

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. PROPONENT

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
16. Code Numbers: A-112.007.001.020

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 It had become rare where intensive hunting occurs, along rivers, roads and near towns, and where forest and scrub had been replaced by grasslands and crops.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 Vacadiaz and abundant in the provinces of Itenes, Marmoré, Yacuma and Vallivan.

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).

El Salvador: Endangered (Serrano, 1978).

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 (Aguilar, 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.

23. 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)

<u>Country/Year</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>1981</u>	<u>1982</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>1984</u>	<u>1985</u>	<u>1986</u>
Argentina	47	1	1	-	-	-	-
Belize	181	-	68	28	1	-	-
Bolivia	-	2	-	4	1500	-	1
Brazil	-	114	50	10	-	-	1
Colombia	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Costa Rica	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ecuador	3	8	23	3	3	-	7
El Salvador	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Guatemala	1	-	-	-	1	-	-

Guyana	-	1	-	1	-	-	1
Honduras	15	3	2	2	2	-	1
Mexico	2	15	14	6	3	-	23
Nicaragua	-	2	7	-	1	-	2
Panama	2765	-	-	3	-	-	-
Paraguay	25390	17069	9370	68928	2741	315	-
Peru	1884	38	2	9	-	-	2
Venezuela	-	-	-	-	-	9	-
South America	299	103	-	-	196	112	42
TOTAL	29594	1737	9549	69007	4449	436	143

Table 2. Apparent minimum net imports of Felis pardalis skins reported to CITES, 1980-86. (Source 1980-1985 - Broad et al., 1988: 1986 - WTMU database)

Country/Year	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986
Argentina	300	-	-	-	-	-	-
Australia	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Austria	1851	843	150	62	11	16	7
Belgium	4887	59	17	95	-	-	-
Brazil	28	-	-	-	-	-	-
Canada	-	72	140	301	111	-	-
China	-	54	-	-	-	-	-
Denmark	547	-	-	2	-	-	1
Finland	24	-	14	-	1	-	-
France	48	14	-	-	4100	-	-
Fed. Rep. of Germany	16418	7885	7941	67281	-	-	179
Greece	202	-	-	-	-	-	-
Hong Kong	180	180	416	395	-	140	146
Ireland	4	4	-	-	-	-	-
Israel	140	12	68	24	124	-	-
Italy	4680	4639	657	593	-	195	-
Japan 98	587	84	40	5	120	139	-
Lebanon	-	-	26	-	-	-	-
Liechtenstein	765	-	-	-	-	-	-
Luxembourg	-	98	12	12	-	-	-
Mexico	39	-	-	-	-	-	-
Netherlands	59	-	-	-	-	-	1
Norway	-	29	14	-	-	-	-
St. Lucia	-	-	-	2	2	-	-
Spain	227	3292	-	201	14	-	-
Switzerland	-	-	-	128	99	-	-
Turkey	-	-	-	41	18	26	15
United States	39	87	77	117	89	-	25
Unknown	-	-	-	-	-	58	-
TOTAL	30563	17730	9676	69294	4574	556	513

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)

Country	CITES	Hunting	Trade	Export
Argentina	1980	1981	1981	1981
Belize	1981	1981	1981	1981
Bolivia	1979	1979	1979	1979
Brazil	1975	-	1967	1967
Colombia	1981	1973	1973	1973
Costa Rica	1975	1984	1984	1984
Ecuador	1975	-	-	1981

El Salvador	1987	-	-	-
French Guyana	1978	1975	1975	1975
Guatemala	1980	1970	1970	1970
Guyana	1977	-	-	1987
Honduras	1985	-	1978	1975
Mexico	-	R 1951	?	1982
Nicaragua	1977	1977	1977	1977
Panama	1978	1980	1980	1980
Paraguay	1977	1975	1975	1975
Peru	1975	R 1977	R 1977	1977
Trinidad & Tobago	1984	1933	1933	?
United States	1975	1982	1982	1982
Venezuela	1975	1970	1970	1970

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 quota 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-browngray 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, 1976-1988).

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).

