

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

Sixth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties

Ottawa (Canada), 12 to 24 July 1987

Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

Ten Year Review Proposals

DELETION FROM APPENDIX II OF SPECIES HAVING NOT BEEN IN  
TRADE SINCE THEIR LISTING

A. Background

At the New Delhi meeting, 1981, the Conference of the Parties decided to carry out a "Ten Year Review of the Appendices", that to this effect Regional Committees and a Secretariat Committee be established, and that a Central Committee should appraise and co-ordinate the regional reviews (Resolution Conf. 3.20).

At the Gaborone meeting, 1983, it became apparent that the "Ten Year Review" based on the work of regional committees would remain uncompleted, and that the envisaged goal, to achieve scientifically sound and effective appendices, could not be reached by this procedure. Therefore, the Conference of the Parties adopted Resolution Conf. 4.7 "Regulation of Trade in Appendix II Wildlife", establishing thus an additional tool for the revision of the appendices.

At the Buenos Aires meeting, 1985, the Conference of the Parties, by adopting Resolution Conf. 5.3, approved the procedure and timetable of the "Significant Trade in Appendix II Species" project, as outlined in document Doc. 5.26, and including a recommendation to the effect that those Appendix II taxa which have never been reported in trade should be considered for deletion from this appendix, unless they have been or should remain included in Appendix II for look-alike reasons.

In addition, the Conference of the Parties expressed its wish that the Ten Year Review Central Committee should continue its work and that the Chairman of this Committee, designated in 1982 (Switzerland), should stimulate the completion of the Review and co-ordinate the submissions of the regions (document Plen. 5.9).

Following the Buenos Aires meeting, the Chairman of the Ten Year Review Central Committee compiled a list of those Appendix II species which have never been recorded in trade since their listing. This list included also the countries of origin of the species and brief information on their

CITES history (Annex 1 which also includes the supporting statements\*). In co-operation with the Secretariat, he prepared questionnaires in the three official languages of CITES, and sent them with an explanatory letter to the range states for completion (Annex 2).

At its 13th meeting in November 1985, the Standing Committee approved the steps taken by the Chairman of the Ten Year Review Central Committee. The Standing Committee decided also that for the species concerned a short, simple text was sufficient as a supporting statement.

**B. Response from the Range States to the Questionnaire**

Questionnaires were sent out to 38 Parties and to 14 non-Party states. They were completed by 21 Parties and by 5 non-Party states. Australia did not complete the questionnaire but indicated that they had established a Specialist Working Group which was mandated to undertake a critical review of the Australia fauna contained in the Appendices I and II of the Convention (letter from the Australian Management Authority dated 31 August 1985).

Completed questionnaires were received from the Management (or competent) Authorities of the following states:

Botswana	(20.07.1985)
Brazil	(17.09.1985)
Cameroon	(31.07.1985)
Chile	(08.10.1985)
China	(04.09.1985)
Colombia	(06.08.1985)
Gambia	(05.08.1985)
Ghana	(08.10.1985)
Indonesia	(30.09.1985)
Liberia	(24.09.1985)
Madagascar	(13.08.1985)
Malawi	(26.08.1985)
Mozambique	(09.09.1985)
Nepal	(19.08.1985)
Nigeria	(30.08.1985)
Pakistan	(15.09.1985)
Senegal	(05.02.1986)
South Africa	(11.11.1985, separate questionnaires for Natal, Cape, Transvaal and Orange Free State)
Thailand	(06.09.1985)
Togo	(01.08.1985)
Zimbabwe	(27.09.1985)
Chad	(17.08.1985)
Gabon	(07.08.1985)
New Zealand	(17.09.1985)
Singapore	(07.09.1985)
Turkey	(17.07.1985)

---

\* As indicated in the "Foreword" these statements are not reproduced in these Proceedings. (Note from the Secrétariat).

There was no response from the following states:

Benin, Congo, Ecuador, France, Guinea, India, Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Peru, Seychelles, USSR, United States of America, Venezuela, Zaire, Zambia, Afghanistan, Angola, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, Guinea-Bissau, Lesotho, Mexico, Namibia, Sierra Leone and Swaziland.

C. Proposals

The proposals are formally submitted by Switzerland on behalf of the Central Committee for the Ten Year Review which consists of the Parties represented in the Standing Committee and of the Secretariat.

Only species have been considered which come up to the following criteria:

- a) They have been listed in Appendix II either by the Plenipotentiary Conference, Washington, D.C. (1973) or at the first (Berne, 1976) or second (San José, 1979) regular meetings of the Conference of the Parties, i.e., at a time when the Berne Criteria were not existant or were not fully applied.
- b) They have not been recorded in trade since their listing to the end of 1985.
- c) They are not included for look-alike reasons under a higher taxon listing.

