

The Chairman observed that there was a general feeling that the draft resolution be adopted but that it required a number of modifications. He highlighted the feeling that a vote of the Conference of the Parties was necessary for the first registration of a captive-breeding operation for each species, that consultation with countries of origin was essential and that founding breeding-stock must have been obtained legally. He suggested that the delegation of Canada convene a working group with the participation of the delegations of Australia, France, Germany and Mexico and observers from IUCN and TRAFFIC to reach a consensus on these matters.

b) Consideration of Proposals

The Secretariat announced that the proposals submitted by the Philippines had been withdrawn several weeks ago.

Panthera tigris altaica (Breeding Centre for Felidae Animals of Hengdaohezi, China)

The delegation of China introduced their proposal, noting that a lack of funds threatened the Centre's continued existence.

The observer from WWF reported that the Centre was successful but pointed out that the sale of derivatives might facilitate illegal trade in parts and products of wild-caught animals. He also questioned the genetic purity of the stock intended for release and whether sufficient prey was available and this was reiterated by the delegation of Bolivia. These concerns were shared by the observer from TRAFFIC who, speaking also for IUCN, suggested that the extreme rarity of the taxon debarred it from registration [under the criteria in paragraph a) ii) of Resolution Conf. 7.10]. She invited the delegation of China to provide information on current stocks of pre-Convention tiger products and recent exports.

The delegations of Kenya and the United States of America and the observer from the International Wildlife Coalition spoke of similar concerns.

The delegation of China responded, noting that no tigers had been taken from the wild since 1960 and that the population, though small, was stable. The process of registering stocks of pre-Convention products had started in 1985 and should be completed within one year. The marking of skins was easy but that of bones extremely difficult because of their small size. Financial assistance was requested from international organizations to fund the Centre.

The delegations of Australia, Japan and Zimbabwe supported the proposal, suggesting that the Secretariat consult with the delegation of China to resolve some of the difficulties. The delegation of Zimbabwe suggested that feeding the tigers tetracycline could solve the problem of marking bones. The delegations of Algeria, Germany, Israel and the United States of America considered that the problems should be resolved before the proposal was approved.

The Chairman proposed that additional discussion should be deferred until the Secretariat had had the opportunity to consult further with delegates on this issue.

Alligator sinensis (Anhui Research Centre of Chinese Alligator Reproduction, China)

In introducing their proposal, the delegation of China noted that income from the sale of products would be used to benefit the conservation of the species.

The delegation of Germany enquired which products were to be marketed, noting that the skins were of little value and that live animals would require careful marking as they would have a high value in Europe.

The observer from IUCN, the Chairman of the Crocodile Specialist Group (CSG), reported that the representatives of the CSG who had visited China had been surprised at the success of the operation. They had no hesitation in supporting the proposal. This view was shared by the delegations of Australia, Bolivia, Botswana, Cuba, Kenya, Nepal and the United States of America, the latter querying the strategy for preventing in-breeding. To a question from the delegation of Canada about the marking system to be used, the observer from IUCN responded by undertaking to work with the delegation of China to resolve the issue. The delegation of Algeria noted that the process of review by IUCN had facilitated the task of Committee I.

The Chairman, seeing no objections, noted that the proposal was recommended to the Conference of the Parties for approval.

The meeting was adjourned at 12h15.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Fourth Session: 5 March 1992: 14h10-15h50

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
Rapporteurs:	J.R. Caldwell T.A. Mulliken

XIII Implementation and Interpretation of the Convention

25. Proposals to Register the First Commercial Captive-Breeding Operation for an Appendix-I Animal Species

b) Consideration of Proposals

Panthera tigris altaica (Breeding Centre for Felidae Animals of Hengdaohezi, China)

The Chairman opened the meeting at 14h10. At the invitation of the Chairman, the delegation of China announced that they were withdrawing their proposal to register the first commercial captive-breeding operation for *Panthera tigris altaica* but, after further review, would submit a revised proposal to the Secretariat. They thanked the Secretariat and the IUCN Cat Specialist Group for their helpful comments on this proposal.

Amazona leucocephala (Janeczek's Parrot Breeding Farm, Germany)

The delegation of Germany introduced their proposal for *Amazona leucocephala*, noting the error in the title indicating that the entire species was covered by the proposal, and adding that the subspecies under consideration was not endangered. Breeding information contained in the proposal was summarised, and it was noted that German authorities had consulted those of Czechoslovakia concerning the origin of the founder stock before import. The delegation of Germany stated that all birds would be marked with transponders, and that it was very unlikely that illegal trade would result from registration of the facility.

The Secretariat noted that many specimens of this subspecies had been smuggled into Europe and commented that, unless there was proof to the contrary, the origin of all specimens must therefore be considered suspect. The delegation of Cuba, while noting that some recovery had taken place owing to conservation programmes, considered the subspecies to be threatened, and believed that there were insufficient guarantees to ensure that registration of a captive-breeding facility would not result in increased smuggling. They therefore opposed the proposal. Concern regarding the similarity of appearance of *A. l. leucocephala* and other, more endangered, subspecies was expressed by the observer from the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums.

The Secretariat said that the proposal provided insufficient information on the breeding programme, and the delegation of Australia expressed concern regarding how the captive stock was to be managed and augmented. Questions regarding whether there was sufficient information to demonstrate that the species was reliably bred to the F2 generation were raised by the delegations of Canada and the United States of America.

The delegation of Germany agreed that the Government of Cuba had the main responsibility for protecting the subspecies, but added that they did not believe that the breeding operation posed a risk to Cuba's wild population. Although they believed that the proposal provided sufficient information to demonstrate reliable breeding to the F2 generation, they agreed to withdraw it and to submit a revised proposal following elaboration of breeding and management information.

Diceros bicornis (National Captive Breeding Centre for Black Rhino, Zimbabwe)

The delegation of Zimbabwe requested that the registration proposal for *Diceros bicornis* be considered in conjunction with the amendment proposal for this species, and this was agreed.

The Chairman announced that the delegations of Denmark and the Netherlands had withdrawn their proposals to list *Intsia* spp. in Appendix II, and that they would explain their decision to the Committee at a later time. He further presented the following statements at the request of the delegations named:

Statement of Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zimbabwe

"Recognizing the serious implications for CITES, the Southern African countries of Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zimbabwe wish to indicate that they have come to this meeting with a willingness to compromise in regard to the elephant issue. Essentially the four States are willing to consider a voluntary moratorium for a reasonable period which would allow time to put in place a trading system that would not encourage any illegal opportunities for ivory trading. However, in the interests of being able to manage their elephants wisely, they are still seeking a downlisting to Appendix II of the elephant populations in the countries concerned."

South Africa Statement on Ivory Trading

"With reference to the South African proposal to list its elephant population in Appendix II, South Africa wishes to bring to the attention of the delegates to this meeting of the Conference of the Parties that: subject to the acceptance of the proposal, in recognition of the continued sincere concern over the possible negative effects of the ivory trade, South Africa will continue to forbid any import or export of ivory or ivory products until the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties."

XIII Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

28. Criteria for Amendments to the Appendices

The Chairman of the working group considering documents Doc. 8.48 to Doc. 8.51 reported that revision of the text of document Doc. 8.48 had been completed, and that agreement in principle had been reached regarding documents Doc. 8.50 and Doc. 8.51. Acknowledging the important efforts of Zimbabwe, he recommended that the Standing Committee be given a mandate to prepare a revised draft of document Doc. 8.50 for submission to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and to seek the expertise of the Secretariat, the Animals and Plants Committees, IUCN and others as appropriate in this regard. He recommended further that the draft resolution so prepared be submitted to the Secretariat no later than 300 days before the next meeting, that the Parties be asked to provide comments to the Secretariat at least 150 days prior to the meeting, and that the comments be circulated no later than 90 days prior to the meeting.

The delegation of Israel stated that, although it had been announced by the Chairman of the meeting that the working group would be open to all interested individuals, two observers had been refused access. The Chairman of Committee I noted this concern, adding that no discourtesy had been intended, that it was unfortunate that conditions were such that it had been necessary to limit the size of the working group, and that the draft text produced by the group would be considered by Committee I.

29. A Review of Procedures and Criteria for the Transfer of Crocodylians from Appendix I to Appendix II

In introducing document Doc. 8.25, the delegation of Germany commented on the great increase in crocodile farming and ranching and on problems associated with these types of management under current CITES Resolutions. Of especial concern was the unsustainable harvest of wild adults as a source of breeding stock and of skins for export under ranching programmes. The delegation of Germany then proposed several minor changes to the text of the draft resolution. The delegations of Australia, the Netherlands and Zimbabwe and the observer from the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group (CSG) congratulated the delegation of Germany on preparing the draft resolution, especially as it might alleviate problems caused by the wording of Resolution Conf. 3.15. They believed that the draft

resolution would be acceptable with minor changes. The Chairman invited the delegation of Germany to convene a small working group to amend the text as necessary and, if possible, to present a revised draft resolution to Committee I for consideration before discussion of proposals relating to crocodylians. The delegation of Germany concurred, and the delegations of Australia, the Netherlands, Portugal and Zimbabwe and the observer from the CSG agreed to participate in the working group.

31. Review of Appendix III

The delegation of the Netherlands introduced document Doc. 8.42, explaining that the Ten-Year Review process did not include Appendix-III species and that it was likely that many of these were neither endangered nor in trade. They proposed that the Animals and Plants Committees review the status of all species listed in Appendix III, and advise the Parties regarding possible amendments. They stressed that the draft resolution was not intended to weaken the rights of range States. The Secretariat suggested that the draft resolution mention the requirement that species included in Appendix III be protected by the national legislation of the proponent country, the Chairman adding that Parties should provide the Secretariat with information demonstrating that such legislation was in place. The delegation of Algeria considered that stronger criteria were required in the operative section. However the delegation of the Netherlands explained that the draft resolution had been worded to allow the Animals and Plants Committees broad scope in their reviews. Noting the general support for the draft resolution, the Chairman suggested that it be accepted and commended to the Conference of the Parties as written, with the operational points made by the delegation of Algeria communicated to the Secretariat and the Animals and Plants Committees. This was agreed.

Following some administrative announcements, the meeting was adjourned at 15h50.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Fifth Session: 6 March 1992: 09h05-12h20

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
Rapporteurs:	M.D. Jenkins R.A. Luxmoore

The Chairman reported that the working group on Scientific Authorities was limited to those already identified and that the Credentials Committee had accepted the credentials of the delegations of a further five Parties.

XIII Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

29. Review of Procedures and Criteria for the Transfer of Crocodylians from Appendix I to Appendix II

The delegation of Germany introduced document Com. 8.4, explaining that it was the result of deliberations of a working group they had convened comprising various delegations, and observers from IUCN, these being members of the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group (CSG). They drew attention to the modifications the working group had made to the original draft resolution annexed to document Doc. 8.25, consisting of slight modification of the fourth paragraph of the preamble, replacement of the first paragraphs a) and b) in the operational part with a single more general paragraph, and amendment of the second paragraph a). The Secretariat confirmed that the retroactive application of Resolutions was already well established and that the wording of the revised paragraph a) was acceptable.

Some concern was expressed by the delegation of Mexico, supported by the delegations of Algeria, Bolivia and Germany, that the present draft resolution did not adequately stress the need for ranching operations to be shown to benefit the conservation status of crocodylians within their natural ranges, and indeed might be seen to penalize the countries of origin unfairly. The Chairman noted that the general issue of consultation with range States was being dealt with in the draft resolution annexed to document Doc. 8.51. With further suggestions for re-wording by the Chairman, the delegations of the United States of America and Zimbabwe and the observer from IUCN, the following amendments to the operative part of the draft resolution in document Com. 8.4 were agreed: paragraph 2, line 4, delete "not" and replace "primarily through depletion of the wild breeding-stock" with in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild, within its area of natural distribution; paragraph a), line 4, insert short-term before "programmes"; paragraphs b) and c), delete underlining; final paragraph, insert before "the Berne Criteria" the words the criteria adopted under the Convention and especially. The Chairman thanked the working group for its efforts and declared the draft resolution agreed for commending to the Conference of the Parties.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

1. Proposals Submitted Pursuant to Resolution on Ranching

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 8.43, relating to five proposals concerning crocodylians; it noted that, under Resolution Conf. 3.15, the issue of collecting of wild specimens of crocodylians, excepting eggs and juveniles, was still controversial although it was partially resolved by draft resolution Com. 8.4.

