

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

---

Thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Bangkok (Thailand), 2-14 October 2004

Third session: 5 October 2004: 09h13-12h00

Chairman: M. Brasher (United Kingdom)

Secretariat: W. Wijnstekers  
J. Armstrong  
J. Barzdo  
S. Nash  
M. Schmidt  
J. Vasquez  
M. Yeater

UNEP: N. Rotich

Rapporteurs: H. Corrigan  
T. Inskipp  
R. Mackenzie  
A. Stattersfield

## **Strategic and administrative matters**

### 11. Review of permanent committees

#### 11.3 Standard nomenclature and the operation of the Nomenclature Committee

The delegation of Mexico noted that, as a result of comments received, they had a number of suggested changes to the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.11 contained in Annex 1 of document CoP13 Doc. 11.3 (Rev. 1). The Chairman invited comments on each of the proposed amendments to the Resolution.

With regard to concerns raised by the delegation of Uganda about paragraph f), the Secretariat clarified that this was referring only to changes in the spelling of the names of species in the Appendices. Regarding paragraph g), the observer from Humane Society International noted that changes in names could alter the scope of protection for a species, and cited two examples where the original scope of a listing had been affected. The Secretariat noted that in the proposed new text, there was no longer any reference to informing the Parties about changes to the names of taxa. With reference to paragraph h), the delegation of Mexico said that the amendments as shown in Annex 1 might not now be needed as the evaluation of implications was included in the proposed additional paragraph k). Dealing with paragraph i), the delegation of the United States of America felt that the Secretariat should notify the Parties about any interim decisions on nomenclature. The Secretariat doubted the necessity of amending this paragraph and noted that the proposed changes were in any case dependent on approval of proposed changes to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) Annex 3, regarding the establishment and operation of the Nomenclature Committee. The Secretariat was also of the opinion that the proposed changes would not achieve the short-term solution that was intended. The delegation of Argentina expressed the opinion that the Standing Committee should be involved where interim decisions on nomenclature were concerned, but the delegation of Mexico, supported by the delegation of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, thought that this would lead to an unnecessarily complicated procedure.

Regarding the paragraph beginning 'ADOPTS the *Checklist of CITES Species*', the delegation of the United States of America was concerned that, in relation to higher taxa for which standard references had not yet been adopted, the *Checklist* contained species names that had not been approved by the Conference of the Parties, and that this had legal implications. The delegation of the United Kingdom noted that the *Checklist* did not contain all species names and synonyms that were included in the taxon-based plant checklists adopted by the Conference of the Parties. The Chairman of the Plants Committee stressed the importance of these latter lists. The observer from UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre noted that his organization compiled the *CITES Checklist*. It did so under contract to the Secretariat and did not make decisions on which species to include, but used the adopted taxon-based lists as a basis and sought approval on the final content from the Nomenclature Committee.

The observer from Humane Society International recommended that, to alleviate confusion about the different types of checklist adopted by the Conference of the Parties, the *CITES Checklist* could be termed a 'standard list', and the taxon-based lists could be termed 'basic lists'.

The Chairman requested the delegation of Mexico to collaborate with other delegations and observers to produce a revised proposal for amending Resolution Conf. 12.11 for consideration by a later session of the Committee.

## **Interpretation and implementation of the Convention**

### **Species trade and conservation issues**

#### **65. Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish**

The Secretariat introduced document CoP13 Doc. 65, noting that there had been difficulties in implementing Resolution Conf. 12.7 and that the provision of clear time schedules for the recommended actions would improve transparency and avoid ambiguity. It also noted that it had one additional change to propose but suggested the formation of a working group to review all proposed changes in more detail. This suggestion was supported by the delegations of Bulgaria, China, the Islamic Republic of Iran, the Netherlands on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, Romania and the Russian Federation, and the observers from the International Caviar Importers Association, IWMC - World Conservation Trust, Pew Institute for Ocean Science and TRAFFIC. The delegations of Canada, the Russian Federation and the United States also supported the proposal for a working group but suggested that it be limited to sturgeon range States.

The Chairman announced the creation of the proposed working group, and asked the delegation of Romania to chair it. He said that the group should be limited to 15 people and would comprise sturgeon range States, including the Netherlands on behalf of the 25 Member States of the European Community, one representative from the conservation NGOs and one representative from sturgeon traders. The conservation NGOs and the sturgeon trade community would have to agree amongst themselves who would participate in the working group.

## **Strategic and administrative matters**

#### **14. Financing of the conservation of and sustainable international trade in species of wild fauna and flora**

The Secretariat introduced document CoP13 Doc. 14, noting that work on this item had been initiated at the 11th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (Gigiri, 2000), and that Decision 12.26 directed the Secretariat to review existing and innovative mechanisms to finance the conservation of species of wild fauna and flora as well as capacity-building for developing countries and countries with economies in transition. The Secretariat acknowledged the contribution of the Government of France, which had enabled it to conduct the review contained in the document. Decision 12.25 had invited Parties and observers to provide to the Secretariat information on best-practice methods for financing conservation and capacity-building. In addition to the three responses from Parties referred to in paragraph 3 of document CoP13 Doc. 14, the Secretariat had also received a response from Peru. The Secretariat indicated that, owing to the limited response, it was not recommending further action at this stage, but presented the document to the Committee for consideration and noted that it would welcome further information on best-practice methods.

The delegation of the Netherlands, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, welcomed the review and urged all Parties to take into consideration the full range of funding mechanisms. Supported by the delegation of Canada, they emphasized the importance of potential recipient countries identifying CITES activities in national poverty reduction strategies and development plans, as well as national biodiversity strategies and action plans, for the purposes of accessing available bilateral assistance for these activities.

The delegation of Nigeria emphasized the importance of this issue and noted the dearth of CITES-related financing mechanisms. This was supported by the delegations of Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Dominica, Eritrea, Liberia, the United Republic of Tanzania and Uruguay. They highlighted the demands placed upon developing countries by CITES and the corresponding need for capacity-building and resources. They expressed surprise that Global Environment Facility (GEF) funding was not available directly for CITES activities, and called for an approach to the GEF. In supporting this suggestion, the delegations of Chad, Guinea, Liberia and the United Republic of Tanzania also highlighted wider problems faced by developing countries that hampered their capacity to implement the Convention; and the delegation of Dominica stressed specific problems faced by small island developing States. The delegations of Indonesia and Nepal noted the need for collaboration with neighbouring countries in the implementation and enforcement of CITES, for example through joint task forces, transboundary cooperation arrangements, and information exchange. The Secretariat indicated that the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) had adopted, in the context of assessing progress towards the 2010 biodiversity target, a target that no species of wild flora or fauna be endangered by international trade, and it suggested that this created the possibility, through the CBD, to access GEF funding for CITES activities.

The delegations of Australia, Canada and New Zealand thanked the Secretariat for its report, acknowledged the need for further capacity-building for implementation of CITES, and urged Parties to use the full range of financing options identified in the report. However, the delegations of Australia and New Zealand cautioned against looking solely to the finite resources of the GEF to fund CITES activities.

The Secretariat indicated that it had noted all the comments made and would continue to seek and disseminate information on innovative financing mechanisms. The Committee noted the report contained in document CoP13 Doc. 14.

The session closed at 12h00.