

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

Twenty-fourth meeting of the Animals Committee  
Geneva, (Switzerland), 20-24 April 2009

Ranching

REVISION OF RESOLUTION CONF. 11.16 (REV. COP14)

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. Decision 14.53 directs the Secretariat, in consultation with the Animals Committee, to:

*examine Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) (Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II) with a view to proposing revisions to the Resolution to make its structure more logical, clarify certain recommendations, edit text and reduce overlap between sections for consideration at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.*
3. This Decision arose from a review of global crocodile ranching programmes considered by the Animals Committee at its 22nd meeting (Lima, July 2006 - see documents AC22 Doc. 12.2 and AC22 Inf. 2), which resulted in document CoP14 Doc. 21 presented at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14, The Hague, June 2007).
4. Some of the suggested changes to Resolution Conf. 11.16 which were mentioned by the Secretariat in document CoP14 Doc. 21 have already been incorporated into the revised Resolution adopted at CoP14. The most substantive remaining suggestion contained in document CoP14 Doc. 21 was to transfer the parts of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) concerned with proposals to transfer populations from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching purposes to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II*.
5. Although not mentioned at CoP14, the Secretariat observes that the suggestion mentioned in paragraph 4 above brings into focus some fundamental questions about the use of ranching in transferring species from Appendix I to Appendix II. For species in demand for international trade, proposals to transfer a species from Appendix I to Appendix II need to *inter alia* comply with one of a number of precautionary measures set out in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14). Broadly these can be either: management to assure implementation and compliance with the Convention and appropriate enforcement controls [paragraph A. 2. b)]; an export quota based on described management measures and effective enforcement controls [paragraph A. 2. c)]; or compliance with the rules for ranching as set out in Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) or Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) on *Guidelines for evaluating marine turtle ranching proposals submitted pursuant to Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)* [paragraph A. 2. d)]. The conditions required for the transfer of a species from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching, which are set out in detail in the Annex to the present document, are much stricter than those required under paragraph A. 2. b) or c) in Annex 4 to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14). Consequently, there

would appear to be little reason or incentive for a Party to make a request to transfer a species from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching purposes. Not surprisingly, at the three meetings of the Conference of the Parties since these provisions have been in effect, only one proposal has been submitted – that for the Cuban population of *Crocodylus acutus* at the 13th meeting (Bangkok, October 2004), for transfer of ranched specimens from Appendix I to Appendix II.

6. Such a situation is perverse, because the requirements for ranching will ensure that any ranching programme successfully used to transfer a species from Appendix I to Appendix II will actually be beneficial to the wild population through reintroduction or in other ways.
7. The Secretariat therefore suggests the following options:
  - a) to repeal (most parts of) Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) and Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) as they are rendered purposeless by paragraphs A.2. b) and c) in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14); or
  - b) to simplify the conditions for making an amendment proposal to revise the two ranching Resolutions in order to bring them on a par with the provisions in paragraphs A. 2. b) and c) in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), thereby removing any disincentive to follow this approach.
8. If ranching as a management technique no longer has a role as a factor in judging proposals to amend the Appendices, it nonetheless remains one of a large variety of production systems which can be used to mitigate the impact of the use of species and ensure a satisfactory non-detriment finding under Article IV of the Convention. Other examples of such production systems can be found in document AC17 Doc. 14 (Rev. 1). The current document therefore needs to be considered in conjunction with document AC24 Doc. 8.1.
9. The Secretariat appreciates that the above suggestions are rather more substantive than those that may have been envisaged under Decision 14.53, but request the Committee's opinion on them in order to determine whether to propose revisions to the Resolution for consideration at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

**Safeguards required to achieve transfer of a species from Appendix I to Appendix II under Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 4**