Proposal to Maintain the Ethiopian Population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II

The delegation of Ethiopia introduced the proposal, noting that the quota for 1992 shown in Table 5 of the supporting statement should be reduced from 6000 skins to 4500. The proposal was supported by the Secretariat, the delegations of Australia, Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, and Zimbabwe, and the observer from IUCN. The delegation of Zimbabwe noted that, for acceptance under Resolution Conf. 3.15, there was no requirement to set quotas, although the draft resolution in document Com. 8.4, if adopted, would impose an obligation to abide by any quotas mentioned in the supporting statement. The delegation of Germany was concerned about the intention expressed in the supporting statement to export live animals, pointing out that this was becoming an increasing problem with the growth of the crocodilian farming industry.

The Committee then agreed to recommend the proposal, noting the modified quota for 1992, and asking the delegation of Ethiopia to take note of the comments of the delegation of Germany concerning the export of live animals. The Secretariat was asked to bring the points raised to the attention of the Animals Committee with the aim of presenting a solution at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Proposal to Maintain the Indonesian Population of *Crocodylus porosus* in Appendix II

The delegation of Indonesia introduced the proposal, stating that significant improvements had been made in recent years to the control of crocodile harvest and trade. They informed the Committee that they had invited the CSG to carry out annual assessments of the crocodile programme for the next three years.

The Secretariat reported that they had some outstanding concerns with the Indonesian proposal in that several of the proposed improvements were still not in place. They pointed out that if the present proposal were rejected the alternative proposal to transfer the population back to Appendix I would automatically take effect and that this might not enhance crocodile conservation in Indonesia.

The delegations of Japan, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea and Singapore, and the observer from IUCN (the Chairman of the CSG), all supported the proposal, noting the significant improvements achieved. The observer from TRAFFIC expressed concern and asked for clarification about the inventory of live crocodiles and skins and the process of reporting on internal and international trade. She suggested that retaining the population in Appendix II under the terms of Resolution Conf. 7.14 might be preferable to adopting the present proposal as the former required monitoring of wild populations. In this she was supported by the delegation of the United States of America who noted the lack of survey data as did the delegations of Algeria and Germany, the latter remarking that the FAO project had failed to locate a single active *C. porosus* nest in five years. Further concerned that the improvements outlined in the supporting statement were still not in place, the delegations of Israel and Germany, and the delegation of Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, opposed the proposal as it was drafted.

The delegations of Australia and Zimbabwe supported the proposal in principle but outlined two alternative solutions should it fail: either continuing the quota for another two years or accepting the ranching proposal and asking the Depositary Government to prepare, for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, a proposal to transfer the population back to Appendix I should monitoring reveal unsatisfactory conduct of the ranching programme. The delegation of Switzerland confirmed that they were willing to prepare such a proposal, although, in principle, they endorsed the view of CSG.

In responding to the concerns raised, the delegation of Indonesia indicated that the inventories of skins would be complete within two months and of live animals on farms by October 1992. They noted that the proposal, if adopted, would result in continuous monitoring and that the introduction of a new law in 1990 had allowed them to bring several prosecutions for illegal domestic trade in crocodile skins.

The Chairman outlined two options for the Committee: inviting informal discussion with the aim of presenting an acceptable solution at the next session; or voting on the proposal immediately. Hearing support for the former from the delegation of the United States of America, he deferred the debate.

Proposal to Maintain the Kenyan Population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II

Introducing their proposal, the delegation of Kenya reported that improvements in crocodile management had resulted from the establishment of the Kenya Wildlife Service.

The Secretariat expressed support for the proposal but requested that Kenya undertake to improve its reporting under the requirements of the Convention. The delegations of Algeria, Senegal and South Africa, and the delegation of Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, along with the observer from IUCN, spoke in favour of the proposal.

In response to concern raised by the delegation of Germany that wild-caught crocodiles had been exported from Kenya declared as captive-bred, the delegation of Kenya noted that two Kenya Wildlife Service staff members always oversaw and recorded the collection of crocodile eggs and that the collection of non-juvenile live animals was not allowed.

The Committee agreed to recommend the proposal but asked that Kenya seek the advice of the IUCN/SSC/CSG on questions raised during the debate.

Proposal to Maintain the Malagasy Population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II

The delegation of Madagascar, introducing the proposal, noted that the ranching programme described had been developed with the assistance of FAO and UNDP since the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. They thought that illegal crocodile hunting and trade in skins had been reduced, despite problems caused by unrest in the country during 1991.

The Secretariat characterised the supporting statement as sketchy and containing old information, but drew attention to new material received immediately prior to the meeting. The observer from IUCN noted that the ranching programme was being carried out under the scrutiny of CSG but that nevertheless he favoured the rejection of the proposal as presented and the maintenance of a quota system. In this, he was supported by the observer from TRAFFIC. The delegations of Algeria and Germany expressed concerns about the proposal, the latter recalling the negative impact of acceptance of a quota for crocodile skins from Madagascar in the past, and suggesting that a working group discuss the issue.

The Chairman identified a weakness in Resolution Conf. 7.14 which precluded the possibility of prolonging the quota for more than two intervals between meetings of the Conference of the Parties, and suggested that a resolution be drafted to correct this.

The delegation of Venezuela then raised some technical matters and the Chairman then deferred discussion of the proposal until after a working group had had the opportunity to consider the issue further.

Proposal to Maintain the Tanzanian Population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II

The delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania introduced their proposal, providing some additional information not contained in their original supporting statement and reporting that they had forwarded a copy of the 1990 survey of the species to the Secretariat and brought with them a document outlining a policy for crocodile management, the absence of which had concerned the Secretariat. They also advised that they had reduced the quota requested for harvest of non-juvenile wild animals from 1900 to 500.

The delegations of Algeria, Germany, Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, and the observers from IUCN and TRAFFIC all supported the proposal in principle but they, and the Secretariat, expressed strong concern about the level of the proposed harvest of non-juvenile wild specimens. In response, the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania replied that they had a serious problem with the killing of humans and domestic livestock by crocodiles and were under strong pressure to act on this. They clarified that the 500 quota comprised 400 animals that could be taken as nuisance animals and 100 as sport-hunting trophies. After this explanation, the delegations of Burundi, Kenya, Liberia, Zambia and Zimbabwe supported the proposal, although the delegation of Zimbabwe suggested, in the interests of reaching a consensus, that the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania might consider reducing the quota in successive years. In response to a suggestion from the delegation of Germany, the Chairman invited the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania, the observers from IUCN and TRAFFIC, and others who had spoken on the matter to confer together to try to reach a consensus.

After some administrative announcements in which he reminded the meeting that working groups were to submit their findings by the morning of 7 March at the latest, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 12h20.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Sixth Session: 6 March 1992: 14h05-17h15

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli O. Owolabi G. van Vliet
Rapporteurs:	C.H. Folland T.P. Inskipp

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

1. Proposals Submitted Pursuant to Resolution on Ranching

The Chairman opened the meeting at 14h05 and called upon the Chairman of the working group set up during the fifth session to consider the remaining *Crocodylus* proposals. Following his presentation, it was agreed that the Committee I minutes should record that Resolution 7.14 operative paragraphs, third "RECOMMENDS", subparagraph a) should be interpreted in a less exclusive sense than drafted. The transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II with the introduction of a quota system should normally be for a maximum period of two intervals between regular meetings of the Conference of the Parties, or one interval should the usual interval become three years, and for those species added at or after the seventh meeting the transfer should normally be for a maximum of two intervals between regular meetings, after which the population should be transferred to Appendix I if it is not retained in Appendix II under the provisions of either Resolution Conf. 1.2 where applicable or Resolution Conf. 3.15 adopted at the third meeting of the Conference of the Parties (New Delhi, 1981).

The Secretariat noted that all Resolutions would be reviewed by the Standing Committee after this meeting of the Conference of the Parties, when the minutes of this meeting would be taken into consideration.

The Chairman of the working group then turned to the setting of quotas, first referring to the proposal from Indonesia for *Crocodylus porosus*. The expected stocks in ranching and captive-breeding operations in Indonesia were as follows:

1992: 26,588; 1993: 34,588; 1994: 46,588.

These totals would include an annual increase of 3,000 in ranching operations and increases of 3,000, 5,000 and 8,000 animals in the respective years from captive breeding.

The following annual quotas for skins had been agreed within the group and accepted by the delegation of Indonesia:

1992: 9,700; 1993: 8,500; 1994: 8,500.

These annual totals would include 7,000 harvested from the above-mentioned stock, 1,500 from the wild and, in 1992, 1,200 skins already held.

Following a suggestion by the Chairman, the delegation of Indonesia withdrew their ranching proposal. There were no further comments and the quotas set out above were agreed.

The annual quotas for *Crocodylus niloticus* for Madagascar had been set as follows:

1992: 3,000; 1993: 4,000; 1994: 4,300.

In addition 100 nuisance animals were to be allowed.

The delegation of Madagascar withdrew their ranching proposal. There were no further comments and the quotas were agreed.

The annual quotas for *Crocodylus niloticus* for the United Republic of Tanzania had been reviewed and the working group suggested the following amendments to the figures given on page 10 of their ranching proposal:

1992: 400; 1993: 200; 1994: 200; 1995 onwards: 100 (all nuisance animals).

In addition 100 skins from trophy hunting annually.

2. Ten Year Review Proposals

The Chairman introduced document Doc. 8.44 and introduced the taxa individually.

FAUNA

Deletion from Appendix II of *Tamandua tetradactyla chapadensis*. The delegation of Germany introduced this proposal on behalf of the Animals Committee. This was probably an invalid taxon, and the recorded trade in this subspecies was all from non-range States and therefore probably misidentified. The Secretariat added that the taxon was protected in all range States and, there being no further comments, the proposal was agreed.

Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of *Felis rufa escuinapae*. The delegation of the United States of America introduced this proposal, explaining that this was probably also an invalid taxon. Mexico, the only range State, had informed them that the populations of *Felis rufa* in their country were all relatively secure and their delegation confirmed that they agreed with the proposal. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition, because of threats to all large carnivores in Mexico, favoured the inclusion of the Mexican populations of the species in Appendix I. The delegations of Germany and Switzerland clarified that this approach was not possible because *escuinapae* was not the only subspecies that occurred in Mexico. There were no other objections and the proposal was agreed.

Inclusion in Appendix I of *Antilocapra americana* +2aa (+2aa meaning the Mexican population) in lieu of *A. a. peninsularis* and *A. a. sonoriensis*.

Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I of *Antilocapra americana mexicana* +2aa (+2aa meaning the Mexican population).

Deletion from Appendix II of *Antilocapra americana mexicana* +2ab (+2ab meaning the population of the United States of America).

Deletion from Appendix I of *Antilocapra americana sonoriensis* +2ab (+2ab meaning the population of the United States of America).

The delegation of the United States of America introduced the four proposals relating to this species, pointing out that the present split listing created enforcement problems. They wished to change to a geographical listing in one appendix and the delegation of Mexico, the only other range State for the species, wished to transfer their population of *A. m. mexicana* to Appendix I because all populations in their country were threatened. The delegation of Zimbabwe believed that deletion of the species from the appendices was preferable because only a few trophies had been recorded in trade. The delegation of Switzerland agreed with this in principle but indicated that this would require a new proposal. They advocated adoption of the proposal to facilitate implementation of the Convention. There being no further objections all four proposals were agreed.

Deletion from Appendix II of *Cygnus columbianus jankowskii*. The delegation of Germany introduced this proposal on behalf of the Animals Committee. This was another subspecies of doubtful validity for which there had been virtually no recorded trade. The delegation of the Russian Federation, the only range State for the breeding population, had no problems with the proposal and it was agreed without objection.

Deletion from Appendix II of *Cyrtonyx montezumae mearnsi* and *C. m. montezumae*. The delegation of the United States of America pointed out that there was no trade in these taxa and, after the delegation of Mexico confirmed that all populations of the species in their country were healthy, the proposal was agreed without objection.

Inclusion in Appendix II of *Phrynosoma coronatum*. The delegation of the United States of America stated that one endangered subspecies of *P. coronatum* was listed in Appendix II and that other confusable subspecies needed to be listed to facilitate enforcement. The delegation of Switzerland was unhappy with this view because, to their knowledge, trade in species of this genus was negligible. However, the delegations of Mexico and several European countries thought that unrecorded trade might well be quite substantial and the proposal was agreed without further objection.

Deletion from Appendix II of *Cynolebias constanciae*, *C. marmoratus*, *C. minimus*, *C. opalescens* and *C. splendens*. The delegation of Switzerland stated that two of these taxa were probably extinct and the other three were invalid. After they had explained the long history of the proposal, comments were sought from the delegation of Brazil. With their support, the proposal was agreed without objection.

