

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

Twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Santiago (Chile), 3-15 November 2002

Committee II meeting

First session: 5 November 2002: 14h10-17h00

Chairwoman: A.-M. Delahunt (Australia)

Secretariat: W. Wijnstekers
J. Armstrong
S. Baker
J. Barzdo
J. Sellar
M. Yeater

Rapporteurs: A. Bamford
J. Gray
C. Lippai
R. Mackenzie

Strategic and administrative matters

The Chairwoman announced that discussion of documents CoP12 Doc. 9.1 and CoP12 Doc. 9.2 would be deferred until the afternoon of 7 November 2002, when revised or new documents would be available. She also said she would seek clarification from the Bureau as to whether agenda item 20 b) on the Results of the wider Caribbean hawksbill turtle dialogue meetings, which the preceding plenary session had referred to Committee I, should be transferred to the working programme of Committee II, given that it concerned sea turtles, as did document CoP12 Doc. 16.3, already scheduled for discussion in Committee II.

16. Cooperation with other organizations

b) CITES and FAO

The Chairwoman agreed to a request from the delegation of Japan to postpone discussion of this item.

14. Title of the Convention

The Secretariat introduced document Cop12 Doc. 14 (Rev. 1). The delegation of Denmark, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union (EU), stated that they did not support this proposal to change the title of the Convention, as the current title was well known and was accurately reflected by its acronym. They expressed concerns, shared by the delegation of the Russian Federation, that this proposal might be a first step towards amending the Convention itself. The delegation of Saint Lucia also opposed the proposal, pointing out that there was consensus on this view in their region. The delegations of Eritrea and the Philippines expressed their support for removal of the word 'endangered'

from the title. Recognizing that there was no consensus within the Committee, the Secretary-General withdrew the document.

13. Establishment of Committees

Documents CoP12 Doc. 13.1, 13.2 and 13.3 were introduced by their proponents (Chile, the United States of America and the Secretariat, respectively). Document CoP12 Doc. 13.1 was supported by the delegations of China and Norway and the Secretariat. The delegations of Kenya, Sierra Leone and Switzerland also expressed support, but voiced concern over budgetary implications. The Chairman of the Animals Committee did not support any increase in the number of Committee members, as would result from acceptance of the document.

The Chairman observed that the general view of the Committee appeared to be that the proposal of Chile in document CoP12 Doc. 13.1 was desirable but that it was not appropriate to implement it at this time. However, the delegations of Brazil, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador and Israel supported the immediate implementation of the proposal. The delegations of Costa Rica and Cuba added that there was consensus in favour of the proposal in their region. After an informal show of hands and a vote by show of hands, the delegation of Antigua and Barbuda, seconded by the delegation of Dominica, requested a roll call vote because they believed that the credentials of some Parties that had voted had not been accepted. The result of the roll call vote was 41 in favour, 34 against and 9 abstentions. Not receiving the required two-thirds majority, the proposal was rejected. The delegation of Switzerland explained that they had abstained because the financial implications of the proposal were not yet clear.

Referring to document CoP12 Doc. 13.2, the delegations of Australia, China, Israel, Japan, Kenya, the Russian Federation, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Switzerland, and the Chairman of the Animals Committee believed that there should be separate Animals and Plants Committees. The delegation of Kenya favoured the options presented in paragraph 10 d) of document CoP12 Doc. 13.2. The delegations of Israel, Japan and Switzerland, and the Chairman of the Animals Committee voiced broad support for these, noting the potential financial savings of concurrent or back-to-back Animals and Plants Committee meetings. However, the Secretary-General stated that savings would not necessarily ensue.

The Chairman of the Animals Committee objected to paragraph 3 of document CoP12 Doc. 13.2, pointing out that the Animals Committee had never declined to work on implementation issues and that Decision 11.164 had not been directed to the Animals Committee.

The delegation of Antigua and Barbuda suggested the need for an audit of the Convention and its functions, but the Secretary-General replied that such a review had only recently been carried out.

The Chairwoman concluded that there was a consensus that the current structure and membership of permanent committees of CITES should not change. This was agreed.

The delegation of Australia specifically supported the creation of a sub-committee of the Standing Committee as an appropriate mechanism for addressing the implementation issues referred to in document CoP12 Doc. 13.3 and the delegation of Norway agreed that these should be under the purview of the Standing Committee. This was supported by the delegations of Fiji and the Republic of Korea. The delegation of the United States of America agreed that this proposal should be explored further. To assist the Committee in considering the financial implications of the proposal, the Secretariat indicated that the cost of a sub-committee meeting in Geneva would be in the region of USD 30,000. The delegation of Denmark, on behalf of the Member States of the EU, agreed that there was a need to raise the profile of implementation issues in the Convention. They were not in favour of creating a new permanent body or a permanent sub-committee of the Standing Committee. Instead they proposed more flexible *ad hoc* arrangements to address implementation issues. They suggested reviewing the mandates of the existing committees to determine whether amendments were needed in this regard. The delegation of Switzerland was also not in favour of a permanent Committee, suggesting that

membership should change according to the type of expertise required for each topic under consideration.

The Secretary-General pointed out that the flexible approach appeared to be reflected in paragraph 10 b) of document CoP12 Doc.13.2. He suggested that implementation issues might be referred to the Secretariat, which would consult with the Standing Committee in each case and consider whether it had adequate capacity, expertise and resources to deal with the issue itself or whether external assistance was required. He observed that this approach would have budgetary implications.

The Chairwoman proposed the establishment of a working group to consider how implementation issues could be dealt with within the existing structure of the Convention. The working group would be chaired by the United States of America and include Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, Fiji, Japan, Peru, the Republic of Korea, the Russian Federation, one or two Member States of the EU, the David Shepherd Conservation Foundation, TRAFFIC and the Secretariat. The Chairwoman indicated that the working group should also consider any outstanding issues in document CoP12 Doc. 13.3.

The Chairwoman closed the session at 17h00.