

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



Fifty-ninth meeting of the Standing Committee
Doha (Qatar), 12 March 2010

SUMMARY RECORD

1. Opening remarks by the Chair

The Secretary-General transmitted the apologies of Ambassador Cristián Maquieira, the Chair of the Standing Committee, for being unable to attend the present meeting, and introduced Mr Meng Xianlin as the representative of China as Alternate Vice-Chair of the Committee, who was taking the chairmanship for this meeting.

The Chair of the meeting welcomed the participants and thanked the Committee for their confidence.

Strategic and administrative matters

2. Agenda

The provisional agenda in document SC59 Doc. 2 (Rev. 1) was adopted without amendment.

3. Rules of Procedure

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 3, which was noted.

4. Credentials

The Secretariat reported that, in accordance with previous practice for Standing Committee meetings held in conjunction with meetings of the Conference of the Parties, credentials submitted for attendance at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP15) were accepted also for attending the present meeting (SC59).

5. Admission of observers

The Secretariat suggested that any observer with a badge allowing attendance at CoP15 be allowed to attend SC59. This was accepted.

6. Summary records of meetings of the Standing Committee and other committees

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 6 and noted the costly and time-consuming nature of preparing full summaries of sessions of the Standing, Animals and Plants Committees. Audio recordings had been produced for SC57 and SC58 and had been made available on the Standing Committee forum of the CITES website. The Secretariat asked for the agreement of the Committee to make the audio recording of those meetings, as well as SC59 and future meetings accessible to everyone. Noting that executive summaries were available for all Standing Committee meetings, the Secretariat suggested that audio recordings replace the full summary records of these meetings. Some Parties noted that it would be difficult for Parties whose mother tongue was not one of the working languages to follow the discussion on an audio file. One Party noted that those with poor internet access would be at a disadvantage if the full record was only available through an audio file on the CITES website. It was agreed that the Secretariat would publish the audio file on the CITES website and also publish a full summary record.

During discussion of this item, interventions were made by the representatives of Africa (Kenya), Asia (China and Japan), Europe (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland¹) and North America (Canada).

7. Relationship with the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)

The Executive Director of UNEP stated that he had agreed to report to the Committee on the relationship between UNEP and CITES. He explained that the UNEP management team was developing a procedure for the delegation of authority for all Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) secretariats to enable them to work without having to always refer back to UNEP headquarters. It would supersede any prior arrangements between UNEP and CITES. He reported that a draft delegation of authority between the Executive Director of UNEP and the Secretary-General of CITES had been developed with the objective of ensuring high-level secretariat services and to clarify the Secretary-General's authority, responsibility and accountability. The draft delegation of authority had been sent to the Chair of the Standing Committee in February 2010 for review. The Executive Director proposed that a working group, that could include two or three members of the Standing Committee, meet in June 2010, to consider the way forward for CITES and UNEP.

He described the process of selecting a new Secretary-General and noted that, to ensure transparency, the Chair of the Standing Committee had been asked to join the interview panel. He reported that the selection had been completed, that Mr John Scanlon had been chosen from a total of 186 applicants, and would begin work as the new Secretary-General of CITES in May 2010. Participants in the meeting welcomed Mr Scanlon's appointment and indicated that they looked forward to working with him.

Members of the Standing Committee expressed support for the formation of the working group and the proposed accountability framework. However, several Parties expressed serious concern that there had been no communication from the Chair to the rest of the Committee regarding the recruitment for the new Secretary-General and that neither they nor other Parties had seen the draft accountability framework. One member pointed out that CITES was not a part of UNEP. They disagreed with the view that it was not necessary to have a separate agreement between the Executive Director and the Standing Committee and stressed that such an agreement could not be replaced by the delegation of authority, which was an internal arrangement between the Executive Director and one of his staff members. It was felt that this subject, as well as the present long-standing agreement between the Committee and the Executive Director, might benefit from discussion by the working group. Some Committee members believed that the membership of the proposed working group should cover all CITES regions. Switzerland, as the Depository Government, were eager to work with UNEP's Executive Director but noted that CITES had a long history and therefore a different architecture compared to more recent MEAs.

One Committee member suggested that CoP15 be used as an opportunity for further consultation with Parties regarding this issue and the constitution of the working group. Document SC59 Doc. 7 (Rev. 2) was noted.

During discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representatives of Africa (Kenya and Zambia), Asia (Japan), Europe (Iceland and the United Kingdom), North America (Canada), Oceania (Australia) and the Depository Government (Switzerland), and by the United States of America and the Executive Director of UNEP.