FLORA

In their introduction to the first proposal, the delegation of the Philippines asked for the record to state that their withdrawal of proposals under item XIII 25. b) of the agenda, relating to registration of captive-breeding operations, had been made several weeks previously.

Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of *Alocasia sanderiana* (amendment of the proposal to delete the species from Appendix I). The delegation of the Philippines indicated that there was no international trade in this species but, as it was not protected by specific legislation, they preferred to retain it in Appendix II. There being no objections, the proposal was agreed.

Deletion from Appendix II of *Caryocar costaricense* and *Platymiscium pleiostachyum*. These proposals had been withdrawn.

Deletion from Appendix II of *Quercus copeyensis*, *Vantanea barbourii*, *Cynometra hemitomophylla*, *Tachigali versicolor* and *Batocarpus costaricensis*. The delegation of Switzerland explained that none of these species had been recorded in international trade. The delegation of Costa Rica, the main range State for all of the species, supported the proposals and they were all agreed without objection.

Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of *Oreomunnea pterocarpa* (amendment of the proposal to delete the species from Appendix I). The delegation of Switzerland recommended that this species be retained in Appendix II for a period so that any international trade would be recorded. There were no objections and this was agreed.

Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of *Didickea cunninghamii* (correction of the erroneous proposal to delete the species from Appendix I). The delegation of Switzerland explained that this was an orchid of no interest to the trade. However, the delegation of India stated that this was a very rare species that should be retained in Appendix I under the terms of Resolution Conf. 2.19. After opposing points of view had been expressed by various delegations and observers, the delegation of Switzerland agreed to withdraw the proposal, on the condition that the delegation of India carries out a study on the species and submits the results before the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Deletion from Appendix II of *Areca ipot*. The delegation of Switzerland pointed out that this species was traded internationally but was commonly artificially propagated. There being no other comments, the proposal was agreed.

Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of *Hedychium philippinense* (amendment of the proposal to delete the species from Appendix I). There were no comments on this proposal which was immediately agreed.

3. Proposals Concerning Export Quotas

At the invitation of the Chairman, the delegation of Zimbabwe introduced the proposal on behalf of all the proponents and explained that the sub-Saharan population of the leopard *Panthera pardus* was abundant in all range States but, by seeking to observe the requirements of Resolution Conf. 7.14, with its significant checks, the proponents were demonstrating responsibility towards their wildlife. The delegations of Botswana, Malawi (where the species in some areas had become a pest) and Zambia confirmed the favourable population status in their countries. The Secretariat

recommended acceptance of the proposal. However, the observer from TRAFFIC, speaking also on behalf of the IUCN/SSC Cat Specialist Group, whilst agreeing in principle with the transfer to Appendix II, was doubtful whether the data provided, especially in relation to management plans, met the conditions of Resolution Conf. 7.14. It was suggested that the transfer to Appendix II be restricted to those Parties which currently had export quotas.

The delegation of Zimbabwe felt that it would be impossible to prepare management plans for all relevant States. Each Party endeavoured to protect sufficient habitat to support the species.

The delegation of France was concerned that transfer to Appendix II of the leopard would encourage commercial trade, and favoured the retention of the species in Appendix I with quotas for hunting trophies. The delegations of Algeria, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Germany, Kenya, Nigeria, Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, Tunisia and Uganda shared this view. The delegation of the United States of America asked about information on population trends. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition felt that the transfer would lead to increased trade in other cat species.

The delegation of South Africa was in favour of the proposal and wished to increase their proposed quota to 75 skins.

In summary, the Chairman observed that many delegations were concerned that adoption of the proposal might increase pressure on the species and encourage illegal trade, but none had spoken against quotas. The delegation of Botswana thought many delegations were basing their opposition to the proposal purely on emotive grounds. The delegation of Switzerland said that the species had been listed in Appendix I since 1975 and was eligible for transfer to Appendix II in accordance with Resolution Conf. 2.23. Agreement to the proposal would allow those farmers who suffered from the activities of leopards to sell skins for export; the number of skins taken would be insufficient to support a major trade.

The delegation of Zimbabwe drew attention to the earlier decision relating to the transfer of *Felis rufa esquinapae* from Appendix I to Appendix II, which had been made despite the evidence of involvement in international trade and the lack of population data. In setting the proposed quotas, no attempt had been made to set these at the maximum sustainable yield, but they represented the number expected to be killed by farmers. They were still in favour of the transfer to Appendix II, whilst retaining the quotas for hunting trophies. The delegation of Switzerland observed that any further amendments would need to be submitted in writing.

Following the suggestion of the Chairman, it was agreed that further discussion should be deferred to allow all the interested parties to be consulted. A decision would have to be made early on 9 March.

The Chairman then introduced the proposal of the Sudan to maintain its population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II subject to an export quota of 8,000 specimens for 1992 and zero for both 1993 and 1994. The delegation of the Sudan explained their need for an export quota in 1992 to dispose of a stockpile of 8,000 skins. However, the observer from IUCN, the Chairman of the Crocodile Specialist Group, found the situation very unsatisfactory, and recommended that the proposal be adopted only under the following conditions: i) that the population should be transferred to Appendix I under the Depositary Government's proposal, but the transfer should be delayed for 30 days longer than the usual period of 90 days; ii) that the stockpile be disposed of within those 30 days, and the skins be sold to Egypt for domestic use, not re-exported to European or other markets; iii) that the proceeds from this sale should be made available to TRAFFIC to spend on marketing studies in the northern African region. The delegation of Germany wished to add that the skins should be inventoried and tagged by an independent observer prior to export. There were no substantial objections to these suggestions but it was agreed that they should be discussed further.

The Chairman then adjourned the meeting at 17h15.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Seventh Session: 9 March 1992: 10h15-12h15

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
Rapporteurs:	T.A. Mulliken K.B. Stansell

The Chairman opened the meeting with the announcement that the Credentials Committee had accepted the credentials of an additional delegation. He explained that proponents withdrawing amendment proposals would be allowed to explain their decisions to Committee I briefly if they notified the Secretariat in writing of their intent at the time the proposal was withdrawn.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

3. Proposals Concerning Export Quotas

The Chairman asked for comments on the proposal relating to *Panthera pardus*. The delegation of Zimbabwe thanked the IUCN Cat Specialist Group for help with revising the supporting statement and agreed to the Chairman's recommendation that further discussion be deferred until the revised document was available. The Chairman also ruled that discussion of *Acinonyx jubatus* be deferred until supporting documentation was available.

Asked to introduce the proposal relating to the Uganda population of *Crocodylus niloticus*, the delegation of Uganda thanked the Government and delegation of Zimbabwe for their help in submitting the proposal, and summarized the status of their ranching programme. Support for the proposal was expressed by the delegation of Portugal, on behalf of the countries of the EEC, and the observer from IUCN, a member of the Crocodile Specialist Group (CSG). There were no objections to the proposal and the Committee agreed to recommend it.

The Chairman asked for additional information regarding the effect of an Appendix-I listing on the Congo's export quotas for *Crocodylus cataphractus* and *Osteolaemus tetraspis*. The delegation of the Congo indicated that they would support the return of their populations to Appendix I, and were told by the Secretariat that field studies on these species were scheduled to begin in the Congo in 1992. The delegation of the Congo, on behalf of the delegation of Cameroon, stated that Cameroon did not object to the transfer of its *Crocodylus niloticus* population to Appendix I. There being no objections, the Committee agreed that the Congo populations of *Crocodylus cataphractus* and *Osteolaemus tetraspis*, and the Cameroon population of *Crocodylus niloticus* be transferred to Appendix I.

The delegation of South Africa requested that their proposal to transfer their country's population of *Crocodylus niloticus* from Appendix I to Appendix II be amended to a quota proposal in accordance with Resolution Conf. 7.14 and this was accepted, with the acknowledgement that South Africa would submit a ranching proposal at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The proposal was briefly described and, there being no objections, a quota of 1000 skins per annum was accepted.

Noting that Somalia had not submitted a request to maintain its quota, and had not complied with the reporting requirements of Resolution Conf. 7.14, the delegation of Switzerland recommended that the Somalia population of

Crocodylus niloticus be transferred to Appendix I. The Chairman noted the sympathy of delegations for the extreme difficulties faced in Somalia, the Secretariat adding that repeated efforts to contact the Somalian authorities had been unsuccessful. Following the suggestion of the CSG, it was agreed to maintain the Somalian population of *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II but to reduce the export quota to zero.

The delegation of Indonesia, responding to questions from the observer from TRAFFIC, stated that Indonesia intended to limit future exports of *Scleropages formosus* to captive-bred specimens, and therefore would not require an export quota. They added that they intended to propose transfer of their population of *Scleropages formosus* to Appendix I at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. Their position was supported by the delegation of Switzerland and by the Secretariat. The observer from TRAFFIC suggested that Indonesia export captive-bred specimens under the terms of Resolution Conf. 7.10. In response to a suggestion from the observer from IUCN, supported by the delegation of Germany, that an export quota for captive-bred specimens be set, the Chairman requested the delegation of Germany to meet other interested parties, to develop this notion and to bring a proposal to a future session.

XIII Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

6. Recognition of the Benefits of Trade in Wildlife

The Chairman asked the delegation of Switzerland to summarize the progress on revising documents Doc. 8.48 to Doc. 8.51. Noting that document Doc. 8.49 had been withdrawn, the delegation of Switzerland commented that annotations of downlisting proposals could solve some of the difficulties associated with the interpretation of the term "primarily commercial purposes". They explained that the preamble was the most important section of document Com. 8.3, a draft resolution to replace document Doc. 8.48, in that it reminded Parties that trade could be beneficial to species and ecosystems. The delegation of Israel, supported by the delegations of Hungary and Zambia, proposed that the draft resolution be amended substantially, and suggested that the working group be reconvened. Noting that no delegate had been denied access to previous working-group meetings, the delegation of Switzerland responded that they were not keen to begin discussions anew, and suggested that proposed amendments be provided in writing to Committee I, an approach supported by the delegation of Zimbabwe. The delegation of Brazil proposed that discussion of the issue be deferred to the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The delegation of Canada disagreed, feeling that the issue was important and needed to be resolved. Concerned with the number of important issues remaining on the agenda, the Chairman stated that it would not be possible to resolve the issue satisfactorily through debate in Committee in the time allowed. He suggested that either the working group reconvene in order to come to a compromise, or that the proposals of the delegation of Israel be considered individually as amendments to document Com. 8.3.

Following administrative announcements and a discussion of the agenda for the afternoon session, the meeting was adjourned at 12h15.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Eighth Session: 9 March 1992: 14h10-17h20

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
UNEP:	R. Olembo
Rapporteurs:	J.R. Caldwell J. Gray

The Chairman commenced proceedings at 14h10 and announced that the Chairman of the meeting had asked Committee I to consider and advise the meeting on documents Com. 8.3 (Rev.), Com. 8.11 and Com. 8.12, produced by a working group of the meeting.

Amendments had been proposed to document Com. 8.3 (Rev.) which had not yet been circulated; its consideration was therefore postponed.

XIII Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

- 28. Criteria for Amendments to the Appendices
and
- 30. Support of Range States for Amendments to Appendices I and II

The Chairman of the working group reported that consensus had been achieved within the group on documents Com. 8.11 and Com. 8.12. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition stated that the preamble of the draft resolution in document Com. 8.11 was slanted towards one particular philosophical view. However, the Chairman of Committee I pointed out that the Standing Committee would lay down the terms of reference for the revision of the criteria referred to and, therefore, the operative paragraphs would not bear the bias that the preamble perhaps did. There being no further dissent, it was agreed to commend the draft resolution to the Conference of the Parties.

There was general agreement on the aims of document Com. 8.12 but also that the text needed rewording in order to reflect these without ambiguity. The principal anxieties related to range States having insufficient influence in the development of proposals and there being a shortage of time for review of proposals by the Parties, especially range States. The first of these concerns was met by a suggestion from the delegation of Botswana that the words and such comments will be provided in the two categories of range State opinions and non-range State opinions be added to the end of paragraph c) of Option 2. The second of these concerns was satisfied by a suggestion from the Chairman of the working group to insert at least before "330 days" in paragraph a) of Option 2.

With these two amendments, it was agreed to commend the draft resolution to the Conference of the Parties.

25. Proposals to Register the First Commercial Captive-Breeding Operation for an Appendix I Animal Species

a) Format and Criteria

The Chairman of a working group of Committee I, on document Com. 8.21, highlighted the differences between this document and the original draft resolution in document Doc. 8.38 Annex. He drew attention to the major change relating to paragraph f), page 2 in document Com. 8.21, and to the possible alternative to paragraphs e) and f), shown in square brackets at the end of the document. Before these alternatives could be discussed, the delegation of Mexico raised a point of order that, owing to a misunderstanding, several invited delegations which had already prepared amendments had been omitted from the working group. The Chairman asked that these delegations, together with the Chairman of the working group, begin urgent discussions at once.