8. References

- Aguilar, W., 1978. El manejo de la Vida Silvestre en Honduras. In: Morales, R., Macfarland, C., Incer, J. and Hobbs, A. (eds), Memorias de la Primera Reunión Regional Centroamericana sobre Vida Silvestre. Matagalpa, Nicaragua 25-29 Julio 1978. Unidad de areas silvestres y cuencas del CATIE.
- Anon., 1976. Conservation, Argentina. Cat Specialist Group Newsletter 2: 4 IUCN/SSC.
- Anon., 1980a. Multi-million forgeries in fur trade documents uncovered. IUCN/WWF News Release No.8/80
- Anon., 1980b. The Ocelot. In: Selected vertebrate endangered species of the seacoast of the United States. Fish and Wildlife Service. U.S. Dept. of the Interior.
- Anon., 1982a. Endangered classification extended to Ocelot in the United States, Endangered Species Technical Bulletin 7(8):1.
- Anon., 1982b. IUCN Directory of Neotropical Protected Areas. Commission on National Parks and Protected Areas, IUCN, Tycooly Int., Dublin, 436 pp.
- Anon., 1984. Evaluation and development of wildlife resources, Trinidad and Tobago. Project findings and recommendations, UNDP, FAO, 22pp.

- Anon., 1987. EEC import restrictions. *TRAFFIC Bulletin* 8(4): 57-58.
- Bacon, P.R. and Ffrench, R.P., 1972. The wildlife sanctuaries of Trinidad and Tobago, Wildlife Conservation Committee, Ministry of Agriculture Lands and Fisheries, 78 pp.
- Barquero, J.I., 1976. La vida silvestre en Nicaragua, Encuentro, Revista de la Universidad Centroamericana 10: 57-66.
- Berger, D. and Portal, C., 1982. Dossier: Espèces animales guyanaises menacées. Unpublished report, 49pp.
- Broad, S., 1987. The harvest of and trade in Latin American spotted cats (Felidae) and otters (Lutrinae). IUCN Wildlife Trade Monitoring Unit, Cambridge, UK, 139 pp.
- Broad, S., Luxmoore, R. and Jenkins, M., 1988. Significant trade in wildlife: a review of selected species in CITES Appendix II. Vol. I. IUCN Conservation Monitoring Centre, Cambridge, UK, p. 183.
- Burton, J.A., 1976. Wildlife imports in Britain 1975. *Oryx* 13(4): 330-331.
- Cabrera, A., 1957. Catalogo de los mamíferos de America del Sur, vol. I. Methatheria, Unguiculata, Carnivora. Revista del Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernadino Rivadavia', Ciencias Zoológicas 4(1): 1-307.
- Ceballos, G. and Navarro L., (in prep.). Endangered mammals of Mexico. In: Ceballos, G. and Navarro L., (eds). The endangered and extinct vertebrates in Mexico.
- Cunha Vieira, C. da., 1955. Lista remissiva dos mamíferos do Brasil. *Arquivos de Zoologia do Estado de Sao Paulo* 8(2): 341-474.
- Dathe, H. and Schops, P. (Hrgs.), 1986. *Pelztieratlas*. VEB Gustav Fischer Verlag, Jena, 323 pp.
- Dollinger, P. (ed)., 1982. CITES Identification Manual. Vol. I. CITES Secretariat, Lausanne, Switzerland.
- Duplaix-Hall, N. (ed),. 1974-1975. *International Zoo Yearbook*, Volumes 14-15, Zoological Society of London, London.
- Ellis, J. and Ellis, G., 1988. Animal collections in Brazilian zoological parks. In: Olney, P.J.S. (ed),. 1988. *International Zoo Yearbook*, Volumes 16-23, Zoological Society of London, London.
- Fuller, K.S., Swift, B., Jorgensen, A. and Bräutigam, A., 1987. Latin American wildlife trade laws (Revised). World Wildlife Fund-US, 418 pp.
- Grimwood, I.R., 1969. Notes on the distribution and status of some Peruvian Mammals in 1968. Special Publication 21. American Committee for International Wildlife Protection and New York Zoological Society, Bronx, New York, 86 pp.
- Guggisberg, C.A.W., 1975. *Wild Cat of the World*, David and Charles, London, 328 pp.