8. Cooperation with the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 8, noting that it had been prepared jointly by the Secretariats of both Conventions. There was considerable synergy between the conventions and their Standing Committees had endorsed a series of joint activities. The Annex to the document consisted of a progress report and highlighted the importance of harmonization of species names. This procedure had been endorsed in 2008 and would hopefully be achieved for mammals at CoP15. The Secretariat reported further that the Conventions were beginning to use each other's staff to attend meetings. Given the prospect of additional funding, a new Secretary-General and the time-frame of Standing Committee meetings, the joint Secretariats requested that the current programme of joint activities be extended until

¹ *On behalf of the member States of the European Union*

the end of 2011 and proposed presenting a revised programme of joint activities for the following triennium at SC61. This was agreed.

During discussion of this agenda item, an intervention was made by the representative of Oceania (Australia).

9. Arrangements for the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties

9.1 Election of officers

The Secretary-General explained the process through which nominees to chair the Conference of the Parties and its sessional committees were selected, and announced the following nominations: Chair of CoP15 - Dr Faleh bin Nasser Al-Thani (Qatar); Alternate Chair of CoP15 - Mr Ghanim Abdullah Mohammed (Qatar); Chair of Committee I - Mr John Donaldson (South Africa); Chair of Committee II - Mr Wilbur Dovey (New Zealand); Chair of the Credentials Committee - Mr Georges Evrard (Belgium). These nominations were approved by acclamation.

With regard to the Vice-chairs of the Conference, the Secretary-General suggested that they should be from the regions of North America and Central and South America and the Caribbean. Mr Robert Gabel (United States) was proposed to serve as one Vice-chair and this was approved by acclamation. It was agreed that the other Vice-chair should be nominated by the members representing Central and South America and the Caribbean, who should inform the Secretariat.

9.2 Other matters

The Secretariat reported that they were experiencing severe problems with printing of documents for CoP15 and asked for the understanding of the Parties.

10. CITES and livelihoods

Peru, as Chair of the CITES and livelihoods working group, introduced document SC59 Doc. 10 and highlighted the three aspects of the project, namely the development of tools for rapid assessment, the establishment of guidelines to address the impact of CITES-listing decisions on the livelihoods of the poor, and the development of a series of recommendations. They suggested that the mandate of the group be extended so that progress could be continued. The Secretariat thanked Peru and the working group, and suggested that the group meet before the subject was discussed at CoP15, as the two draft background papers included in Annexes 1 and 2 needed fine-tuning. UNEP-WCMC, which had drafted up the two papers, drew attention to the draft resolution in document CoP15 Doc. 14.

The Committee agreed to the continuation of the working group to finalize the resolution and the two draft papers and prepare a final version for review and endorsement by the Standing Committee at its 62nd meeting.

During discussion of this agenda item, an intervention was also made by Humane Society International.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Compliance and enforcement

11. National laws for implementation of the Convention

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 11 and drew attention to paragraph 2, noting that Peru's legislation could now be placed in Category 1 under the National Legislation Project. It also advised the Committee that CITES-implementing legislation had been adopted by Armenia and Serbia. It remarked that, generally, there had been an improvement in the number of Parties that had enacted legislation or reported on their legislative progress, and noted that there was the opportunity to liaise with other Parties in the margins of CoP15. It suggested a deadline of 30 September 2010 for Parties listed in paragraph 9 to explain where they were in the process. Parties that commented expressed support for appropriate compliance measures, including recommendations to suspend trade, as Parties had had sufficient time, often many years, to put in place adequate legislation.

The Standing Committee agreed that a recommendation to suspend commercial trade in specimens of CITES-listed species would be issued in relation to those Parties that had not complied with Decision 14.25 by 30 September 2010.

During discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representative of Europe (United Kingdom) and by the United States.

12. National reports

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 12, noting that since it had been written, annual reports had been received from Mauritania. The Secretariat drew attention to those Parties identified in paragraph 4 of the document, which had failed to submit annual reports for three consecutive years, and noted that they were potentially subject to a Standing Committee recommendation to suspend trade under Resolution Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP14). Following an exchange of views, it was agreed to delay further discussion on the issue until SC60 so that the Secretariat could consult with concerned Parties in the margins of CoP15 and obtain their missing reports.

During discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representatives of Africa (Kenya and Zambia) Central and South America and the Caribbean (Costa Rica) and Oceania (Australia), and by the United States.