21. Marking of Specimens

Doubts remained regarding document Com. 8.9, despite an introduction from the Chairman of the relevant working group who felt that all concerns had been addressed, notably by introducing a reference to Article VI, paragraph 7. In order to emphasize that where it was not appropriate to adopt the use of implantable transponder microchips, other marking techniques should be used, the delegation of Algeria proposed that the words and without excluding the use of other methods, be inserted before "adopt" in paragraph a) under "RECOMMENDS". This was agreed. It was further agreed, based on a suggestion by the delegation of Switzerland, to delete the superfluous words in paragraph c), namely those following "concerned". The delegation of the United States of America noted that paragraph i) did not exclude the provision of funds from external sources and as such did not "obligate" the Trust Fund. The draft resolution, so revised, was accepted by the Committee for conveyance to the Conference of the Parties.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

3. Proposals Concerning Export Quotas

Consultations between the Chairman of the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group and the delegation of the Sudan had now resolved outstanding problems regarding the Sudanese proposal. The following terms had been outlined.

1. The proposal of Switzerland (as Depository Government) should be accepted, but its entry into force be delayed by 30 days;
2. the stockpile of skins accumulated should be disposed of during these 30 days;
3. the skins should be sold only after tagging and in accordance with CITES regulations; and
4. an independent observer should be appointed to oversee the documenting, tagging and export of the skins.

The delegation of the Sudan invited a visit from the Secretariat and asked that it supply the necessary tags within one month. They suggested that US\$ 2 per tag be donated to the Secretariat via the Management Authority of the Sudan, to be used specifically for crocodile surveys in that country. There being no substantial objections to these revisions the amended proposal was agreed.

Reporting on the proposal concerning *Scleropages formosus*, the delegation of Indonesia agreed to a quota of 3000 captive-bred specimens, with a maximum individual length of 15 cm, for 1993, with a provision for an increase of 1000 for 1994. They clarified that the quota for wild-caught specimens would remain at zero. The Committee agreed to commend the revised proposal to the Conference of the Parties.

4. Other Proposals

1. *Tarsius syrichta*

The Secretariat reported that the delegation of the Philippines had withdrawn their proposal to transfer *Tarsius syrichta* from Appendix II to Appendix I because there had been insufficient research to determine whether the species warranted listing in Appendix I.

2. *Manis temminckii*

Turning next to the proposal to delete *Manis temminckii* from Appendix I, the Secretariat suggested that the proponents amend the proposal in order to transfer the species to Appendix II and asked Parties to improve their implementation of CITES for *Manis* spp. This latter point was echoed by the observer from TRAFFIC.

The proponents, supported by the delegation of South Africa, stressed that national legislation and enforcement were the key instruments for conserving this species, as most trade was domestic.

Other delegations, however, wished the species to remain in Appendix I. The delegation of Kenya, supported by that of Nigeria, believed that this would strengthen the case for national legislation to protect the species. Fears were expressed by the delegation of Germany that over-exploitation of Asian species could lead to pressure on African pangolins. The delegation of Malaysia was likewise concerned and that of Algeria felt the species should remain in Appendix I while further study was undertaken.

The observer from IUCN also recommended further research but felt that, as the species did not meet the criteria for Appendix-I listing, it should be transferred to Appendix II. Concern over the similarity of *Manis temminckii* to Asian pangolins led the delegations of Japan, Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, Switzerland and the United States of America to support transfer to Appendix II rather than the deletion from the appendices.

In the light of these discussions the proponents withdrew the proposal.

In summarizing this debate, the Chairman believed that valuable discussion had taken place pointing to the need for a clearer evaluation of the status of all pangolins, to the inconsistencies in current listings of *Manis* spp. in the appendices and to the largely illegal nature of pangolin trade.

16. *Ceratotherium simum*

The delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that a small working group be established to produce a draft resolution promoting positive measures to deal with the trade in rhinoceros horn. However, the delegation of Zimbabwe stated that they would prefer not to do so yet, but to await the outcome of discussions in Committee. They further requested that the South African proposal on *Ceratotherium simum simum* be debated before that submitted by Zimbabwe. This was accepted by the Chairman, who also ruled that rhinoceroses would be discussed immediately following the discussion of proposals concerning the African elephant in order that a working group on rhinoceroses could be established as soon as possible, if deemed necessary.

The Chairman put forward a procedure for amendment of session minutes, namely, that any group that felt it had been misrepresented should contact the Secretariat with any substantive alterations. The Chairman had several proposed amendments of his own to make to documents Com. I 8.1 to Com. I 8.6, and comments from the floor were noted by the Secretariat.

The meeting was adjourned at 17h20.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Ninth Session: 10 March 1992: 09h10-12h30

Chairman:	M.W. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	J. Berney O. Menghi J.G. Barzdo
UNEP:	R. Olembo
Rapporteurs:	R.A. Luxmoore K.B. Stansell

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other Proposals

The Chairman opened the session at 09h10, noting that the first agenda item to be considered would be the proposed transfer of certain populations of *Loxodonta africana* from Appendix I to Appendix II. The Secretariat advised that Botswana had withdrawn its separate proposal relating to its own population.

13. *Loxodonta africana* (populations of Botswana, Malawi, Namibia and Zimbabwe)

The Minister of Commerce and Industry of Botswana introduced the proposal on behalf of the four proponent countries. He presented a summary of the status of the species in Botswana, emphasizing that at issue was not ivory trade but the need to manage the African elephant for ecological reasons. He noted that his Ministry was also responsible for maintaining biodiversity in protected areas throughout the elephant's range.

The Minister of Environment and Tourism of Zimbabwe stressed the importance of sustainable use of wildlife for the benefit of rural communities as an alternative to subsistence agriculture and as a means of ensuring the continued conservation of African elephants. He also noted that the Panel of Experts report, prepared pursuant to Resolution Conf. 7.9, had concluded that Zimbabwe met the criteria for a transfer of its elephant population to Appendix II. He volunteered to impose a mandatory moratorium on ivory trade and assured the Committee that none of the proponents would allow their elephant populations to become extinct.

The delegation of Malawi presented documents Doc. 8.46.1* and Doc. 8.58 which revised the original proposal. They summarized that they were seeking the transfer of their elephant populations to Appendix II, resumption of trade in non-ivory products within CITES, assistance in developing the necessary trade controls and a mechanism for return of the populations to Appendix I if certain conditions were not met. In the spirit of compromise, they were offering a mandatory moratorium on commercial trade in ivory until the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, agreement that any future re-opening of that trade would be limited to specified importing countries which prohibit re-export, agreement to differentiate within Appendix II among the four member States with respect to lifting the

* This document was distributed at the meeting as document Doc. 8.46 Annex 2 Addendum. (Note from the Secretariat).

moratorium, and a willingness to accept a decision to transfer the populations back to Appendix I at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties if necessary.

The Secretariat summarized its recommendations, noting that it considered that the biological criteria for transfer to Appendix II had been met for the populations of Botswana and Zimbabwe and that the criteria on ivory trade controls were not relevant in view of the amended proposal. It noted that, in adopting Resolution Conf. 7.9, the Conference of the Parties had accepted the principle of including populations of the African elephant in different appendices. The Chairman of the Panel of Experts introduced their report contained in document Doc. 8.46 Annex 7, drawing attention to its conclusions. He noted the restricted time available for assessing the five countries originally covered by the proposal and regretted any inconsistencies that this might have caused within the report and between this report and that contained in document Doc. 8.46 Annex 6.

Support for the proposal was voiced by the delegation of Switzerland, who appealed to delegates to be consistent in their decisions and to follow the process adopted at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties. They suggested that, in view of the differing biological status of the species, the proposal should be considered separately for each of the four countries.

A large number of delegations, including those of Austria, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, the Congo, Gabon, Israel, Kenya, Nigeria, Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC, the United Republic of Tanzania, Togo, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Zambia, spoke in opposition to the proposal. Many delegations recognized the efforts made towards elephant conservation in the proponent States, and few questioned the evidence that populations were locally large and well managed. Whilst there was support for the principle of sustainable use, some of the major points causing them to reject the proposal were: it was premature because the necessary trade controls were not yet in place; elephant populations in most of Africa had declined dramatically and had not yet recovered adequately; elephants migrate across international borders and so populations which cross the boundaries between countries should be treated together; any move to transfer the species to Appendix II in part of its range, even for the trade in products other than ivory, would stimulate illegal hunting elsewhere; there is continuing illegal trade in ivory through the proponent States and international co-operation in law enforcement and training of enforcement staff is inadequate; the majority of the States within the range of the species opposed the proposal; and the transfer of the species to Appendix I was thought to have been generally effective in reducing illegal hunting. The delegation of the United Kingdom called on developed countries to support conservation efforts in Africa, and pledged an additional one million US dollars for this purpose.

The Chairman noted that only one of the delegations had spoken in favour of the proposal and he invited a response from the proponents. After a brief suspension of the session, the Minister of Commerce and Industry of Botswana made the following statement on behalf of the four proponents:

"We are extremely perplexed. In 1989, when the entire elephant population of Africa was listed in Appendix I of CITES, the Parties simultaneously adopted a set of criteria and procedures for transferring back to Appendix II those elephant populations which clearly did not belong on Appendix I. We assume that this was because the Parties were not entirely comfortable with their decision.

"We have now complied with those criteria, submitted proposals based on those criteria, satisfied those criteria and, prior to this meeting, expected to have our elephant transferred back to Appendix II according to those criteria. It seems to us that the goalposts have been moved - and this brings into doubt the integrity, objectives and long term motives of CITES.

"We have asked ourselves the question - what possible use can there be in prolonging this debate? All along we have assumed that those countries who have conserved their elephant well would have their efforts rewarded. This seems not to be the case. We are being told we are selfish in not giving up our successful conservation programmes based on sustainable use and on a recognition of the rights of rural peoples who are not present at this meeting. The model we are being asked to adopt is the one which has so signally failed.

"The question which remains is what will we do next? The choice which the Parties have effectively made is to reject an offer of a continued moratorium (which belies the assertion that we are selfish) and to accept the risk that we will now legally trade in ivory outside the CITES umbrella. It is no wonder we are puzzled and saddened.

"Mr Chairman, I would like to give this meeting the assurance that we have no intention of behaving irresponsibly as a result of this decision. We will now put our heads down and address the matter of implementing reliable trade

controls in our own countries. As soon as this is done we will consider whether we are ready to trade with those countries who meet our standards as purchasers.

"There is a bigger question which we will now have to address - that of evaluating the costs and benefits of remaining within this treaty. We will review our participation in CITES as soon as we have reported to our respective governments. We assure you that our evaluation will be conducted in an objective and analytic manner without allowing emotion to cloud our judgement. Our decision will be in the interest of elephant conservation and the long term benefits to the people of the region.

"Mr Chairman, it is a matter of considerable regret to us to have to withdraw the proposal which is before the meeting."

The Chairman closed the debate on the proposal, noting that there was a universal commitment to elephant conservation; a willingness to collaborate to assist African countries in conservation; and that increased funding was needed for this purpose.

On a point of order, the delegation of the United Kingdom enquired whether the suggestion of the delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania to form a working group could be pursued. The Chairman noted that, although debate on the previous proposal was now closed, the next proposal related to the same species and so the matter could be raised under that topic. He reminded delegates that the proposal submitted by South Africa should be considered separately from the previous proposal and that it should not be assumed that delegations held the same views towards both.

15. *Loxodonta africana* (population of South Africa)

The delegation of South Africa introduced their proposal, acknowledging the assistance derived from the recommendations of the Panel of Experts, and noting the pride felt by their countrymen in the conservation of wildlife. They drew attention to document Doc. 8.46.2*, indicating that they proposed a mandatory moratorium on ivory trade until at least the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The Secretariat drew attention to their recommendations contained in document Doc. 8.46 that the proposal be adopted. A member of the Panel of Experts presented their report on South Africa (document Doc. 8.46 Annex 6).

Remarking that their comments applied equally to the previous proposal, the delegation of Japan supported the proposal on the basis of the scientific advice contained in document Doc. 8.46 Annex 6.

While recognizing the expertise in wildlife management practised in South Africa and the advances made in combatting illegal trade, a number of delegations, including those of Algeria, France, Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia, spoke against the proposal on the grounds that its acceptance would be premature for many of the same reasons as discussed in relation to the previous proposal. The delegations of the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia particularly highlighted the continuing problem of illegal trade in ivory passing through South Africa, and the need for regional co-operation to combat this.

