

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 I meeting

Eleventh session: 12 November 2002: 19h00-21h30

Chairman: D. Morgan (United Kingdom)

Secretariat: T. De Meulenaer
M. Lindeque

Rapporteurs: A. Bamford
C. Lippai
R. Mackenzie
P. Wheeler

Consideration of proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II

66. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

The delegation of Costa Rica introduced proposal Prop. 12.16 to transfer the yellow-naped parrot *Amazona auropalliata* from Appendix II to Appendix I. The delegation of Switzerland observed that, under the newly adopted standard reference for Psittaciformes, the taxon was now considered to comprise three subspecies of a more widespread species, *Amazona ochrocephala*. They raised concerns, echoed by the delegation of Norway, regarding identification, particularly of young birds. They suggested that international trade might not be a primary threat to the bird and queried whether ranching would be possible if it were listed on Appendix I.

The delegation of Costa Rica noted that the proposal included descriptions of each subspecies. They acknowledged that domestic trade might be a problem but asserted that all threats, including international trade, needed addressing.

The proposal was then accepted by consensus. The Chairman noted identification concerns and urged the proponent Party to produce identification material as soon as possible.

The delegation of Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union, introduced proposal Prop. 12.18 to transfer *Ara couloni* from Appendix II to Appendix I. The delegations from the range States, Bolivia, Brazil and Peru, all spoke in support of the proposal. They noted the low reproductive rate of the species and its vulnerability to trade. The delegation of Switzerland drew attention to the reported high levels of domestic trade and asked what actions range States were taking to address this. The delegation of the United States of America queried the rarity of the species, noting that the distribution was discontinuous but that the species might be common where found; consequently they believed there was insufficient population information to warrant listing in Appendix I. The Secretariat stated that it shared Switzerland's concerns regarding lack of domestic trade controls. The proposal was supported by Pro Wildlife and Eurogroup against Bird Crime Germany. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

The delegation of South Africa then withdrew proposal Prop. 12.19 to transfer the South African population of *Poicephalus robustus* from Appendix II to Appendix I.

The delegation of Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union, introduced proposal Prop. 12.22, regarding all species in the genus *Heosemys*. The Secretariat lent its support to the proposal, but noted that a technical point required clarification. It believed that, in naming only four species, the proposal as presented did not refer to the entire genus *Heosemys*, since a fifth species, *H. sylvatica* was recognized. It therefore suggested that the proposal be amended to clarify that it referred to *Heosemys depressa*, *H. grandis*, *H. leytensis* and *H. spinosa*, but that these did not constitute the entire genus. The delegation of India suggested instead that the proposal be altered to include the fifth species, *H. sylvatica*, but the Chairman ruled that this would amount to extending the scope of the proposal. The proposal was then accepted by consensus, with the change in presentation as suggested by the Secretariat.

The delegation of India introduced proposal Prop. 12.24, to include all species of *Kachuga* except *Kachuga tecta* in Appendix II. The Secretariat noted that it had been pointed out by the Nomenclature Committee that the taxonomic status of *Kachuga trivittata* in relation to *Callagur borneoensis* was unclear and would need to be resolved if the listing were accepted. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

The delegation of the United States introduced proposal Prop.12 28, to include *Pyxidea mouhotii* in Appendix II, which was accepted by consensus.

The delegation of the United States introduced proposal Prop.12.31, to include all species of *Chitra* in Appendix II, which was accepted by consensus.

The Chairman introduced proposal Prop. 12.32, to include all species of *Pelochelys* in Appendix II, which was accepted by consensus.

The delegation of New Zealand presented proposal Prop. 12.33, to list the genera *Hoplostethus* and *Naultinus* in Appendix II. The delegations of Denmark on behalf of the Member States of the EU, Japan and Switzerland questioned why New Zealand had not rather proposed to list the genera in Appendix III, given that they were endemic and that they were fully protected by law in New Zealand. The Secretariat agreed, while allowing that some potential importing countries would not have provisions for the proper implementation of Appendix III. The delegation of New Zealand replied that they did not believe that an Appendix-III listing would provide the same level of protection and monitoring as an Appendix-II listing and requested putting the proposal to a vote. With 30 votes in favour, 39 against and 26 abstentions, the proposal was rejected.

The delegation of the Philippines, speaking also on behalf of the delegations of India and Madagascar, introduced proposal Prop. 12.35 to include *Rhincodon typus* in Appendix II. They stated that the species was biologically vulnerable and of high value in international trade, with a largely unmanaged and unregulated fishery, noting evidence that populations were in decline. They drew attention to document CoP12 Inf. 31 which contains a statement from the Municipality of Donsol, Philippines, supporting the Appendix-II listing. The delegation of India added that listing the species in Appendix II would complement existing national management measures and recognize the need for additional identification protocols for whale shark parts and derivatives, a process to which the Scientific Authority of India could contribute. The delegations of Bahamas, Honduras, Mexico underscored the importance of the species in ecotourism and supported the proposal. The delegation of Romania also supported the proposal, and stated that an Appendix-II listing had contributed to the collaborative management of sturgeon.

The delegation of Denmark on behalf of the Member States of the EU supported the proposal and expressed concern at the levels of exploitation of and trade in large shark species. They recognized the gaps in information on the status of whale sharks and supported application of the precautionary

principle in this instance. Supported by the delegations of Canada and Tunisia and the observer from the Shark Research Institute, they believed that the criteria in Resolution Conf. 9.24 for an Appendix-II listing were met.

The representative of Greenland on the delegation of Denmark stressed the need to avoid duplication with regard to the work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations in the conservation and management of marine living resources, and highlighted the role of the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the 1995 Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. They expressed the view that CITES was not designed to deal with commercially exploited fish species and that the proposal was premature. This was supported by the delegations of China, Iceland and Singapore.

The delegation of China, supported by the delegation of Iceland, emphasized the lack of available data, particularly on the reasons for the decline in whale shark sightings, and felt that an Appendix-II listing was not justified. They also added that international trade was not a significant threat to the species as most consumption was local. This was supported by the observer from the Shark Fin and Marine Products Association Limited. The delegation of Iceland said that by-catch was greater than targeted off-take and that the conservation value of the Appendix-II listing was likely to be negative in that it could lead to a reduction in the reporting of by-catch data. The delegation of China questioned whether an Appendix-II listing could be effectively implemented given difficulties in identifying parts and derivatives. This was countered by the observers from the IUCN and TRAFFIC and the Shark Research Institute.

The delegation of the Philippines requested a vote by secret ballot and this was agreed. The result was 62 in favour, 34 against, nine abstentions and one spoilt and the proposal was rejected.

The delegation of Germany on behalf of the Member States of the EU introduced proposal Prop. 12.40 to include *Atrophoneura jophon* and *A. pandiyana* in Appendix II. The delegations of Japan, Norway and Switzerland stated that they could not support the proposal given the lack of international trade data. The delegations of India and Sri Lanka, as range States of the two species, together with the observer from the International Wildlife Coalition, supported the proposal.

The Chairman suggested a vote by show of hands and the result was 58 in favour, 14 against and 28 abstentions. The proposal was accepted.

The session closed at 21h30.