13. Enforcement measures

The Secretariat commented that it had little to report at this time but wished to draw attention to the progress made towards implementation of the improved situation in Nigeria. The Secretary-General had visited the country and met with Government and enforcement agencies. The Secretariat noted the four steps now needed:

- a) New legislation to implement the Convention – the Secretariat had received a draft;
- b) Nigeria should convene a multi-agency enforcement committee – this was now active;
- c) The Secretariat and the Government should convene a multi-agency seminar – it was hoped this would take place in summer 2010 if funding could be arranged; and
- d) Nigeria should take practical action, such as seizures of wildlife material from local markets, etc.

In view of this very welcome progress, the Secretariat requested that it be granted the discretion to withdraw the recommendation to suspend trade with that country as soon as it had adequate CITES-implementing legislation in place. Nigeria reported on the measures they had taken.

The Standing Committee agreed that the withdrawal of the recommendation to suspend trade should be decided on through the postal procedure following a report from the Secretariat that all required measures had been taken by Nigeria.

During the discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representatives of Africa (Kenya) and Europe (United Kingdom), and by Mali and Nigeria.

14. Review of Significant trade

14.1 Implementation of recommendations of the Animals and Plants Committees

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 14.1, noting that the cases under consideration had already undergone a very thorough review over quite a long period, fully involving the range States at each stage. It stressed that all the recommendations in the document had been made in consultation with the Chair of the Animals or Plants Committee as appropriate.

With regard to *Cyathea contaminans* from Indonesia, that country had provided details of the measures they were taking and the Secretariat's recommendation was to remove it from the Review of Significant Trade. This was agreed.

Likewise, it was agreed to remove *Galanthus woronowii* from Georgia from the review.

With regard to *Christensonia vietnamica* from Viet Nam, no response had been received from that country and the proposal was therefore to recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of this species from Viet Nam. This was agreed.

Similarly it was agreed to recommend trade suspensions regarding *Pterocarpus santalinus* and *Taxus wallichiana* from India, as no response had been received from India.

Regarding *Rauvolfia serpentina* from Myanmar, although the country had provided some details, there had been no response to more recent enquiries from the Secretariat and it was agreed to recommend that all Parties suspend trade in specimens of this species from Myanmar. With regard to the same species from Thailand, all concerns had been addressed and a zero quota for wild material established. It was therefore agreed to remove Thailand's population of *Rauvolfia serpentina* from the review.

With regard to *Pachypodium bispinosum* and *Pachypodium succulentum* from South Africa, the Secretariat noted that it had not received all of the material required from South Africa and therefore proposed that the Committee recommend a suspension of trade in these species with South Africa. In response, South Africa proposed the following actions:

- a) South Africa will set a zero export quota, from 2010, for exports of specimens of *Pachypodium bispinosum* and *P. succulentum* taken from the wild until it complies with the recommendations by the Plants Committee.
- b) The CITES Secretariat will publish this zero export quota on its website.
- c) Regarding exports of artificially propagated plants, the Management Authority of South Africa will:
 - i) Set a moratorium on exports of specimens of *P. bispinosum* and *P. succulentum* from the Eastern Cape until all Eastern Cape nurseries growing the two species are inspected and cultivated parental stock is audited; and
 - ii) In consultation with the Scientific Authority of South Africa, prepare a checklist of criteria to assess whether plants proposed for export are artificially propagated in compliance with the definition of 'artificially propagated' in Resolution Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP14). This checklist should be implemented by all Management Authorities in South Africa.
- d) Past reporting of exports and imports of *P. bispinosum*, by South Africa and importing countries respectively, should be audited to determine the source of discrepancies. Past reporting of exports and imports of *P. succulentum* by South Africa and Japan respectively, should be audited to determine the source of discrepancies.

The Committee agreed that, with the implementation of these actions, the species *Pachypodium bispinosum* and *P. succulentum* from South Africa could be removed from the review.

Regarding *Myrmecophila tibicinis* from Belize, the Secretariat reported that no response had been received from Belize recently and therefore proposed that the Committee recommend a suspension of trade in the species with Belize. This was agreed.