In response to a request from the delegation of Algeria, the Chairman ruled that a working group could consider broader issues of elephant conservation, but that further discussion of the specific proposals regarding listing in the appendices would not be appropriate. He suggested that such a group might be arranged under the auspices of the Animals Committee.

Regretfully, the delegation of South Africa withdrew its proposal.

4. *Ursus americanus*

Noting that its introductory comments applied to all three proposals relating to bear species, the delegation of Denmark, on behalf of the countries of the EEC, recalled that they were being resubmitted following their rejection at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties and had been prepared in close consultation with the IUCN/SSC Bear Specialist Group as a result of concern over the levels of trade in bear products and derivatives in Asia. The delegation of Denmark pointed out that the proposal for *Ursus americanus* was being submitted with reference to Article II, paragraph 2(b), because of similarity of appearance with other bear species, especially those from Asia,

* This document was distributed at the meeting as document Doc. 8.46 Annex 2 Addendum. (Note from the Secretariat).

which were severely threatened by trade. They stated that Appendix-II listing for look-alike purposes meant, in their opinion, that range States, when making their findings for issuance of export permits are simply required to assure themselves that the specimen being exported is actually of *Ursus americanus*. This would accomplish the identification of legal shipments and should alleviate any concerns of the range States over unnecessary administrative burdens and undue interference with the management of the species. The delegation acknowledged the step taken by Canada to include the species in Appendix III, but did not consider the provisions relating to this appendix to be sufficiently well implemented. The Secretariat concurred and recommended acceptance of all three proposals.

The delegation of Canada opposed the proposal on the grounds that most of their trade was in hunting trophies to the United States of America and that inclusion in Appendix II would impose an unnecessary administrative burden. They appealed to the delegations of the United States of America and Mexico to join them in listing their populations of the species in Appendix III. The delegation of the United States of America gave assurance that they would do so but noted that their population was not threatened and therefore opposed its inclusion in Appendix II. The delegation of Mexico also considered that inclusion of the species in Appendix III provided adequate protection, but called for a review at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. They recalled that the species had been protected in Mexico for eight years.

The observer from IUCN, the Chairman of the Bear Specialist Group, reported that trade in bear derivatives was pervasive and increasing; he believed that the combined population of all species of bears could not sustain this trade for long and relayed the opinions of a large number of scientists surveyed in 1992 that inclusion in Appendix II was necessary to control the trade. The observers from the World Society for the Protection of Animals, TRAFFIC and WWF supported the proposal, recalling that the delegation of the United States of America had opposed the deletion of *Manis temminckii* from the appendices on the grounds that it would be difficult to control the medicinal trade in derivatives of the other Asian species. They noted that identification problems for bears were particularly severe because almost all of the trade was in medicinal products.

The delegation of Japan commented that they supported the proposal in principle, but believed that the inclusion in Appendix III of the populations of both Mexico and the United States of America would allow for adequate control of the trade as in a case of listing in Appendix II.

The delegations of Singapore and Zimbabwe and the observer from the Canadian Wildlife Federation opposed the proposal, believing that the inclusion in Appendix III should allow adequate control of the trade - see original corrections copy?.

The delegation of Denmark then called for a vote. The proposal was rejected by 42 votes in favour to 24 against.

The Chairman noted that the failure of Parties to implement trade controls for species included in Appendix III should be addressed elsewhere.

5. *Ursus arctos* (populations of China and Mongolia)

The delegation of Denmark observed that this proposal was necessary to replace the current listing of *Ursus arctos pruinosus* in Appendix I. With clarification from the Secretariat that this was acceptable, they drew the Committee's attention to the need to include the population of Bhutan in the proposal because it had recently been discovered that the subspecies also occurred in that country.

The proposal was supported by the delegation of China who reported massive trade in bear products. The delegation of the Russian Federation remarked that the nominate subspecies was more widespread in Mongolia than was *pruinosus*. After clarification from the delegation of Denmark that the Appendix-I listing would not prevent trade in hunting trophies, there were no objections and it was agreed to recommend the proposal, as amended, to the Conference of the Parties.

6. *Ursus arctos* (all remaining unlisted populations)

The delegation of Denmark noted that this proposal had been submitted under the conditions of Article II, paragraph 2(b), because of similarity of appearance, and recalled that favourable comments had already been received from the Management Authority of the Russian Federation. The proposal was agreed without objection.

3. *Dusicyon (Cerdocyon) thous*

The delegation of Argentina noted that this proposal had been submitted under the conditions of Article II, paragraph 2(b), because of similarity of appearance. The delegation of Switzerland regretted that the population data in the supporting statement were ten years out of date and that the trade data were only up to 1984. They questioned whether it was necessary to add this species to Appendix II. After a statement from the delegation of Argentina that there were problems of identification with skins of other species of fox, the proposal was agreed without further objection.

8. *Hyaena brunnea*

The proposal was introduced by the delegation of Namibia, supported by the delegation of Malawi, who observed that there was virtually no trade in the species and no reason to believe it was threatened by trade.

The delegation of Kenya questioned the principle of removing species from the appendices when there were few biological data and felt that rare species should be retained in Appendix I. The Secretariat recommended acceptance of the proposal, noting that the Convention should not be used as a vehicle for addressing conservation problems unrelated to trade. Discussion on the proposal was then deferred.

The meeting was adjourned at 12h30.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Tenth Session: 10 March 1992: 14h05-17h15

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
UNEP:	R. Olembo
Rapporteurs:	C.H. Folland J. Gray

At 14h05, the Chairman opened the session and the Secretariat announced that a document from a Japanese organization, about whales, should not have been circulated as the organization was not officially registered.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other proposals

8. *Hyaena brunnea*

The delegations of Kenya and the United Republic of Tanzania were concerned about the apparent lack of good data to support the proposal. The former delegation, however, supported a transfer of the species to Appendix II, and this was recommended as a formal amendment to the proposal by the delegation of Portugal, on behalf of the countries of the EEC. The delegations of Switzerland and the United States of America and the observers from TRAFFIC and IUCN felt that the original proposal met the criteria necessary for its acceptance, referring particularly to Resolutions Conf. 2.23 and Conf. 3.20. The Chairman called a vote on whether the proposal should be amended to the transfer of the species to Appendix II and, as there was not a two-thirds majority in favour, a vote ensued on the original proposal, which was rejected.

76. *Thunnus thynnus* (western Atlantic population)

77. *Thunnus thynnus* (eastern Atlantic population)

The delegation of Sweden introduced these proposals, emphasizing that their main objective was to return Atlantic bluefin tuna populations to a sustainable level. To this end, they were prepared to consider constructive alternatives to their proposals, on certain conditions. The Chairman noted that these conditions were very close in language to the four operative paragraphs of the draft resolution in document Doc. 8.57 Annex, whose sponsors, the delegations of Canada, Japan, Morocco and the United States of America, registered their support for the position taken by the delegation of Sweden. In particular, the delegation of Canada considered that efforts made by the International Convention for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) were now bearing fruit, and support for this organization, as outlined by the delegation of Sweden and document Doc. 8.57, was therefore appropriate. The delegation of Canada further stated that it was important that the role of ICCAT should be seen to be effective.

The delegation of Sweden withdrew their proposals but reserved their country's right to continue to monitor tuna stocks. The Chairman clarified that, subsequently, document Doc. 8.57 Annex was also withdrawn, and noted that the

delegations of the sponsor States had been in agreement with the delegation of Sweden and with ICCAT over the operative part of the draft resolution.

91. *Intsia spp.*

95. *Gonystylus bancanus*

The delegation of the Netherlands explained the background to these proposals, which they had co-sponsored. The supporting statements had been sent to range States for comment in July 1991 but, acknowledging that there had been little time for this exercise, the delegation of the Netherlands was ready to withdraw the proposals since a majority of the relevant range States objected to them. The delegation of the Netherlands believed that the proposals had nonetheless provided a constructive framework to discuss whether CITES and the International Tropical Timber Agreement were the proper instruments to provide a basis for sustainable tropical timber trade. They urged closer co-operation with the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), by the Parties and by the Secretariat.

Echoing this, the delegation of Denmark sought clarification of the relationship between CITES and ITTO and stressed the importance of consultation with range States. The Danish Government wished to work with the Tropical Forestry Action Programme (TFAP), ITTO, IUCN and CITES to provide active protection for endangered tropical timber species.

The delegation of Malaysia felt that the proposals had not been formulated on a rational basis and that CITES was not the proper forum for their discussion. They could support closer co-operation between CITES and ITTO as long as this would not "straight-jacket" international trade in tropical timber. They stated that Malaysia and other range States had not been consulted over the proposals.

The observer from ITTO welcomed collaboration between his organization and CITES, especially since ITTO could contribute specialist information on tropical timber.

9. *Acinonyx jubatus* (populations of Botswana, Malawi, Namibia, Zambia and Zimbabwe)

The delegation of Namibia introduced document Doc. 8.22 (Rev.), asking for a quota of 5 to be inserted for Botswana in the draft resolution. Together with the delegations of Botswana and Zimbabwe, they stressed the importance of attaching commercial value to their cheetah populations as a prime means for the species' conservation. Following a query from the delegation of Kenya, the delegation of Namibia clarified that no skins would be allowed to be exported under the terms of this proposal, but only trophies and live animals. This led the delegation of the United Kingdom to ask whether such trade was not already allowed for species listed in Appendix I. The delegations of Namibia and Switzerland replied that, although this was the case in theory, practice had not always borne this out. The proposal aimed to facilitate such trade within the designated quotas.

The Committee, having been reminded by the Chairman that this was a narrower proposal than the original, aiming not only to conserve but to increase cheetah populations, agreed that the proposal should be recommended to the Conference of the Parties.

10. *Felis geoffroyi*

The delegation of Brazil advanced this proposal. The Secretariat declared that, in the interests of avoiding problems of identification, they recommended its acceptance.

The delegation of Argentina announced that this proposal had the support of all range States. Noting this, the delegation of Switzerland reluctantly pointed out that this proposal was not in accordance with the Berne Criteria.

It was agreed that the proposal be commended to the Conference of the Parties.

11. *Mirounga angustirostris*

It was unanimously agreed to commend this proposal to the Conference of the Parties.

12. *Orycteropus afer*

The delegation of Malawi introduced this proposal, likening its objective to that of a Ten-Year-Review proposal. There were no objections, and the proposal was accepted.

17. *Ceratotherium simum simum* (population of South Africa)

The delegation of South Africa introduced their proposal, drawing attention to the complete failure of the Appendix-I listing, and to the fact that poaching had not diminished. The introduction of a legal trade was urgently needed. They stated that IUCN's use of the word "illegal" in the fourth paragraph of page 80 of "Analyses of Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices" was inaccurate. The delegation of Botswana supported the proposal.

The Secretariat recognized that the Convention had been ineffective in protecting the species in Africa but considered the proposal to be premature.

The delegations of Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania and the United Kingdom considered that the problem lay in the insatiable markets in importing countries. They feared the extinction of African and Asian species was at stake if the proposal were accepted now. The delegation of Zambia and the observers from Earthtrust and TRAFFIC echoed the concern that the Appendix-I listing had failed because the markets in China (including Taiwan), the Republic of Korea and Thailand remained open, with very little effort being made in these places to penalize illegal trade. The observer from TRAFFIC felt that too little attention was paid by the media and in general to the problem.

The delegation of Zimbabwe, supporting the proposal, stressed the need for urgent action; Management Authorities needed resources quickly to escalate their response to increased poaching. They added that their responsibility was to give priority to the survival of their rhino population above any constraints imposed by the Convention.

The observer from IUCN acknowledged the mistaken use of the word "illegal" referred to by the delegation of South Africa. He felt frustration that the need for innovative studies proposed by IUCN and TRAFFIC had not been widely recognized. This need was seconded by the delegation of the United States of America.

In response to a point of order, raised by the delegation of Zimbabwe, the Chairman explained that issues common to the three rhinoceros proposals could be discussed at this stage, but the proposals would need to be considered individually.

The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition considered the risk of opening legal trade in rhinoceros horn to be unacceptable.

The delegation of China explained that they were fully committed to the Convention and that no import permits for rhinoceros horn had been issued since their accession to the Convention. Further measures, including registration of rhinoceros horn stocks, were being undertaken.