- Hall, E.R., 1981. The mammals of North America, 2nd edition. 2 vols. Wiley. New York, 1358 pp.
- Inskipp, I. and Barzdo, J., 1987. World checklist of threatened mammals. Nature Conservancy Council, Peterborough, UK, 125 pp.
- ISIS., 1987. ISIS SDR abstract. Minnesota, USA.
- Koford, K.B., 1973a. Project 694. Status survey of Jaguar and Ocelot in tropical America. World Wildlife Yearbook 1972-73: 215-219.
- Koford, K.B., 1973b. Spotted Cats in Latin America: An interim report. Oryx 7 (1): 37-39.
- Melquist, W.E., 1984. Status survey of otters (Lutrinae) and spotted cats (Felidae) in Latin America. Contract completion report, IUCN, Switzerland, 269 pp.
- Mena Moya, R.A., 1978. Fauna y caza en Costa Rica. R.M. Costa Rica.
- Navarro, L.D., 1985. Status and distribution of the Ocelot (Felis pardalis) in South Texas, Msc Thesis for Texas A & I University.
- Olney, P.J.S. (ed.), 1976-1988. International Zoo Yearbook, Volumes 16-27, Zoological Society of London, London.
- Paradiso, J.L., 1972. Status Report on Cats (Felidae) of the World, 1971. U.S. Dept. of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D. C.
- Salas, J.B., 1978 Informe sobre las actividades que desarrolla el Departamento de Vida Silvestre en Nicaragua. In: Morales, R., Macfarland, C., Incer, J. and Hobbs, A. (eds), Memorias de la Primera Reunión Regional Centroamericana sobre Vida Silvestre. Matagalpa, Nicaragua 25 - 29 Julio 1978. Unidad de areas silvestres y cuencas del CATIE.
- Serrano, F., 1978. Informe sobre las actividades de la Unidad de Parques Nacionales y Vida Silvestre en El Salvador. In: Morales, R., Macfarland, C., Incer, J. and Hobbs, A. (eds), Memorias de la Primera Reunión Regional Centroamericana sobre Vida Silvestre. Matagalpa, Nicaragua 25 - 26 Julio 1978. Unidad de areas silvestres y cuencas del CATIE.
- Smith, N.J.H., 1976. Spotted cats and the Amazon skin trade. Oryx 13(4): 362-371.
- Sunquist, M. and Ludlow, M., 1985. Ocelots in Venezuela, Cat News 3: 11-12.
- Tello, J. L., 1986. The situation of the wild cats (Felidae) in Bolivia. Including notes on other wildlife species and on general aspects of the conservation and utilization of natural resources. CITES Secretariat, 60 pp.
- Terborgh, J.W., Fitzpatrick, J.W. and Emmons, L., 1984. Annotated checklist of bird and mammal species of Cocha Cashu biological station, Manu National Park, Peru Fieldiana Zoology New Series, Number 21: 1-29.

- Thornback, J. and Jenkins, M., 1982. The IUCN Mammal Red Data Book, Part 1. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland, 516 pp.
- Vallester, E., 1978. Informe de Panama sobre la situación de la Fauna Silvestre. In: Morales, R., Macfarland, C., Incer, J. and Hobbs, A. (eds), Memorias de la Primera Reunión Regional Centroamericana sobre Vida Silvestre. Matagalpa, Nicaragua 25 - 29 Julio 1978. Unidad de areas silvestres y cuencas del CATIE.
- Vaughan, C., 1983. A report on dense forest habitat for endangered wildlife species in Costa Rica. United States Department of the Interior and the National University, Merida, Costa Rica, 99 pp.
- Wetzel, R.M. and Lovett, J.W., 1974. A collection of mammals from the Chaco of Paraguay. The University of Connecticut Occasional Papers, Biological Science Series 2(13): 203-216.
- Ximenez, A., 1974. Notas sobre felidos neotropicales 6. Contribución a la elucidación de las variaciones individuales de Felis pardalis Linne, 1758 (Mammalia: Felidae). Comunicaciones del Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales Bernardino Rivadavia (Zoologia) 4(7): 41-55.
- Zawisza, T., 1984. Guia ecológica de la fauna de Venezuela, Caracas.

0

0