Regarding *Falco cherrug* from all nine range States where the species was of urgent concern, the Secretariat reported that the case of Mongolia had been dealt with at SC58. Regarding the other eight States, which had suspended issuance of export permits for the species, the Committee agreed to the Secretariat's recommendation in subparagraph 18.d) that:

- a) the Secretariat shall include a zero export quota for wild specimens of *Falco cherrug* from these eight range States;
- b) any State wishing to resume trade shall advise the Secretariat of measures taken to comply with the recommendations in sub-paragraph c); and

- c) the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, shall determine whether they have been implemented and report to the Standing Committee accordingly.

Mali reported that they were having difficulties trying to set up a team to study the status of *Poicephalus senegalus*. This was noted, together with the remaining parts of the document, which did not require a decision of the Committee.

During the discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representative of Europe (United Kingdom) and Mali, South Africa, the United States of America and the Chair of the Animals Committee.

14.2. Review of recommendations to suspend trade made more than two years ago

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 14.2 and drew attention to the information in paragraphs 6 to 8, which was noted.

With regard to *Strombus gigas* from Haiti and Grenada, it was agreed to maintain the recommendation to suspend trade.

Both Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation had signed the *Memorandum of Understanding concerning the Conservation, restoration and sustainable use of the Saiga antelope*. In view of this, and the lack of trade in recent years, the Committee agreed to lift its recommendation to suspend trade, but if either State wished to resume export of specimens of this species, it should advise the Secretariat of the measures it has taken to comply with the recommendations of the Animals Committee, and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, should determine whether the recommendations have been implemented and report to the Standing Committee accordingly.

With regard to *Naja* species from the Lao People's Democratic Republic, the Secretariat had received no response from that country and therefore recommended to maintain the recommendation to suspend trade. This was agreed.

The Secretariat believed the suspension of trade in *Falco cherrug* from Armenia, Iraq, Mauritania and Tajikistan could be lifted. This was agreed, with the proviso that, if Armenia or Iraq wished to resume export of specimens of this species, they should advise the Secretariat of the measures they have taken to comply with the recommendations of the Animals Committee, and the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair of the Animals Committee, should determine whether the recommendations have been implemented and report to the Standing Committee accordingly. However, there were still concerns regarding Bahrain and it was thought advisable to maintain the recommendation to suspend trade for that country. This too was agreed.

The Secretariat noted that there was almost no trade in *Cycas thouarsii* from Madagascar and it was agreed that the recommendation to suspend trade in specimens of the species in the families Cycadaceae, Stangeriaceae and Zamiaceae from Madagascar could be lifted. Concerning trade in specimens of these species from Mozambique and Viet Nam, the Committee agreed to maintain its recommendation to all Parties to suspend trade.

The Committee noted that, in future, in order to reflect the preamble of Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13), the Secretariat would make it clear that any recommendations made by the Committee under the Review of Significant Trade concerned only trade covered by Article IV of the Convention, and not Article VII (the latter including specimens of animal species bred in captivity or of plant species propagated artificially).

During the discussion of this agenda item, an intervention was made by Humane Society International.

15. Ranching operations

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 15, thanked France for providing funding for the work involved and noted that a draft report was being developed by consultants. It reported that Madagascar had made additional progress on the recommended priority actions adopted at SC58, but that certain activities (e.g. a capacity-building workshop and audits of ranching operations) had only been undertaken

very recently. In the light of this, it suggested that the SC58 working group on this issue meet again in the margins of CoP15 and report further at SC60. This was agreed.

During the discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by Madagascar and Wildlife Management International.

Species trade and conservation

16. Great apes

The Secretariat noted that, although there was no document on this issue, it was not being ignored. It drew the Committee's attention to document CoP15 Doc. 42. This oral report was noted.

17. Asian big cats

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 17 and referred to the reports received from China, India, Malaysia, Thailand and Viet Nam. It also reported that, since the document had been written, it had received a further report from the Lao People's Democratic Republic. Thanking the United Kingdom, the United States and the European Commission for the funding they had provided for the training, it explained that law enforcement training had been enthusiastically received in the region. It drew attention to the Global Tiger Initiative and the Kathmandu Global Tiger Workshop hosted by Nepal and to documents CoP15 Doc. 43.1 and 43.2, which would be discussed at CoP15. One observer commented that tiger farms were stimulating trade in wild tigers and requested that tiger products from all sources be prohibited. One member of the Committee stated that any amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.5 should concentrate on law enforcement and illegal trade. The Committee noted the document and agreed that any further discussion of this subject should take place during CoP15.

During discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (China), Europe (United Kingdom) and North America (Canada), and by the United States of America and Conservation International.

18. Tibetan antelope

The Secretariat said that this matter would be discussed at CoP15 under agenda item 46. This was noted.