In summarizing the discussion, the Chairman noted the concern that the rhinoceros populations were not being sustained, that the introduction of a legal trade might further aggravate the problems, and that there was a real need for action in market countries. He further suggested that the incoming Standing Committee might investigate the reason for the failure of the Convention to protect rhinoceros populations, with the intention of reporting to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The Chairman, supported by the delegation of Kenya, proposed the closure of the debate.

The delegation of Zimbabwe suggested adjournment to discuss a qualified transfer to Appendix II, allowing only trade in horn taken from living rhinoceroses.

On a vote, the proposal for an adjournment was rejected and that for the closure of debate accepted. On a further vote, the proposal was rejected, but the Chairman noted that the intensity and seriousness of the discussions reflected the value of bringing the subject to debate.

16. *Ceratotherium simum* (population of Zimbabwe)

The delegation of Zimbabwe felt it unlikely that this proposal would be accepted, in the light of the preceding discussion, and it was therefore withdrawn.

18. *Diceros bicornis* (population of Zimbabwe)

The Chairman clarified that this proposal was for consideration with that relating to the captive-breeding operation for this species, mentioned in document Doc. 8.39 (Rev.).

The delegation of Zimbabwe spoke of the alarming recent increase in poaching incursions into their country. Innovative measures, such as de-horning exercises were necessary. Conservation successes in Zimbabwe had been achieved where trade in a species had been permitted and the delegation therefore sought adoption of the proposal with an annotation along the lines of that relating to the listing of vicuna. Specifically, only products resulting from de-horning, in accordance with management plans (including captive-breeding plans) need be traded, but possibly those recovered from poachers and from dead animals could also be traded. Money for management programmes could then be raised from the legal sale of horn.

The delegations of Algeria and the United Republic of Tanzania opposed the proposal, as did the delegation of Kenya, who felt that funds could be raised in other ways.

The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition stressed that any sale of rhinoceros horn would destabilize attempts to control illegal trade in the product; attention should be focused on importing countries. The observer from WWF sought a positive message from this meeting and not simply a rejection of this proposal.

In the light of discussions, the Chairman suggested adopting the following points to commend to the plenary meeting.

1. The decline in both African and Asian rhinoceros populations had been dramatic and there had been a distressing failure to conserve the rhinoceros under its Appendix-I listing; range States' efforts had proved insufficient.
2. Market demand was a dominant factor in undermining conservation efforts.
3. It was extremely urgent that the Standing Committee and the Secretariat, with the Parties' support, take new action to:
 - i) continue to assist range States of African and Asian rhinoceroses;
 - ii) to undertake a trade study to identify methods of influencing the markets and to bring pressure to bear at their most vulnerable points.
4. The Parties, the Secretariat, NGOs and the Standing Committee should harness the media to alert concerned people world-wide to campaign against the damaging trade in rhinoceros horn.

The delegation of Zimbabwe, objecting that such approaches had failed in the past, asked for an indication of whether there would be support for their proposal in the most restricted form, that is with trade permitted only in products from de-horning, including such products derived from captive breeding. The proposal was put to the vote and rejected.

The delegation of the United States of America suggested that a proposal to establish export quotas for hunting trophies be discussed with the delegation of Zimbabwe. The Chairman agreed to consult with these delegations.

It was announced that the credentials of one further delegation had been accepted.

The meeting was adjourned at 17h15.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Eleventh Session: 10 March 1992: 17h50-19h20

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	O. Menghi J. Kundaeli
UNEP:	R. Olembo
Rapporteurs:	M.D. Jenkins T.A. Mulliken

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other Proposals

The Chairman opened the session by noting that the procedure for dealing with the rhinoceros issue would be to draw together all existing documentation and present text during the next session.

In view of the shortage of time, the Chairman outlined his proposed procedure for discussion of proposals: he would ask the Committee if there were any objection to a proposal; if so he would ask for the proposal to be presented and would then hear objections; if not, he would take the proposal as being agreed by the Committee.

19. *Capra falconeri*

The delegation of the United Kingdom introduced the proposal, noting that it had been prepared at the request of the Animals Committee and would result in the whole species being included in Appendix I. After noting a few minor errors in the supporting statement, he drew attention to the complex subspecific taxonomy and the decline in the species across its range. The delegation of Pakistan, a range State, supported the proposal in principle, but was concerned that transfer of the subspecies to Appendix I might cause problems as some populations were subject to limited sport hunting which provided income to local communities. However, they were reassured that Appendix-I listing would not prevent such hunting. The delegation of Switzerland observed that the data in the supporting statement were over twenty years old and that the proposal did not meet the Berne Criteria, but that some rationalization of the present listing was desirable. The observer from IUCN pointed out that more recent data confirmed that populations in several areas were low and declining. Of the remaining range States, the delegations of India and the Russian Federation supported the proposal and the delegation of Afghanistan noted that there was a lack of biological information. The delegation of Germany reported that the Animals Committee were concerned by a look-alike problem with the Appendix-I *C. falconeri* subspecies and with reported marked declines in populations of the Appendix-II subspecies.

There being no objections, the proposal was agreed.

20. *Hippotragus equinus*

The delegation of Zimbabwe introduced the proposal by noting that South Africa, which had proposed the species for listing in Appendix II in 1981, now had healthy populations of the species and saw no role for CITES in conserving it.

The only notable trade in the species was in hunting trophies and live animals used to found new populations. The delegations of Malawi and South Africa and the Secretariat supported the proposal. In response to a request from the delegation of Algeria for further information, the Chairman drew attention to the IUCN analyses of proposals. The observer from IUCN noted that the species had been reviewed in detail by the IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group, who reported it to be widespread, with some populations increasing, and who did not consider international trade to pose a threat. In response to the observer from the International Wildlife Coalition, who stated that the downlisting proposal did not satisfy the Berne Criteria, the delegation of Switzerland noted that the original listing proposal had not done so. The delegation of Portugal, on behalf of the countries of the EEC, did not support the proposal as they were concerned about trophy hunting and the apparent instability of some populations. However they did not sustain objection to the proposal, which was agreed.

21. *Rhea americana*

There were no objections to this proposal, which was therefore agreed without discussion.

22. *Mycteria leucocephala*

The delegation of the United States of America explained that this species had been proposed for inclusion in Appendix II owing to similarity of appearance of juveniles to those of the Appendix-I species *Mycteria cinerea*. They noted that specimens of the latter had been traded illegally as *M. leucocephala*. The Secretariat commented that development of appropriate enforcement tools would be more effective in controlling illegal trade, with which the delegation of South Africa agreed. Asking that it be noted that importing countries should make a special effort to distinguish between *M. cinerea* and *M. leucocephala*, the delegation of the United States of America withdrew the proposal.

23. *Anas formosa*

In introducing the proposal, the delegation of the United Kingdom stated that although the catastrophic decline in *Anas formosa* populations was not because of trade, the species was now so threatened that international trade was of conservation concern. They noted that it was used for food and feathers as well as for aviculture, with most exports originating in China, a country whose Scientific Authority supported the proposal, as did the Scientific Authority of Japan and authorities contacted in the Russian Federation and the Republic of Korea. Similarity of appearance of *A. formosa* to several Appendix-III species was also noted. Suggesting that trade was not a significant factor in the species' decline, the Secretariat recommended that the proposal be rejected, the delegation of the Russian Federation agreeing and suggesting that other international agreements be used to help protect the species. The observer from IUCN noted the proposal was supported by the International Council for Bird Preservation (ICBP) and individuals who had reviewed the proposal for the IUCN analyses. There being no sustained objections, the proposal was agreed.

24. *Goura* spp.

According to the delegation of the Netherlands, the populations of the three *Goura* species appeared to be declining, and captive breeding had met with limited success. They concluded that the several hundred specimens recorded in international trade were probably wild-caught, and therefore traded illegally, as all range States prohibited export. They suggested that an Appendix-I listing would support the efforts of the range States to protect these species. The proposal was opposed by the Secretariat, who stated that internal utilization was the primary cause of population declines, although trade in specimens fraudulently declared as captive-bred was of concern, and should be addressed by the Parties. The delegations of Indonesia and Papua New Guinea also opposed the proposal, explaining that the species were protected by national legislation and not threatened by trade. In view of the opinions of the range States, the delegation of the Netherlands withdrew the proposal.

25. *Amazona aestiva*

The delegation of the United States of America announced that they had withdrawn this proposal in recognition of the management efforts of the Government of Argentina related to *Amazona aestiva*, which included population surveys, development of management programmes, and the provision of a zero export quota until such programmes could be put in place.

26. Cacatua goffini

Noting that the significant trade reviews by the Animals Committee had determined that, at current levels, international trade in *Cacatua goffini* was likely to be detrimental to its survival, the delegation of the United States of America proposed that the species be transferred to Appendix I, especially in view of its restricted range and low reproductive rate. Agreeing with the delegation of the United States of America, the Secretariat added that ICBP considered the species to be highly endangered, and that imports reported in CITES annual reports exceeded Indonesia's capture quotas. The delegation of Indonesia responded that their information for 1989 to 1991 showed that exports remained below established quotas, adding that they were willing to propose a moratorium on exports until the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. While supportive of Indonesia's suggestion of a moratorium, the observer from TRAFFIC felt that the species' highly threatened status, combined with the history of inadequate trade controls in Indonesia, indicated that the proposal should be accepted. This was supported by the observer from the International Wildlife Coalition. The Chairman noted that a number of delegations supported the proposal, the delegation of Indonesia withdrew its objection, and the proposal was agreed.

27. Cacatua haematuropygia

There were no objections to this proposal, which was therefore agreed without discussion.

28. Eos reticulata

The delegation of the United States of America asked that discussion of this species be deferred in order to allow consultation with the delegation of Indonesia. This was supported by the Chairman, who reminded the delegations of the Secretariat's recommendation that a zero quota for *Eos reticulata* be imposed.

29. to 47. Bucerotidae spp.

The delegation of Switzerland indicated that a series of proposals dealing with the same family had been submitted, some by the Netherlands and the others by Thailand. The Chairman deferred discussion of these proposals, asking that the delegations of the proponent Parties and Switzerland as the Depository Government confer to expedite the Committee's deliberations.

48. and 49. Pteroglossus spp. and Ramphastos spp.

The Chairman deferred discussion of these proposals following an intervention by the delegation of Switzerland and in view of the absence of the delegation of the proponent Party.

50. Pittidae spp.

The delegation of Malaysia introduced the proposal, highlighting the family's extensive range and the scarcity of information on status and trade for many species. They stated that the primary reason for listing the entire family in Appendix II was to address look-alike problems. They were supported by the observer from the International Wildlife Coalition who stated that shipments of pittas were often not identified to species, and thus even the apparently low levels of trade might represent a serious threat to certain very rare species, two of which were listed in Appendix I. The delegation of India also supported the proposal, noting that, while there was apparently little trade, many populations were small. The proposal was strongly opposed by the delegation of Switzerland, which maintained that the family did not satisfy either biological or trade criteria for listing and adding that there was no look-alike problem and that none of the approximately 50 range States appeared to have been consulted. The delegation of Zimbabwe, the Secretariat and the observer from IUCN, speaking also for ICBP, also spoke against the proposal.

The Chairman noted that the proposal's main fault appeared to be its breadth and suggested that a significant number of species might merit inclusion, but that including the entire family was possibly not appropriate. He suggested deferring discussion until the next session. Following opposition to this from the delegation of Switzerland, he invited the delegation of Malaysia to consider withdrawing the proposal and revising it with the help of the Animals Committee for submission at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. After a further intervention from the delegation of Switzerland, the delegation of Malaysia withdrew the proposal.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 19h20.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Twelfth Session: 11 March 1992: 09h05-13h05

Chairman:	M. Holdgate (IUCN)
Secretariat:	I. Topkov O. Menghi J. Kundaeli G. van Vliet
Rapporteurs:	M.D. Jenkins K.B. Stansell

The Chairman opened the meeting at 09h05. Following several administrative announcements, the Secretary General informed the Committee that Equatorial Guinea had indicated its intention to accede to the Convention. He also announced that he had just signed a USD 123,000 grant agreement between the Secretariat and the United States of America to provide for the development of a CITES law-enforcement seminar on African elephant conservation.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other Proposals

28. *Eos reticulata*

Following confirmation by the delegation of Indonesia that the quota for this species would be reduced to zero until the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and an indication that field studies had been proposed by the International Council for Bird Preservation, the delegation of the United States of America withdrew their proposal.

29. to 47. Bucerotidae

A total of 19 proposals covering the South-east Asian genera of hornbills had been submitted. The Chairman had previously asked the proponents of the various proposals to confer and recommend to the Committee the best way to proceed in its deliberations.

