AMENDMENTS TO APPENDICES I AND II OF THE CONVENTION

Other Proposals

A. PROPOSAL

Transfer of Felis pardalis from Appendix II to Appendix I. (Note: The subspecies Felis pardalis mearnsi and Felis pardalis mitis are listed in Appendix I.)

B. PROPOONENT

The Federal Republic of Germany.

C. SUPPORTING STATEMENT

1. Taxonomy
   11. Class: Mammalia
   12. Order: Carnivora
   13. Family: Felidae
   14. Species: Felis pardalis
   Synonym: Leopardus pardalis
   15. Common Names:
       English: ocelot
       French: ocelot
       Spanish: Ocelote, Manigordo, Gato onsa

2. Biological Data
   21. Distribution: The ocelot is widely distributed from Arizona and South-West Texas to Paraguay and northern Argentina (Guggisberg, 1975). The ocelot occurs in the following countries: Argentina, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, French Guiana, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, USA and Venezuela.

   In Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Panama only the subspecies Felis pardalis mearnsi occurs. It probably also occurs in Colombia. In Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay only the subspecies Felis pardalis mitis occurs. Both subspecies are listed in Appendix I.

Remark: The above given distribution of the species and some subspecies is no longer scientifically supported. There is now a consensus among scientists that the coloration and external characteristics of the skins are not valid scientific criteria on which the subdivision of the species into subspecies can be based (see App. A). At present there is no agreement among scientists on the distribution of the subspecies or on the way their distribution should be determined (see App. B).
Consequently the distribution of the subspecies is no longer defined and an everywhere equal enforcement of the regulations of CITES, for this species, is not possible.

22. Population: Very little information is available on the population status for individual countries. Paradiso (1972) reported that although no precise population estimates existed, the species is known to be threatened in parts of its range. It had become rare where intensive hunting occurs, along rivers, roads and near towns, and where forest and scrub had been replaced by grasslands and crops. Populations were reported to survive in a wide variety of habitats (Koford, 1973b). Since then the hunting pressure has increased enormously.

Argentina: It only occurs in the most northern parts of the country. Considered rare and uncommon (Anon., 1976).

Belize: Probably common in suitable habitat.

Bolivia: Tello (1986) reported that if the populations had been threatened, as reported by Thornback et al. (1982), populations had increased considerably since then. However, the survey method used by Tello was too poor for scientific statements. Vargas (cited in Tello, 1986) reported that the species was scarce in the provinces of Cercado, Marban and Vacadia and abundant in the provinces of Itenes, Marmore, Tacuma and Vallivian.

Brazil: It was described as vulnerable by Ayres and Best (cited in Thornback et al., 1982).

Colombia: No information.

Costa Rica: Numbers greatly reduced, listed as endangered (Mena Moya, 1978). Population estimates vary from 200 (Lopez, cited in Melquist, 1984) to 2,000-3,000 only in the large forest areas (Vaughan, 1983).

Ecuador: All of the spotted cats are considered rare (Melquist, 1984).


French Guiana: Situation probably similar to Suriname.

Guatemala: No information.

Guyana: Situation probably similar to Suriname.

Honduras: All of the felids are considered threatened or endangered (Aguirar, 1978). The population was described as small and available habitat had declined markedly (Honduras CITES MA, cited in Broad et al., 1988).

Mexico: Endangered (Ceballos cited in Broad et al., 1988).

Nicaragua: Endangered (Salas, 1978).

Panama: Endangered (Vallester, 1978).
Paraguay: Due to rapid destruction of habitat and increasing hunting pressure, a reduction of numbers in the Chaco region has taken place in the 1970s (Thornback and Jenkins, 1982). Since then the situation has not improved.

Peru: After heavy hunting in the 1960s populations were thought to have recovered somewhat after the introduction of protective legislation in 1973 (Pacheco, 1973). Reported to be common in the Cocha Cashu area of the Manu National Park (Terborgh et al., 1984).

Suriname: The species seems to be reasonably common, with extensive areas of suitable habitat remaining (Melquist, 1984).

Trinidad and Tobago: Its status is considered uncertain, but it seems to be common in some areas (Anon., 1984).

USA: Total population number estimated to be less than 100, mostly in Texas (Anon., 1980).

Venezuela: Melquist (1984) reports that it is considered moderately common. According to Hoogersteijn (cited in Broad et al., 1988) the species is still common in forests and on private ranches with good gallery forest, and in some heavily forested national parks north of the Orinoco. South of the Orinoco there is reportedly little human settlement or habitat disturbance and populations are expected to be good.