In cases where one or several range states had indicated that they, tentatively, are not in favour of a delisting, the species has nevertheless been considered to allow the Parties to fully discuss the problem of the Appendix II species not being in trade, but the objections and reasons therefore formulated by the Parties have been noted.

Since efforts for providing supporting statements which come up to the Berne Criteria would be extremely time consuming and expensive, and since, in many cases, it would be impossible to meet the Berne Criteria because no, or only insufficient, information on the population status at the time of the listing of the species is available, emphasis has been given to explain why a species is rare and what the effects of a delisting would be.

D. Notes from the Secretariat

By letter dated 13 March 1987, the Chairman of the Ten Year Review Central Committee informed the Secretariat of the withdrawal of the proposal to delete from Appendix II the species Caecobarbus geertsi, as it was listed on that appendix in 1981 only.

The recommendations from the Secretariat are in Annex 3 to this document.

The comments from the Parties are in Annex 4 to this document.

Consideration of Proposals for Amendment  
of Appendices I and II

Ten Year Review Proposals

Deletion from Appendix II of Species Having Not Been in Trade  
Since their Listing

LIST OF PROPOSALS

<u>SPECIES</u>	<u>COUNTRIES OF ORIGIN</u>
<u>Burramys parvus</u>	Australia
<u>Erinaceus frontalis</u>	Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zimbabwe
<u>Nesolagus netscheri</u>	Indonesia
<u>Lariscus hosei</u>	Brunei Darussalam(?), Indonesia, Malaysia
<u>Dipodomys phillipsii phillipsii</u>	Mexico
<u>Cynogale bennettii</u>	Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam
<u>Eupleres goudotii</u>	Madagascar
<u>Trichechus senegalensis</u>	Angola, Benin, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Togo, Zaire
<u>Pudu mephistophiles</u>	Colombia, Ecuador, Peru
<u>Anas bernieri</u>	Madagascar
<u>Megapodius freycinet abbotti</u>	India (Nicobar Island)
<u>Megapodius freycinet nicobariensis</u>	India (Nicobar Island)
<u>Francolinus ochropectus</u>	Djibouti
<u>Francolinus swierstrai</u>	Angola
<u>Tetrao mlokosiewiczii</u>	Islamic Rep. of Iran, Turkey, USSR
<u>Pedionomus torquatus</u>	Australia

<u>Numenius minutus</u>	Australia, USSR
<u>Larus brunnicephalus</u>	China, USSR
<u>Picus squamatus flavirostris</u>	Afghanistan, China, India, Islamic Rep. of Iran, Nepal, Pakistan, USSR
<u>Pitta brachyura nympha</u>	China, Peoples' Democratic Republic of Korea, Japan, Republic of Korea
<u>Pseudochelidon sirintarae</u>	Thailand
<u>Niltava ruecki</u>	Indonesia, Malaysia
<u>Psophodes nigrogularis</u>	Australia
<u>Carduelis yarrellii</u>	Venezuela, Brazil
<u>Emblema oculata</u>	Australia
<u>Clemmys muhlenbergii</u>	United States of America
<u>Paradelma orientalis</u>	Australia
<u>Phrynosoma coronatum blainvillei</u>	United States of America
<u>Thamnophis couchi hammondi</u>	United States of America
<u>Ambystoma lermaense</u>	Mexico
<u>Latimeria chalumnae</u>	Indian Ocean
<u>Salmo chrysogaster</u>	Mexico
<u>Stenodus leucichthys leucichthys</u>	USSR
<u>Plagopterus argentissimus</u>	United States of America
<u>Ptychocheilus lucius</u>	United States of America
<u>Cynolebias constanciae</u>	Brazil
<u>Cynolebias marmoratus</u>	Brazil
<u>Cynolebias minimus</u>	Brazil
<u>Cynolebias opalescens</u>	Brazil
<u>Cynolebias splendens</u>	Brazil
<u>Xiphophorus couchianus</u>	Mexico
<u>Choromytilus chorus</u>	Chile
<u>Cyprogenia aberti</u>	United States of America
<u>Epioblasma torulosa rangiana</u>	United States of America
<u>Fusconaia subrotunda</u>	United States of America

<u>Lampsilis brevicula</u>	United States of America
<u>Lexingtonia dolabelloides</u>	United States of America
<u>Pleurobema clava</u>	United States of America
<u>Paryphanta</u> spp.	New Zealand
<u>Coahuilix hubbsi</u>	Mexico
<u>Cochliopina milleri</u>	Mexico
<u>Durangonella coahuilae</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexipyrgus carranzae</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexipyrgus churinceanus</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexipyrgus escobedae</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexipyrgus lugoi</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexipyrgus mojarralis</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexipyrgus multilineatus</u>	Mexico
<u>Mexithauma quadripaludium</u>	Mexico
<u>Nymphophilus minckleyi</u>	Mexico
<u>Paludiscala caramba</u>	Mexico