The delegation of the Netherlands summarized by noting that they had submitted separate proposals for listing the entire genera *Aceros*, *Anorrhinus*, *Anthracoceros*, *Buceros*, *Penelopides* and *Ptilolaemus* in Appendix II; in addition Thailand had submitted a series of proposals for its own hornbill species, proposing some species for Appendix-II listing and four species of *Aceros*, one of *Anthracoceros* and one of *Buceros* for transfer to or listing in Appendix I. The Netherlands had also prepared two complementary proposals for rationalization of the present listing of *Buceros bicornis*, one entailing listing the entire species in Appendix I and the other entailing transfer of *Buceros bicornis homrai* to Appendix II. They noted that the Appendix-II proposals by Thailand would become redundant if the Dutch proposals were accepted. The only points of difference, therefore, were with the Appendix-I proposals of Thailand.

The Secretariat congratulated the delegation of the Netherlands on its efforts to make more comprehensible the appendices regarding these species and indicated its general support for the proposals.

In the discussion that followed, the delegation of Thailand withdrew all its proposals for Appendix-I listing (30, 31, 41 and 45) except those for *Aceros nipalensis* and *A. subruficollis*, stating that, although domestic legislation protecting hornbills existed, there was evidence of significant illegal trade continuing and that inclusion of these species in Appendix I was warranted. In this they were supported by the delegations of India, Malaysia and Nepal.

There were no objections to the Dutch proposals to list the six genera in Appendix II and hence proposals 29, 35, 38, 42, 46 and 47 were agreed.

However, the delegation of Switzerland, supported by the delegations of the United States of America and Zimbabwe requested clarification of the available data on population status and trade in the taxa still proposed for Appendix-I listing, expressing concern that there was inadequate information to determine whether international trade was a significant threat and whether this listing was therefore appropriate. The delegation of Zimbabwe also noted that the taxa proposed for Appendix-I listing were apparently no rarer than, and in some cases were commoner than, others which were not so proposed, such as *Aceros everettii* which appeared to be nearly extinct.

In response to the first concern, the observer from IUCN noted that the best available data on these species were presented in some detail in their analysis of the proposals. With respect to *Buceros bicornis*, the delegation of the Netherlands explained that at present the commoner of the two subspecies was listed in Appendix I and that differentiating the two subspecies was extremely difficult; listing of both subspecies in the same appendix was therefore desirable.

There being no sustained objections, proposals 32, 33 and 43, entailing listing of *Aceros nipalensis*, *A. subruficollis* and *Buceros bicornis* in Appendix I were agreed, with proposal 44 becoming redundant. The Chairman asked that the status of other species, especially *Aceros everettii*, be studied critically by the range States and expert observers before the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties with a view to providing further advice on the treatment of this group under the Convention.

48. and 49. *Pteroglossus* spp. and *Ramphastos* spp.

The delegation of Paraguay introduced the proposals noting that, following further consultations with the concerned range States, they were amending their proposal to apply only to the following six species: *Pteroglossus aracari*, *P. viridis*, *Ramphastos vitellinus*, *R. sulfuratus*, *R. toco*, and *R. tucanus*.

The delegation of Costa Rica, supported by the delegations of Argentina, Bolivia, Honduras, Mexico, Panama and Venezuela, noted the significant efforts of Paraguay in reaching a consensus with the affected range States and supported the amended proposals.

The delegation of Switzerland expressed concern that the supporting statements did not present adequate information to permit determination whether the species met the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II. They suggested that the limited available information indicated that total trade in these species was probably only a few hundred annually and that the species may be threatened by factors not specifically addressed by the Convention. The observer from TRAFFIC noted that the species in the amended proposals were those exported under a quota system from Guyana and Suriname for which reasonable trade data already existed and hence questioned whether inclusion in Appendix II would provide any additional information or protection.

The delegation of Panama, supported by the delegations of Brazil and Honduras, responded that there was precedence for including species in Appendix II based on similar levels of information, noting that the intent was to avoid unsustainable use of the species.

The delegation of Paraguay stated that they did not want to list more species that do not meet the Berne Criteria in the CITES appendices. Therefore they had studied the trade data and, after consultation with the delegations from Central and South American countries, had decided to reduce the number of proposed species to six. On the other hand, they were surprised to hear the delegation of Switzerland stating that if the family *Trochilidae* is listed in Appendix II and the African elephant in Appendix I, the whole family *Ramphastidae* should be listed in Appendix II. The delegation of Paraguay finally urged the Parties to consider their proposals carefully in the future, as well as the proposals they intend to support, to avoid a massive violation of the Berne Criteria at meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

On the proposal to include *Pteroglossus aracari* and *P. viridis* in Appendix II, the Chairman noted an objection and asked for a vote, and the proposal was agreed.

On the proposal to include *Ramphastos sulfuratus*, *R. toco*, *R. tucanus* and *R. vitellinus* in Appendix II, the Chairman, noting an objection, asked for a vote and the proposal was agreed.

The delegation of Switzerland requested that the minutes reflect that, in their opinion, the data presented did not meet the Berne Criteria, and the Chairman so noted.

51. *Clemmys insculpta*

After a brief discussion, in which it was suggested by the delegation of Zimbabwe that listing the species in Appendix III might be more appropriate, the proposal was agreed without objection.

52. *Clemmys muhlenbergi*

The delegations of Austria and Switzerland noted that international trade was not apparently a significant threat to the species and questioned how Appendix-I listing would help its conservation. The delegation of the United States of America, supported by the observer from the International Wildlife Coalition, stressed that the species was highly sought-after in the pet trade and had been illegally exported. There being no sustained objection, the proposal was agreed.

53. *Crocodylus niloticus*

The proposal had been amended to a quota proposal (see document Com.I 8.7).

54. *Corucia zebrata*

The delegation of Germany introduced the proposal, noting that the species was in international trade in increasing numbers and that the major exporting country, the Solomon Islands, was not a Party. After support for the proposal from the delegation of Papua New Guinea, the other range State, the proposal was agreed without objection.

55. *Vipera wagneri*

The proposal was agreed without objection.

56. *Conraua goliath*

The delegation of the United States of America, the proponent Party, stated that the proposal was a response to the potentially explosive demand for the species for the pet trade. They had received only limited comments from the range States on the proposal but would be prepared to withdraw it if they were satisfied that adequate controls on exploitation were in place. Following statements from the delegations of Cameroon and Gabon, the delegation of the United States of America withdrew the proposal. The Chairman hoped the range States had noted the concerns of the proponent Party and that they would be carefully monitoring the situation.

57. to 72. *Rana* spp.

The delegation of Germany introduced the proposals, noting that trade in frogs' legs from Indonesia had increased in recent years and that the proposals concerned 16 threatened or possibly threatened Asiatic *Rana* species.

The delegations of Austria and India both supported the proposals. Several delegations, including those of some range-state Parties, and the Secretariat voiced serious concerns about the proposals, or directly opposed them, noting the lack of biological and trade information presented on the species, questioning the reasoning behind the particular choice of species and noting the extreme difficulty of enforcement because of problems of identification of parts in trade.

In response to these concerns, the delegation of Germany withdrew the proposals, but noted that they would take up the suggestion of the delegation of China to carry out further studies on biology and trade with a view to presenting a modified version of the proposals at a subsequent meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The delegation of Switzerland then asked that importing countries monitor trade in frogs' legs on a country-by-country basis even if imports could not be identified to species.

73. *Clupea harengus*

The delegation of Zimbabwe announced that the proposal regarding *Clupea harengus* was being withdrawn, explaining that the proponent Parties felt that it had now served its purpose, although they believed there was still a case for listing the species in the appendices. They contrasted the response to this and other fisheries proposals with the response to those dealing with terrestrial species, including the African elephant, noting that they believed the solution to the problems was the same in both cases, namely the development of improved management for sustainable use. They also felt that the proposal had underlined the problems and feelings of range-state Parties, in most cases third-world countries, when proposals were submitted by other Parties, usually first-world countries, without adequate prior consultation and notice.

74. *Polyodon spathula*

The Secretariat announced that the United States of America, in view of a limited but legitimate export trade, now proposed inclusion of the species in Appendix II rather than Appendix I. After a request from the delegation of Switzerland, asking that, as live specimens of the species could grow very large, importing Parties be restrictive when allowing imports for the pet trade, the amended proposal was agreed without objection.

75. *Gymnocharacinus bergi*

This proposal had been withdrawn.

78. *Strombus gigas*

This proposal was agreed without objection.

79. *Schinopsis* spp.

This proposal had been withdrawn.

80. *Tillandsia* spp.

The Secretariat stated that it considered the original proposals to list the entire genus *Tillandsia* in Appendix II inappropriate and strongly advocated a modification to include only those few species which merited consideration. The delegation of Germany noted that, following suggestions made in the Plants Committee informal group discussions and after consultation with range States and botanical experts, it had modified its proposal which now included only the species *Tillandsia harisii*, *T. kammii*, *T. kautskyi*, *T. mauryana*, *T. sprengeliana*, *T. sucrei* and *T. xerographica*. All of these were in international trade and with one exception were easily distinguished from other species, the exception being the close resemblance of two of them to *T. hondurensis*. The delegation of Germany requested the Plants Committee to look into the last problem with the aim of proposing more species for inclusion in the appendices at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, to facilitate enforcement.

The delegation of Austria then introduced their proposal, recording the dramatic increase in *Tillandsia* trade in the past five years, quoting statistics for Guatemalan exports and stating that 95 per cent of plants offered for sale were wild-collected, artificial propagation being at present negligible. They also stressed the difficulty of distinguishing between species, particularly non-flowering specimens, at the point of import, and hence they still proposed the entire genus for listing.

The delegations of Bolivia, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico, all range States, spoke against the Austrian proposal as did the delegations of the Netherlands, Switzerland and the United Kingdom. The delegation of Guatemala further commented on the lack of both adequate consultation with range States and scientific justification for the proposal. They did, however, give qualified support to the modified German proposal, echoed by the delegations of Bolivia and Mexico. Following this, the delegation of Austria withdrew their proposal.

Several other delegations, including those of Brazil and Costa Rica, supported the German proposal. The Chairman of the Plants Committee introduced information just received from the Bromeliad Society, which opposed the inclusion of *T. harisii*, *T. kammii* and *T. mauryana*. The German proposal as amended was however agreed without objection.

81. to 88. Cactaceae

The Chairman of the Plants Committee reported that the plants working group after useful discussions had reached the decision to recommend adoption of all proposals concerning the family Cactaceae except one, proposal 87 regarding *Turbinicarpus* spp. Proposals 81 to 86 and 88 were all agreed without objection.

The delegation of the United States of America introduced proposal 87, noting that six species of *Turbinicarpus* were already included in Appendix I, that taxonomic revision had extended the genus to include additional species, that there was nomenclatural complexity and that just over half of the species proposed for inclusion in Appendix I were considered rare in the wild.

The delegation of Mexico outlined serious problems with the illegal export of Mexican endemic cacti and questioned whether Appendix-I listing would help solve this. However, they were prepared to accept the proposal if the Plants Committee would undertake to analyze trade in and propagation of cacti that had been illegally exported from Mexico. The Chairman of the Plants Committee agreed to this.

The delegation of Switzerland, supported by the delegation of Thailand and the observer from TRAFFIC, questioned the wisdom of including whole genera in Appendix I when some species were not threatened and emphasized the need to adhere to the Berne Criteria. The Chairman observed that it was too late to amend the proposal during the present meeting and, after an objection to the proposal, took a vote. The proposal was agreed by 49 votes to 5.

89. *Dionaea muscipula*

The Chairman of the Plants Committee reported that the plants working group had reached consensus to recommend this proposal, and it was agreed without objection.

90. *Dalbergia nigra*

The proposal was agreed without objection.

91. *Intsia* spp.

This proposal had been withdrawn.

92. *Pericopsis elata*

The delegation of the United Kingdom noted that, as recommended by the Secretariat, the proposal had been amended to apply only to saw-logs, sawn wood and veneer. They reported that the species was in trade as timber and that FAO had found it to be endangered in part of its range and seriously threatened by genetic erosion in other parts. They acknowledged the efforts of range States in managing the resource and controlling trade but felt that Appendix-II listing would provide valuable monitoring and help to ensure that use was sustainable.

The delegation of Ghana reported that the species was rare in Ghana but internal use was legally controlled and export restrictions had been put in place preventing the export of logs. They stressed that control of timber export in Ghana was the responsibility of the Timber Marketing Board which was not the CITES Management Authority. They thought it unnecessary for Parties to impose more restrictions, although would not object to inclusion of the species in Appendix III. The delegation of Cameroon, a range State, also stated that timber trade was outside the scope of their country's Management Authority. The Chairman made the point that it was governments and not government departments who were responsible for upholding the Convention. The delegation of the Congo, a range State, supported the proposal, as did the delegation of Portugal on behalf of the countries of the EEC and the observers from IUCN and TRAFFIC.