19. Elephants: MIKE and ETIS subgroup

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 19. Drawing attention to the limited time available for the Subgroup to meet before SC59, it suggested that the Subgroup meet during CoP15 to discuss the issues in paragraph 3 of its document, and to reconvene the Subgroup with new members at SC60. This was agreed without discussion.

20. Sturgeon: Operation of the caviar trade database

The Secretariat reported that the caviar trade database continued to operate but that there was currently very little international trade in wild sturgeon products. It urged the Parties not to lose sight of sturgeons. This was noted.

21. Bigleaf mahogany

The Secretariat introduced document SC59 Doc. 21 and reported the following.

Two members of the Secretariat had undertaken a mission to Peru in January 2010. The Secretariat thanked Peru for its technical and logistical support, ITTO for providing financial support for one member of the Secretariat (under the CITES-ITTO project) and the Chair of the Plants Committee for her advice. Unfortunately, the PC Chair had not been able to participate in the mission because of prior commitments. Following the preparation of document SC59 Doc. 21, the Secretariat had had several discussions with Peruvian officials in Lima and Geneva about the findings and recommendations contained in the document. The Secretariat had also communicated with the United States about its mahogany trade and related bilateral cooperation with Peru, particularly under the Peru-United States Trade Promotion Agreement.

Current implementation status of SC57 recommendations

Peru's legislation had been placed in Category 1, and the Secretariat congratulated Peru on this significant achievement. New institutions (Management Authority, Scientific Authority and Enforcement Authority) had also been reshaped. High-level representatives of the Peruvian Government were attending the present meeting. Finally, there had been strong engagement on this matter by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in both Lima and Geneva.

Following the Secretariat's mission, Peru had provided additional information on legislation, the national Plan of Action and utilization of the 2008 and 2009 quotas.

During bilateral discussions with the Secretariat, Peru had expressed strong concern about the wording of paragraphs 14 and 36 of document SC59 Doc. 21. In paragraph 14, it was stated that "Peru [had] not yet instituted a reliable system for reporting regularly on the implementation of its [quotas and leftovers]". Peruvian authorities had indicated that they thought this statement was inaccurate and implied that Peru's records on mahogany were untrustworthy and suspect. This had not been the intention and the Secretariat regretted any misimpression given by the statement. The Secretariat's point had been that the Peruvian authorities could not rely on the existing information system to give them quick and complete access to mahogany trade information, such as the current status report on annual quotas, the amounts traded under the quotas and the quantity of leftovers. The Secretariat understood that the current information system had been in existence since 2004 but was outdated. It was a high priority under the National Action Plan for Mahogany ('PAEC') (approved by the President) – and in national legislation – to create a new system. According to the PAEC, the system was to have been developed during 2008-2009, but work was only now beginning and it was unclear how long it would take to put a new system in place. The Secretariat further understood that Peru may have access to external funds which could help expedite the development and implementation of a sound system. Without such a system, the Secretariat believed that Peru could not effectively manage its mahogany trade.

In paragraph 36, the Secretariat had recommended that "Peru institute a voluntary moratorium on mahogany exports until it [had] put an information system in place and reconciled the two approaches now being used to determine the quota and to authorize mahogany for export".

Since that recommendation, the Secretariat had determined that the two different approaches stemmed not just from the work of two different institutions (Management Authority and Scientific Authority) but also from two different pieces of legislation: the forestry legislation (which provides for a system of approved concessions) and the CITES legislation (which provides for a non-detriment finding underlying a national export quota for mahogany). These two pieces of legislation, which currently seemed to be inconsistent or even in conflict, needed to be made coherent or to be implemented in a coherent fashion.

Peru had explained to the Secretariat that it was not possible to institute a voluntary moratorium, *inter alia*, because this might have the perverse effect of increasing illegal trade, causing simmering political sensitivities to erupt, and making it difficult to obtain responsible private sector engagement on the management of mahogany and other timber species. Overall, Peru felt that the focus on its mahogany trade was unfair as other range States also had CITES implementation problems and higher volumes of mahogany trade. The Secretariat agreed that the Standing Committee should be looking at mahogany trade in other range States as well. The Committee had taken a step in that direction by asking range States to use Box 5 in CITES documents for mahogany exports to indicate the approved concession or area – as Peru had done. On behalf of the Standing Committee, letters (in English) had been sent to mahogany range States (other than Peru) and countries that import mahogany from Peru (other than the United States). The letters had recently been translated into Spanish and would now be sent to additional range States and importing countries. In those letters, the Secretariat asked range States to respond to the Committee's request, and it intended to provide those responses at SC61 for consideration and possible action.