DELETION FROM APPENDIX II OF SPECIES HAVING NOT BEEN IN TRADE SINCE THEIR LISTING			
SPECIES :		COUNTRY :	
<b>1 Is the species considered</b> <input type="checkbox"/> abundant <input type="checkbox"/> common <input type="checkbox"/> rare <input type="checkbox"/> extinct <input type="checkbox"/> status unknown	<b>2 Is the population</b> <input type="checkbox"/> increasing <input type="checkbox"/> stable <input type="checkbox"/> decreasing <input type="checkbox"/> fluctuating <input type="checkbox"/> status unknown	<b>3 Is the distribution</b> <input type="checkbox"/> widespread <input type="checkbox"/> scattered <input type="checkbox"/> localized, few sites <input type="checkbox"/> localized to 1 site <input type="checkbox"/> status unknown	<b>4 Is the habitat situation</b> <input type="checkbox"/> improving <input type="checkbox"/> stable <input type="checkbox"/> deteriorating <input type="checkbox"/> changing but not affecting species <input type="checkbox"/> status unknown
<b>5 If the species is considered threatened, is it by</b> <input type="checkbox"/> loss of habitat <input type="checkbox"/> environmental pollution <input type="checkbox"/> competition with or predation by other species <input type="checkbox"/> subsistence hunting / collecting <input type="checkbox"/> other local use <input type="checkbox"/> international trade <input type="checkbox"/> other: specify:		<b>6 Is the information provided under 1 to 5 based on</b> <input type="checkbox"/> scientific reports on the population and habitat over a number of years <input type="checkbox"/> scientific reports based on a single survey (indicate year) <input type="checkbox"/> reports by reliable observers other than scientists over several years other: specify:  Specify author and year of scientific reports:	
<b>7 Has there been evidence of international trade since the species was listed</b> <input type="checkbox"/> regular exports which were not reported to Secretariat <input type="checkbox"/> rejected applications for export permits <input type="checkbox"/> attempted illegal exports <input type="checkbox"/> no evidence		<b>8 If there have been attempted illegal exports</b> <input type="checkbox"/> how many cases have been detected since the listing <input type="checkbox"/> how many specimens have been involved <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable	
<b>9 Could illegal exports be prevented</b> <input type="checkbox"/> by implementing CITES within your country <input type="checkbox"/> by mutual assistance from other CITES Parties <input type="checkbox"/> by enforcing national legislation <input type="checkbox"/> not applicable		<b>10 Is the species protected under national law</b> <input type="checkbox"/> totally (taking not allowable, or permitted under special circumstances only, e.g. for scientific purp.) <input type="checkbox"/> partially (taking regulated: licensing system, quotas, closed seasons or other limiting elements) <input type="checkbox"/> occurs in National Parks or adequate reserves <input type="checkbox"/> no protection	
<b>11 Do you feel that the situation of the species would become (more) critical if it would be removed from Appendix II</b> <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes: specify why:		<b>12 Would a proposal to delete the species from the Appendices, made at the next ordinary meeting of the Parties</b> <input type="checkbox"/> be supported <input type="checkbox"/> be opposed by your country (tentative view only)	
<b>13 Is there any reason to consider the species a look-alike of another CITES species that is in trade ?</b> <input type="checkbox"/> no <input type="checkbox"/> yes: specify:			
Place and date			
Please return this questionnaire prior to 30 September 1985 to: Swiss Federal Veterinary Office Schwarzenburgstrasse 161 CH-3097 LIEBEFELD-BERNE Switzerland		Stamp and signature	

Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

Ten Year Review Proposals

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE SECRETARIAT

1. The Secretariat's recommendations given below are provisional and may be changed on the basis of information that the Secretariat is expecting to receive from various sources, including Parties (range states in particular) and others.
2. The Secretariat fully supports the principle behind these proposals, because if accepted this will result in:
  - a) no detrimental effect on the species in the wild;
  - b) a simplification and rationalization of the CITES Appendix II;
  - c) making the implementation of CITES easier and more effective; and
  - d) reducing unnecessary workload (training of enforcement officers, identification of specimens).
3. Consequently, the Secretariat recommends that the proposals be approved by the Conference of the Parties for the above-mentioned reasons except the following:
  - Pudu mephistophiles: In spite of the existence of Identification Manual sheets, the problem of "look alike" with P. pudu (listed in Appendix I) cannot be totally excluded. Therefore, the Secretariat would recommend that the species be kept in Appendix II and, because it is endangered and in order to simplify the appendices, that a proposal for transfer to Appendix I be considered for submission to the seventh meeting of the Parties.
  - Latimeria chalumnae: The Secretariat has received further information regarding this species (see also comments from Liechtenstein and Switzerland in Annex 4 to this document). In addition, it was informed by telex (Mr. Bruton, 1987) that the JLB Smith Institute of Ichthyology, Grahamstown, South Africa, has sent a research expedition on the status of this species and will inform the Secretariat further at a later date. Population numbers are apparently low and there is some international (scientific) trade. Therefore, the Secretariat recommends that the species be kept in Appendix II pending further studies and consultation with the Government of the Comoros.
4. Regarding the following proposals, the Secretariat makes the following comments:
  - Trichechus senegalensis: Switzerland is making a double proposal, either to delete the species from Appendix II, or to transfer it to Appendix I. Even if there is no evidence of international trade, the Secretariat favours the transfer to Appendix I where all the other