Following an objection, the Chairman called a vote, with the proposal being agreed by 53 votes to 4. He then strongly emphasized a point raised by the observer from TRAFFIC, namely that the Plants Committee, the Secretariat, other Parties and international organizations should help range States as much as possible to overcome problems that would arise from the adoption of this proposal.

93. and 94. *Swietenia* spp.

The Secretariat read out a written statement from Costa Rica indicating that it was withdrawing its proposal and supporting that of the United States of America. The delegation of the United States of America announced that, after consultation with range States, particularly Costa Rica, and taking into account the Secretariat's recommendations, they were amending their proposal as follows: for *Swietenia macrophylla*, only saw-logs, sawn wood and veneer from populations of Mexico and Central America including Panama were included; and for *S. mahagoni*, only saw-logs, sawn wood and veneer were included.

In the debate that followed, chiefly concerning *S. macrophylla*, delegations of many of the range-state Parties emphasized their countries' commitment to sustainable management of their natural resources, particularly timber, but differed on the merits of the proposal before them. The delegation of Brazil, whose country was the major exporter of *S. macrophylla*, supported the proposal and stated that they would have been happy to have the entire species, including the population of their own country, included in Appendix II. However, they would accept the proposed amendment on condition that range States develop management programmes for the sustainable use of the species. The delegations of Guatemala, Honduras and Panama questioned the scientific basis of excluding some populations of the species from the amended proposal, noting the problems of implementation that this would cause, these being reiterated by the delegation of Mexico. The delegation of Honduras further did not consider it necessary for its population of the species to be included in Appendix II, although the delegations of Mexico and Panama saw merit in including all Central American populations of the species. In view of the apparent lack of consensus reached, the delegation of the United States of America further amended their proposal to exclude *S. macrophylla*.

The delegation of Australia noted that the species in the proposal satisfied both biological and trade criteria for listing in Appendix II but recognized the implementation problems this might bring, particularly the increase in the administrative burden on Parties and difficulties of identification of parts in trade, and they urged the Plants Committee to examine these problems regardless of whether this specific proposal were accepted. They further urged the Secretariat to increase communication and co-operation with the International Tropical Timber Organization. The Secretariat responded that such action was under way, and that it believed a solution to the problem of identification could be found.

Following an objection, the Chairman took a vote on the amended proposal, which now only concerned *S. mahagoni* and was agreed by 38 votes to 4.

The Chairman noted the generally constructive tone of the debate, and the concerns of a number of the range States, and again emphasized the need for the Plants Committee and the Secretariat to do their utmost to help range States ensure that listing of timber species in the appendices would be of benefit to conservation.

95. *Gonystylus bancanus*

This proposal had been withdrawn.

96. *Guaiacum officinale*

After some discussion, this proposal was agreed without objection.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 13h05.

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

Eighth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Kyoto (Japan), 2 to 13 March 1992

SUMMARY REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE I MEETING

Thirteenth Session: 11 March 1992: 14h20-16h10

Chairman: M. Holdgate (IUCN)

Secretariat: J. Berney
O. Menghi
J. Kundaeli

UNEP: R. Olembo

Rapporteurs: J.G. Barzdo
J.R. Caldwell
J. Gray
T.P. Inskipp

The Chairman opened proceedings at 14h20.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

3. Proposals Concerning Export Quotas

Seeking a final decision on the proposal to transfer the sub-Saharan population of *Panthera pardus* from Appendix I to Appendix II, the Chairman referred the Committee to document Doc. 8.45.1*.

The delegation of Zimbabwe thanked the IUCN/SSC Captive Breeding Specialist Group for assistance in revising the proposal. Attention was drawn to the deletion of two paragraphs from section 3.32 of the original proposal and the inclusion of a new one.

The delegation of Kenya stated that there had been an increase in leopard poaching recently in their country. They were concerned that transfer of the populations to Appendix II would allow poached skins to be traded, which could lead to a re-opening of the spotted cat skin trade in Africa. This concern was shared by the delegations of the Central African Republic, Germany and the United Republic of Tanzania, who could see no benefit of Appendix-II listing.

The delegation of India endorsed these comments and stressed that there were look-alike problems with skins of the more highly endangered Asian population of leopard.

The Chairman pointed out that the document proposed only a temporary transfer to Appendix II. The strict limitation of trade to tagged, tourist souvenirs or hunting trophies was emphasized by the delegation of Switzerland.

Raising a point of order, the delegation of Germany, supported by the delegation of the Congo, asked that a vote be taken. The Chairman explained that there were two crucial elements to the proposal: revision of existing quotas; and transfer of certain populations to Appendix II. The Secretariat pointed out that, if the proposal were rejected, the quotas established at the seventh meeting of the Conference of the Parties would still apply. The concerns of the delegation of Kenya were not with the quotas but with the transfer to Appendix II. The delegation of Zimbabwe

* This document was distributed at the meeting as document Doc. 8.45 Addendum. (Note from the Secretariat).

proposed that, in the event of the proposal being rejected, the new quotas be taken as amending those in Resolution Conf. 7.7.

Following clarification that non-proponent countries with quotas already established by Resolution Conf. 7.7. would not lose them, a vote was taken and the proposal rejected. There being no objections to the revised quotas, these were agreed for commendation to the Conference of the Parties.

XIII Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

24. Role of the Scientific Authority

The delegation of the United States of America, as Chairman of the relevant working group, introduced document Com. 8.24, specifying the reasons for the changes made to the original draft resolution and the proposed changes to this document, including the insertion of the words in question after "species" in paragraph e), line 3. Regarding the former, changes had been made mainly to improve the language and to delete sections on which consensus had not been reached. Regarding the words "in question", the Chairman of the working group stated that they were included so that it would be clear that when a species is listed in Appendix II due to similarity of appearance, i.e. under the provisions of Article II, paragraph 2(b), the advice of the Scientific Authority of the country of export should be based on confirmation that the specimens to be exported are from this species and on information, e.g. from marking, to ensure that the specimens are distinguishable from those of the similar taxon listed under the provisions of Article II, paragraph 2(a), and that the export is not detrimental to the latter species.

After various exchanges, notably over whether the words "shall", "designate" and "appropriate" were apposite in certain parts of the text of document Com. 8.24, the Chairman suggested that the document be amended as follows:

- in paragraph 3, line 4, of the preamble, substitute 7.10 for "7.19";
- in paragraph a), line 1, insert a comma after "Parties";
- in paragraph e), line 3, insert in question after "species" and delete "that" after "and";
- in paragraph e), line 4, delete "shall" after "permit";
- in paragraph m), line 2, substitute country for "State".

These amendments were accepted and it was agreed to commend document Com. 8.24, as amended, to the Conference of the Parties.

6. Recognition of the Benefits of Trade in Wildlife

The Chairman sought the comments of the Committee on the draft resolution in document Com. 8.3 (Rev. 3). The delegation of Germany believed that this was superfluous and that the intent should have been addressed in the preamble of the Convention, and questioned whether Article XI, paragraph 3, enabled the adoption of such a draft resolution. However, they would not object to it.

The delegation of Suriname proposed that, in the operative part, the words and/or to the development of local people be inserted after "ecosystems". This was agreed.

Two typographical errors in document Com. 8.3 (Rev. 3) were pointed out by the delegation of Zimbabwe and noted by the Secretariat.

The delegation of Kenya, supported by the delegation of Israel, sought to amend the seventh paragraph of the preamble to indicate that non-consumptive uses of wildlife were no less important than consumptive uses. The delegation of Zimbabwe stressed that the relative importance depended on the particular circumstances. The delegation of Bolivia suggested that the draft resolution should not make a comparison, leading the Chairman to propose that the words "may be of equal importance to consumptive commercial use" be replaced by are also of enormous importance. This was agreed. There was no objection to a proposal from the Chairman that the underlining in the preamble be removed, and the draft resolution as amended was agreed.

25. Proposals to Register the First Commercial Captive-Breeding Operation for an Appendix-I Animal Species

The Chairman brought the Committee's attention to document Com. 8.21 (Rev.), referring to Guidelines for a Procedure to Register and Monitor Operations Breeding Appendix-I Animal Species for Commercial Purposes.

The delegation of Canada, Chairman of the working group on this subject, deferred to the delegation of Australia to explain the group's proposed changes to the wording of the document, as follows.

In the main part of the draft resolution:

- in the second preambular paragraph, third line, the word "and" should be an;
- in paragraph b), first line, the word "all" should be deleted, and , where appropriate, should be added after "to establish";
- in paragraph e), second line, "the environmental impact and risk" should be replaced by ecological risks;
- in paragraph g), insert in the first line , particularly range States, after "Parties", and insert at the end of the second line , making sure in particular all range States have received the proposal;
- in paragraph h) delete the words in bold type in the second and third lines, and insert , particularly range States, after "Party" in the third line;
- in paragraph j), replace the words in bold type with which acquire additional specimens of Appendix-I species comply with the requirements of this Resolution;
- paragraphs d), l) and m) should be deleted, recognizing that the concepts involved were too complex to resolve during the present meeting of the Conference of the Parties;
- the alternative to paragraphs h) and i), on page 3, should be deleted and replaced by INSTRUCTS the Animals Committee to examine the complex issues related to the origin of founder breeding-stock and the relationship between registered breeding operations and conservation programmes for the species within the countries of origin and to report on its findings and recommendations at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and.

In addition, the following amendments were proposed to the Annexes to the draft resolution:

Annex 1:

- in the third preambular paragraph, insert in range States may after "purposes" and insert than in non-range States after "costs";
- in the fourth preambular paragraph, insert may, in some cases, after "purposes"; and make the consequent grammatical corrections;
- in paragraph 4. b), replace the term "CITES permits" with CITES documents;

Annex 3:

- in paragraph h. of the operative part, delete "all", insert , where appropriate, after "Parties", and insert Appendix-I after "native".

The Committee agreed to all these amendments.

The delegation of Malaysia proposed an amendment to paragraph i) on page 2 of the draft resolution, to append the words or by postal vote procedures under Article XV of the Convention. This was agreed and the draft resolution was approved as amended.

XIV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other Proposals

16. *Ceratotherium simum* (Zimbabwe)

17. *Ceratotherium simum simum* (South Africa)

18. *Diceros bicornis* (Zimbabwe)

Noting the request made by the observer from WWF in an earlier session of the Committee, that a positive message addressing the problem of illegal trade in rhinoceros horn should emerge from this meeting, the Chairman proposed the text of a statement to be included in the Committee's minutes (text annexed to this summary report). Following a request from the delegation of Israel that the Chairman ensure the statement did not contradict a draft resolution agreed in Committee II, Committee I agreed that the statement be presented to the Conference of the Parties.

On behalf of Committee I, the delegation of Brazil expressed gratitude for the Chairman's masterly handling of the agenda. After thanking the interpreters for their hard work and devotion to duty, the Chairman closed the meeting at 16h10.

STATEMENT ON RHINOCEROS CONSERVATION

Committee I has been seriously concerned by the evidence presented that despite great effort, substantial expenditure and tragic loss of human life, the populations of all species of rhinoceros have continued to decline in virtually all parts of their range.

It is clear that illegal trade in rhinoceros horn has been a major cause of this alarming situation, and that despite the listing of the species in Appendix I, the CITES machinery has been largely ineffective. This, in fact, is largely a consequence of the high market demand in certain countries, including some that are not party to the Convention.

As a result of these pressures, the survival of most rhinoceros species is now in doubt.

The Committee, therefore, considers that a new effort is needed by the Parties and the Standing Committee, and it requests the Conference to instruct the Standing Committee and the Secretariat:

1. to assist, and to encourage Parties and national and international conservation and funding agencies to assist national efforts for rhinoceros conservation in Africa and Asia as a matter of the utmost urgency;
2. to commission a comprehensive study of the illegal trade in rhino horn and other rhino products, especially in order to identify points at which that market may be most vulnerable to influence;
3. to provide measures to inhibit illegal international trade in rhinoceros horn and products, and in this context to propose maximum effective pressures on States, whether or not party to CITES, to comply with Resolution Conf. 6.10 which recommends the prohibition of all trade in rhinoceros parts and derivatives;
4. to enlist the energetic support and commitment of the public and the media, so as to increase the pressure on State to close markets for rhino horn and products; and to promote a public switch from consumption of those products to acceptable and sustainable substitutes.

Martin Holdgate - 11 March 1992