Conclusions

The Secretariat was concerned that Peru had achieved formal or 'paper' compliance but not necessarily real 'on-the-ground' compliance with the SC57 recommendations. Accordingly, concerns remained about the SC57 recommendations related to implementation and law enforcement. In this connection, the Secretariat had identified three indicators for achieving real compliance:

1. Installation of a modern, effective information system which is operational;

2. Alignment of the forestry and CITES legislation and the work of relevant institutions in relation to quota determination and authorization for export; and
3. Government's purchase of the additional timber authorized for harvest in 2008, which had been the subject of attempted *ex post facto* revision of the 2008 quota.

The Standing Committee had been working with Peru since 2004 to address concerns about its mahogany trade. Some progress had been made, but the SC57 recommendations were still not fully met and that situation was starting to appear persistent.

The Secretariat invited the Standing Committee to consider recommending a suspension of trade until Peru had met the three indicators, or to delay implementation of such a recommendation for several months to give Peru time to meet the three indicators. Alternatively, it could consider other compliance measures identified by Peru or Committee members.

Following this report from the Secretariat, Peru stated that they had a sustainable management programme for mahogany, which contained detailed scientific information on mahogany populations at the national level and a proposal for their silvicultural treatment, and the non-detriment finding which only allowed the harvest of 1 % of the population of commercial age. Furthermore, more than 60 % of the exported volume of mahogany came from concessions and permits from native communities that applied a voluntary forest certification. The management programme also included a forest information system that allowed for the tracing and controlling of the exploitation and transport of forest products, and compulsory *in situ* verifications of all specimens of mahogany described in the management plans, to ensure the existence of each tree. The independence of the Management Authority, Scientific Authority and Enforcement Authority were also a guarantee for full transparency in decision-making. Peru added that the Mahogany Action Plan was to be implemented by 2012.

Some non-governmental observers thought that Peru's progress was only on paper and did not reflect the situation on the ground. They believed further that the bigleaf mahogany was approaching commercial extinction in Peru and thus supported the recommendation to suspend trade.

Summarizing additional interventions, the Chair proposed that Peru have until 30 September 2010 to fulfil the three compliance indicators identified in the Secretariat's oral statement. If Peru had not made sufficient progress by that time, the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chair, would initiate a postal procedure on a proposal to recommend suspension of trade in the bigleaf mahogany from Peru. This was agreed.

During discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representatives of Asia (China), Europe (United Kingdom) and North America (Canada), and by the observers from Peru, the United States TRAFFIC and WWF.

22. Ramin

Malaysia presented document SC59 Doc. 22 and their ramin trade report for January to November 2009, noting that exports had diminished even despite Australia and the European Union having lifted their import suspensions. They proposed that ramin not be included in the agenda of the next Standing Committee meeting. Indonesia also reported on their activities on this species. One Committee member noted that the joint ITTO/CITES project was still ongoing and suggested that the Committee wait for its completion before making further decisions.

The Committee agreed that Indonesia and Malaysia should report on the outcomes of the implementation of the ITTO/CITES project at SC61.

During the discussion of this agenda item, interventions were also made by the representatives of Europe (United Kingdom) and Oceania (Australia).

Regional matters

23. Structure of regional reports

The Secretariat presented document SC59 Doc. 23, drawing attention to the draft template for the presentation of reports of regional representatives. This was generally supported and one member of the

Committee noted the need for work to continue on investigating ways of reducing the burden of reporting for Parties. This was agreed.

During the discussion of this agenda item, interventions were made by the representatives of Europe (United Kingdom) and North America (Canada).

Concluding items

24. Any other business

No additional business was raised.

25. Determination of the time and venue of the 60th and 61st meetings

The Secretary-General stated that the 60th meeting would be held immediately after the closing ceremony of CoP15. It was expected that the 61st meeting would be held in Geneva in June or July 2011 and that Parties would be informed after a decision had been made by the new Chair. This was noted.

26. Closing remarks

The Secretary-General thanked the Chair for stepping in at such short notice and for handling the meeting so well. He expressed appreciation of the cooperation of all participants in arriving so efficiently at the decisions that had been taken and thanked the interpreters and the Secretariat staff for their work.

The Chair closed the meeting at 17h00.