species of the genus are listed. The listing of Trichechus spp. in Appendix I will, in addition, simplify this appendix more than the deletion of T. senegalensis will simplify the appendices in general.

- Unionidae spp.: The Secretariat is in favour of the proposal and, on the basis of information currently available, it has the feeling that all species of the family listed in Appendix I should also be deleted.

Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

Ten Year Review Proposals

COMMENTS FROM THE PARTIES

I Comments from Ghana

Ghana has no objections to any of the proposals.

II Comments from Liechtenstein and Switzerland

The following information has been received after the proposals have been submitted:

Pseudochelidon sirintarae

Bung Boraphet, the only location where the species is known to occur in Thailand is a freshwater reservoir and marsh 20 km East of Nakhon Sawan. It consists of a freshwater fisheries area of 25,600 ha, a restricted fishing area of 15,040 ha, and a no fishing area of 6,241 ha. A hunting ban applies to 10,600 ha within the reservoir and marsh. During winter, the reed beds of this marsh are the roosting grounds not only of Pseudochelidon sirintarae, but also for barn swallows (Hirundo rustica) and large quantities of weavers (Ploceus spp.) and buntings (Emberiza spp.). Weavers and buntings are systematically netted for the market and inevitably some river martins are captured too. There have been several instances of river martins being offered for sale on local markets.

The river martin and barn swallow populations seem to have drastically declined in recent years, but it is not clear whether in fact they have been reduced - which would primarily be due to the annual burning of reeds to make place for lotus cultivation - or whether the disturbance has simply caused formerly large roosts to fragment and disperse.

Suggested protective measures are the protection of the site under the Ramsar Convention and the prohibition of bird netting in areas where river martins may occur.

Latimeria chalumnae

From 1952 to 1971, an average of 3.2 coelacanths has been taken in Comoran waters and exported to musea and scientific institutions all over the world. The annual catch in 1985 and 1986 was four specimens, but it is not known whether they have been exported. The Comoran Government pays a reward for each animal caught. Under these circumstances Appendix II listing is obviously without purpose, but it should be discussed whether the taking of around four specimens per year is detrimental to the survival of the species, and, if so, whether the species should be transferred to Appendix I at the 1989 meeting.

### III Comments from USSR

#### Tetrao mlokosiewiczii

A large portion of the population of this species (more than 70,000 individuals) occurs within the USSR territory, and in the Islamic Republic of Iran and Turkey it is rarely found in some local areas. In USSR, protection and normal natural reproduction are ensured through national legislation. On our part, there is no objection to the deletion of this species from CITES Appendix II, although it would be desirable to know the actual position of both the Islamic Republic of Iran and Turkey.

#### Numenius minutus

This species is native to USSR, its population has stabilized in recent years and numbers have increased in some localities. The protection measures taken in USSR and the RFSSR ensure the protection of this species.

In Washington, in 1973, it was recommended to include this species in Appendix II because of its great similarity with Numenius borealis, and by this means to prevent possible abuse through illegal trade between collectors.

At this time, we do not have any objection to the deletion of this species from CITES Appendix II.

#### Larus brunicephalus

Only some colonies of this species occur in USSR territory, at the western limit of its range. The main population nests in China and northern India. It is protected in the USSR and its colonies are found in Nature Reserves or Protected Areas.

This species was listed in CITES Appendix II in order to prevent taking and trade between collectors of the similar species Larus relictus which winters in the same area. Now, there is available characteristics which allows the identification of both species in any of their plumages and, therefore, we have no objection to the deletion of this species from CITES Appendix II.

#### Picus squamatus flavirostris

This subspecies occurs in bushes along riversides and old thickets and gardens in the plains of Afghanistan, eastern Islamic Republic of Iran and perhaps in some areas of the north-western Pakistan. In USSR this woodpecker subspecies is currently extinct. It is close to extinction in Afghanistan and eastern Islamic Republic of Iran because bushes have been destroyed. In such a situation, the maintenance of this subspecies in Appendix II does not allow its protection against extinction, because it needs special measures. The subspecies P. s. squamatus occurs in sufficiently high numbers and its population guarantees the protection of P. squamatus as a species. On our side, there are no objections to the deletion from CITES Appendix II.