The present available population studies do not give clear scientific criteria on which the actual status of this species can be based. The only conclusion, which can be drawn from these studies, is that there are populations, which are certainly threatened and that the status of the other populations is not known.

Experts think that due to the enormous trade in skins (see tables 1 and 2), which has taken place till far in the 1980s, more than the already listed populations, if not all, have become threatened.

Habitat/Ecology: The ocelot is found in a variety of habitats including humid tropical and subtropical forests, savannas, semi-arid thorn scrub, coastal mangroves, swamp forests and other kinds of dense cover (Koford, 1973b). It is said to be more adaptable than the jaguar (Panthera onca), persisting in partly-cleared forests, dense cover near large towns, secondary growth woodland and abandoned settlements (Koford, 1973a). It is generally but not exclusively nocturnal, normally solitary and territorial (Navarro, 1985).

Estimates of home range size vary from 252 ha for males and 207 ha for females (Navarro, 1985), to 600 ha for males and 150 ha for females (Sunquist and Ludlow, 1985). In riparian habitats with high carrying capacity, it can exist at densities of approximately three per square kilometer (Eisenberg cited in Broad et al., 1988), but it only reaches such high densities in areas of dense vegetation cover. Other density estimates include 0.4 per square kilometer in the mosaic of habitats in Venezuela and 1 adult per square kilometer in forests in Peru (Sunquist, cited in Broad et al., 1988).
The ocelot will rest in trees, but most hunting is terrestrial. It is certainly less aboreal than the margay (Felis wiedii) (Kolford, 1973a).

The ocelot has a weight of 9–18 kgs, a body length of 65–100 cm and a tail of 30–45 cm long (Dathe, 1986). Its diet mainly consists of small rodents (Emmons, cited in Broad et al., 1988), but reptiles, birds, small mammals such as young deer and peccaries, monkeys, coatis, agoutis and pacas are also taken (Guggisberg, 1975).

There is no fixed breeding season in the tropics. Litter size varies from one to two, usually one (Emmons, cited in Broad et al., 1988).

3. Trade Data

31. National Utilization: For the local market skins are used for making garments and coats. Worked skins are also sold to tourists as souvenirs.

32. Legal International Trade: During the 1960s this species supplied the vast majority of the spotted cat skins in international trade (Broad, 1987). In the late 1960s over 100,000 skins were imported into the USA each year, most of which were from Brazil and Colombia, but almost all countries with a population of ocelots were involved (Paradiso, 1972). This trade went on into the 1970s. In 1980 coats of this species were sold for up to US$ 40,000 in the Federal Republic of Germany (Anon., 1980a). Live specimens are only traded in very low numbers, compared with the huge numbers of skins in trade. Live specimens are now mainly traded for zoos and for a small amount as pet animals.

In the Tables 1 and 2, respectively the numbers of skins exported by the reported countries of origin (or exporting country if no origin reported); and the minimum net imports of Felis pardalis skins reported to CITES, for the years 1980–1986, are given.

Obviously Paraguay has been the major source of skins in trade. The large number of skins reported in trade in 1983 went via France to the Federal Republic of Germany. A point to note is that in Paraguay only the subspecies Felis pardalis mitis occurs, which is listed in Appendix I of CITES.

Table 1. Reported countries of origin (or exporting country if no origin reported) of skins of Felis pardalis reported to CITES, 1980–1985 – Broad, et al., 1988): 1986 – WTMU database)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These CITES data show a general decline after 1980. An analysis of CITES data for earlier years indicate that the trade has been decreasing since 1978 (Broad, 1987). The 70,000 skins reported in 1983 is in discrepancy with this statement and actually this is the highest number reported since 1976. The main importing country has been the Federal Republic of Germany.
33. **Illegal Trade:** Paraguay has been the major exporter of skins of *Felis pardalis*, although the only subspecies occurring in Paraguay is *Felis pardalis mitis*, which is listed in Appendix I of CITES. Ocelot skins originating from Paraguay, could therefore not have been in trade. Paraguay is known to have been featuring as a re-exporter for large numbers of wildlife skins smuggled out of Brazil. Next to that all wildlife exports from Paraguay have been illegal in Paraguay since 1975 (Fuller *et al.*, 1987).

In 1986 a shipment from Bolivia containing 2,100 skins of *Felis pardalis* was confiscated in Belgium.