<p>Paragraph A. 2. b)</p> <p>The CoP is satisfied with the implementation by the range States of the requirements of the Convention, in particular Article IV; and appropriate enforcement controls and compliance with the requirements of the Convention.</p>	<p>Paragraph A. 2. c) and B</p> <p>An integral part of the amendment proposal is an export quota or other special measure approved by the CoP, based on management measures described in the supporting statement of the amendment proposal, provided that effective enforcement controls are in place</p>	<p>Paragraph A. 2. d) and Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)</p> <p>A ranching proposal is submitted consistent with the applicable Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties and is approved.</p>
	<p>Paragraph B</p> <p>Where the Plants Committee, the Animals Committee or a Party becomes aware of problems in compliance with the management measures and export quotas of another Party, the Secretariat shall be informed and, if the Secretariat fails to resolve the matter satisfactorily, it shall inform the Standing Committee which may, after consultation with the Party concerned, recommend to all Parties that they suspend trade with that Party in specimens of CITES-listed species, and/or request the Depository Government to prepare a proposal to transfer the population back to Appendix I.</p>	<p>Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)* (similar detailed conditions apply in Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.))</p> <p>The ranching programme must be primarily beneficial to the conservation of the local—population (i.e., where applicable, contribute to its increase in the wild or promote protection of the species's habitat while maintaining a stable population)</p>

	<p>If, on review of a quota and its supporting management measures, the Animals or Plants Committee encounters any problems with compliance or potential detriment to a species, the relevant Committee shall request the Depositary Government to prepare a proposal for appropriate remedial action.</p>	<p>All products (including live specimens) of each operation must be adequately identified and documented to ensure that they can be readily distinguished from products of Appendix-I populations</p>
		<p>The programme must have in place appropriate inventories, harvest-level controls and mechanisms to monitor the wild populations</p>
		<p>There must be sufficient safeguards established in the programme to ensure that adequate numbers of animals are returned to the wild if necessary and where appropriate</p>
		<p>Any Party submitting a ranching proposal for a population of a species include in the proposal the following, in addition to the usual biological data requested for proposals to amend the Appendices:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) details of its marking system that should meet the minimum requirements of the uniform marking system defined in this Resolution;</li> <li>ii) a list specifying the types of products produced by the operation;</li> <li>iii) a description of the methods that will be used to mark all products and containers entered into trade; and</li> <li>iv) an inventory of current stocks of specimens of the species concerned, whether or not they are from the ranching operation</li> </ul>
		<p>A proposal not be approved unless it contains the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) evidence that the taking from the wild will have no significant detrimental impact on wild populations;</li> <li>ii) an assessment of the likelihood of the biological and economic success of each ranching operation;</li> <li>iii) assurance that the operation shall be carried out at all stages in a humane (non-cruel) manner;</li> </ul>

<p>iv) documented evidence to demonstrate that the programme is beneficial to the wild population through reintroduction or in other ways; and</p> <p>v) assurance that the general criteria in RECOMMENDS paragraph b) of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) shall continue to be met</p>		
<p>Proposals must be received by the Secretariat at least 330 days before CoP and subject to pre-evaluation by the Secretariat in consultation with the Animals Committee. Proponents must provide further information to the Secretariat if requested.</p>		
<p>Proposals that include a component of a wild-adult harvest be examined much more stringently than those based purely on collection of eggs, neonates, larvae or other juvenile life stages</p>		
<p>Successful proponents subsequently limit the manner of exploitation of wild populations to those techniques described in their proposals and not, for example, later initiate new short-term programmes for taking wild animals without notifying the Secretariat.</p>		
<p>Any changes to the ranching programme to be submitted to the Secretariat, who, in consultation with the Animals Committee, should determine whether the changes proposed substantially alter the original ranching programme, and undermine or jeopardize the conservation of the wild population. If so, a new proposal may be required.</p>		
<p>Annual reports on all relevant aspects of each approved ranching operation be submitted to the Secretariat by the Party concerned</p>		

\* In contrast to other proposals to amend the Appendices which must be submitted 150 days before a Conference of the Parties, ranching proposals must be submitted at least 330 days in advance and thereafter, in consultation with the Animals Committee, the Secretariat must seek appropriate scientific and technical advice to verify that the criteria in Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) have been met, seeking extra information from the proponent if required.