

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



Twenty-fifth meeting of the Animals Committee
Geneva (Switzerland), 18-22 July 2011

RANCHING AND TRADE IN RANCHED SPECIMENS OF SPECIES
TRANSFERRED FROM APPENDIX I TO APPENDIX II (DECISION 15.51)

1. This document has been prepared by the Secretariat.
2. At its 15th meeting (CoP15, Doha, 2010), the Conference of the Parties adopted Decision 15.51 as follows:

Directed to the Animals Committee

The Animals Committee shall:

- a) *evaluate the merit of reinstating the ability to transfer suitably qualified populations that continue to meet the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) Annex 1 from Appendix I to Appendix II pursuant to Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) or Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.); and*
 - b) *if merit is found, draft a revision of the terms of paragraph A. 2 in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to eliminate the requirement that downlisting proposals pursuant to Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) or Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) must also meet the criteria in Annex 1 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15).¹*
3. The Secretariat recalls that this Decision arose from discussion of document CoP15 Doc. 28 at CoP15. For ease of reference, the relevant extract from this document is attached as an Annex to the present document.
 4. The Committee is invited to commence implementation of Decision 15.51.

¹ *Note from the Secretariat: the Secretariat understands that the intention of paragraph b) of this Decision is that, if the Animals Committee finds merit in the ability referred to in paragraph a), then it should draft a revision of section A. 2 in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) to allow proposals to downlist populations of Appendix-I species pursuant to Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP15) or Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) even if the species continue to qualify for inclusion in Appendix I under the criteria listed in Annex 1 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15).*

Extract from document CoP15 Doc. 28 which was submitted by the Secretariat at CoP15

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 *inter alia*, to 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:
 - a) management to ensure implementation and compliance with the Convention and appropriate enforcement controls [paragraph A. 2. b)];
 - b) an export quota based on described management measures and effective enforcement controls [paragraph A. 2. c)]; or
 - c) 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)].
6. As can be seen in Annex 1 to the present document, the conditions required for the transfer of a species from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching, through paragraph A. 2. d), 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 propose 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 such proposal has been submitted – that for the Cuban population of *Crocodylus acutus* at the 13th meeting (Bangkok, October 2004).
7. 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.
8. The Animals Committee considered this at its 24th meeting (Geneva, April 2009) and recommended *inter alia* that:
 - a) *all proposals for the transfer of populations from Appendix I to Appendix II, whether for ranching or not, be done under the provisions of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14);*
 - b) *the core elements of Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) be retained to inform consideration of precautionary measures under Annex 4, paragraph A.2.d, of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14);*
 - c) *such elements, which should be in line with other provisions in Annex 4, paragraph A.2, of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), be incorporated in a separate new draft resolution that referred to Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP14);*
 - d) *accordingly, Resolutions Conf. 9.20 (Rev.) and Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) be repealed in their entirety; and*
 - e) *the implications for populations previously downlisted for ranching under Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) and its predecessors are assessed.*

CoP15 Doc. 28 Annex 1

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

Paragraph A. 2. b)	Paragraph A. 2. c)	Paragraph A. 2. d)
<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>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>A ranching proposal is submitted consistent with the applicable Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties and is approved.</p>
	Paragraph B	Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)* [similar detailed conditions apply in Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.)]
	<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 Depositary Government to prepare a proposal to transfer the population back to Appendix I.</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>

	Paragraph B	Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)* [similar detailed conditions apply in Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.)]
		The programme must have in place appropriate inventories, harvest-level controls and mechanisms to monitor the wild populations
		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
		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: i) details of its marking system that should meet the minimum requirements of the uniform marking system defined in this Resolution; ii) a list specifying the types of products produced by the operation; iii) a description of the methods that will be used to mark all products and containers entered into trade; and iv) an inventory of current stocks of specimens of the species concerned, whether or not they are from the ranching operation
		A proposal not be approved unless it contains the following: i) evidence that the taking from the wild will have no significant detrimental impact on wild populations; ii) an assessment of the likelihood of the biological and economic success of each ranching operation; iii) assurance that the operation shall be carried out at all stages in a humane (non-cruel) manner; iv) documented evidence to demonstrate that the programme is beneficial to the wild population through reintroduction or in other ways; and v) assurance that the general criteria in RECOMMENDS paragraph b) of Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) shall continue to be met

	Paragraph B	Resolution Conf. 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)* [similar detailed conditions apply in Resolution Conf. 9.20 (Rev.)]
		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.
		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
		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.
		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.
		Annual reports on all relevant aspects of each approved ranching operation be submitted to the Secretariat by the Party concerned

* 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.