In several range states there are still large legal and illegal stocks present. Apparently these stocks never dry up! At present it is tried to bring these stocks into trade through free-ports or non-Party countries. The volume of this illegal trade is difficult to define, but it could be high.

34. **Potential Trade Threats:**

341. **Live Specimens:** No direct trade threat. There has been a trade in pet animals, especially to the US. Nowadays only a small trade in live specimens exists, mainly for and between zoos. There have been experiments with farming for the fur-industry, but these have not been successful (Dathe *et al.*, 1986).

342. **Parts and Derivatives:** The main threat is the trade in skins. Although all range states prohibit, at the moment, the commercial export of skins, poaching and smuggling continues on a large scale. All around the world shipments, without legal CITES documentation, containing large numbers of skins are being held in stock. In 1987 and 1988 several illegal shipments containing ocelot skins have been confiscated (e.g. in Denmark and Belgium). As long as the species as a whole is not covered by Appendix I of CITES, a potential market for these illegal skins will continue to exist.

4. **Protection Status**

41. **National:** All range-states with exception of Mexico are Party to CITES.

In Table 3 the legal prohibitions on hunting, internal trade and commercial export of all range states are given. Dates are those on which the legislation came into force. Sources - Latin America (Fuller *et al.*, 1987), Trinidad and Tobago (James, 1983), United States (Anon., 1982a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>CITES</th>
<th>Hunting</th>
<th>Trade</th>
<th>Export</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

44
El Salvador 1987  
Guyana 1977 - - 1987  
Honduras 1985 - 1978 1975  
Mexico - R 1951 ? 1982  
Paraguay 1977 1975 1975 1975  
Trinidad & Tobago 1984 1933 1933 ?  

42. **International**: The species is listed in Appendix II of CITES since 1977. The subspecies *Felis pardalis mearnsi* and *Felis pardalis mitis* are listed since 1977 in Appendix I of CITES.

In October 1986 the EEC installed a ban on the import of skins of *Felis pardalis* (Anon., 1987).

The species is known to occur in a number of protected areas, throughout its range (Anon., 1982b).

43. **Additional Protection Needs**: If the Berne Criteria are interpreted in a narrow way, then it will be observed that, for this species, these Criteria are not fulfilled. However, the special circumstances (e.g., the impossibility to determine the distribution of the subspecies and the impossibility to determine the origin of the skins) and the situation in the range states require the strongest possible protection, which in this case can only be given through an Appendix I listing. The present subdivision in subspecies within the appendices of CITES is not an effective measure to protect the threatened populations.

Listing of the species as a whole in Appendix I of CITES will prevent a further decline of the populations, throughout the range, as a result of poaching for the skin trade. The subspecies already listed in Appendix I will benefit from this measure.

At the moment there is insufficient information on the status, distribution and ecology of the species to ensure a sustainable harvest. When this information is on hand, trade, under a strict quo system, could be considered again.

5. **Information on Similar Species**

The closest similar species are *Felis wiedii*, which is somewhat smaller, and *Felis tigrina*, which is much smaller. The range of both species almost totally overlaps the range of the ocelot.

Skins of *Felis pardalis* can be distinguished from skins of *Felis wiedii* as the hairs on the neck are directed towards the crown and not to the tail as in *Felis wiedii*; and from skins of *Felis tigrina* as there are two whirls on the shoulder and not one as in *Felis tigrina* (Dollinger, 1982).
6. **Comments from Countries of Origin**

This proposal was discussed during the 2nd meeting of the Animals Committee in Montevideo (April 1989). The representatives of several range states (i.e. Bolivia, Costa Rica, Paraguay and Uruguay), showed a positive attitude towards the proposal.

All range states will be consulted as soon as possible.

7. **Additional Remarks**

71. **Skin Quality/Coloration:** The skins of ocelots are strong and highly priced.

   The highest prices are paid for the "blue" skins, which originate from the northern parts of its range.

   The ground colour is blueish-brown to reddish-yellowgray. The spotting is very distinct and varies strongly. Subspecies cannot be recognized on the spotting of the skins (Dathe et al., 1986).

72. **Captive Breeding:** An annual average of 23 animals were bred between 1972 and 1986 in collections contributing to the International Zoo Yearbook (Duplaix-Hall, 1974-1975; Olney, 1976-1986).

   In 1987 a total of 77 animals were kept in 22 collections contributing to ISIS (ISIS, 1987). In 1984 a total of 51 animals were held in 22 Brazilian zoos alone (Ellis, et al., 1988).
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