

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



Fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
The Hague (Netherlands), 3-15 June 2007

Summary record of the second session of Committee I

05 June 2007: 14h00

Chairman: G. Leach (Australia)

Secretariat: T. De Meulenaer
D. Morgan
S. Nash

Rapporteurs: P. De Angelis
J. Gray
R. Mackenzie
C. McLardy

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation issues

58. Hawksbill turtle

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 58, and recalled Decisions 13.38 and 13.41. It also drew attention to document CoP14 Inf. 4. The Secretariat further referred to Decision 13.40, which had directed the Secretariat, subject to funding and before CoP14, to arrange a meeting of the wider Caribbean region on the hawksbill turtle. It informed the Committee that, notwithstanding a pledge of funding for that meeting from the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, insufficient funds had been available to arrange a regional meeting prior to CoP14. In response to a request for clarification from Mexico, the Secretariat indicated that it was not aware whether funds for such a meeting would remain available from the United Kingdom after CoP14.

Cuba noted that, while some progress had been made, it was not yet possible to speak of a regional strategy on the hawksbill turtle. They informed the Committee that they had decided to declare a voluntary moratorium on marine turtle fisheries from 2008, allowing only a minimum level of catch for scientific purposes. Cuba suggested that CITES should continue to address the hawksbill turtle issue until CoP15, and that the Secretariat should endeavour to secure funding for at least one meeting in the wider Caribbean region. These suggestions were supported by Mexico, who noted that all range States should be involved in any regional meeting. Further efforts under CITES on conservation of hawksbill turtle were also supported by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Costa Rica, Dominica, Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, Mexico and Namibia, as well as TRAFFIC and WWF.

The United States of America highlighted multilateral cooperation on marine turtles in the wider Caribbean region, particularly through the Inter-American Convention for the Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) and the Caribbean Environment Programme (CEP). The IAC had called for a workshop evaluating the status of the hawksbill turtle in the region, and the United

States would provide support for that workshop. They agreed with the Secretariat's conclusion in document CoP14 Doc. 58 that no further CITES action was required on the issue at this time, but suggested that CITES should collaborate with other bodies in the region, and might cooperate with the IAC and the CEP to include the topic of illegal trade in the planned regional workshop. Saint Lucia supported the United States, emphasising that they wished to continue to cooperate with other range States.

Mexico, supported by the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, suggested that updated decisions based on Decisions 13.38 and 13.40 should address cooperation with the IAC.

Namibia commended the efforts of the wider Caribbean region and called for support for such efforts from the international community. They suggested that the limited progress with respect to Decision 13.38 resulted from a lack of capacity, and Dominica agreed.

The Chairman established a working group with a mandate to draft new decisions for CITES involvement with hawksbill turtles in the wider Caribbean region. He noted that new approaches might be needed, rather than a simple reiteration of the content of previous Decisions. The working group, to be chaired by Mexico, would comprise Bahamas, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, China, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominica, Fiji, Honduras, Jamaica, Japan, Saint Lucia, Trinidad and Tobago, the United Kingdom, the United States, Caribbean Regional Fisheries Mechanism, Caribbean Environment Programme, Humane Society of the United States, IWMC World Conservation Trust, TRAFFIC and WWF.

62. Sea cucumbers

The Chairman of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP14 Doc. 62.

Norway objected to the draft decisions in Annex 2 on the basis that they referred to non-CITES listed species and would cause overlap with work of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). They therefore proposed that the draft decisions be rejected in their entirety. Iceland supported Norway, and China stressed that any CITES work on sea cucumbers should be in line with the Memorandum of Understanding between FAO and CITES.

Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, supported the draft decisions but suggested that they should set out priorities, specific actions and time-frames. The United States, supported by Fiji, said that the draft decisions should be strengthened to reflect additional needs identified in the discussion paper, including the consideration of Appendix-II listings for sea cucumber species. They also suggested requesting Parties involved in sea cucumber fisheries to develop management plans, and directing the Secretariat and other agencies to seek funding for capacity-building workshops for the development and implementation of such plans.

Japan highlighted the fact that the costs for implementing the draft decisions directed to the Secretariat and the Animals Committee would be significant and had not been built in to the proposed budget under agenda item 7.3.

FAO outlined its programme of work relating to sea cucumbers, which included an identification manual and a review and analysis of stocks, as well as technical guidelines for sustainable use of sea cucumbers to be developed at a workshop in November 2007.

TRAFFIC, speaking also on behalf of WWF, endorsed the draft decisions and the suggestions of Germany and the United States. Species Management Specialists suggested that the third draft decision should be redrafted and the fourth draft decision rejected to reflect existing FAO activities.

The Chairman established a working group to consider the draft decisions, in the light of the Committee's discussions. The working group would comprise China, Ecuador, Fiji, Iceland, Indonesia, Japan, Norway, the Republic of Korea, the United States, FAO, IWMC World Conservation Trust, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center, Species Management Specialists and TRAFFIC, and the European Community would provide its chairman.

Trade control and marking issues

37. Appendix-I species subject to export quotas

37.1 Leopard export quotas for Mozambique

Mozambique introduced document CoP14 Doc. 37.1 proposing to increase their leopard export quota from 60 to 120. Botswana, Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, Japan, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zimbabwe, and IWMC supported the proposal. Delegates noted that the quota appeared to be conservative and sustainable, and that the move would contribute to local economic development. FFI noted that SSN's analysis of this proposal appeared to misinterpret the trade data and that Mozambique had not exceeded their export quota in 2005.

Israel opposed the proposal on the grounds that it lacked scientific rigour, as it provided little recent information on population status, distribution and ecology, making it difficult to determine a quota.

Following some additional discussion, the proposal was accepted.

Matters referred by the plenary

Uganda's request for a quota under Appendix-I species subject to export quotas

Uganda introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 3 to establish a leopard export quota. This proposal was originally submitted to request a transfer of Uganda's population of leopards from Appendix I to Appendix II. During the second plenary session, they had agreed to withdraw that proposal and to amend it in order to submit it under agenda item 37. The text of the proposal was amended to conform to Resolution Conf. 9.21 (Rev. CoP13) on application for a quota and to reduce the requested quota from 50 to 28.

Germany, on behalf of the Members States of the European Community, Japan, Namibia, Pakistan, South Africa, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, on behalf of the 14 member countries of the Southern African Development Community, and Zimbabwe supported the proposal.

The Democratic Republic of the Congo supported the proposal but expressed concern for the crossborder leopard populations it shared with Uganda, noting that the quota may create tension or foster poaching in the Democratic Republic of the Congo national parks that share a border with Uganda.

Israel recognized that while wildlife-human conflict was a serious issue, they did not feel that the proposal could be accepted as written owing to the lack of recent population data and the lack of details regarding the mechanism by which the funds will be returned.

Following some additional discussion, the proposal was accepted.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Trade control and marking issues

37. Appendix-I species subject to export quotas

37.2 Black rhinoceros export quotas for Namibia and South Africa

Kenya introduced document CoP14 Doc. 37.2 requesting a repeal of Resolution Conf. 13.5, which set an annual export quota of five black rhinoceros for both Namibia and South Africa.

In document CoP14 Inf. 39, Kenya expressed concerns regarding the management and monitoring capabilities of the two Parties, and apparent population declines within certain range States due to increased poaching and demand for rhinoceros horn since the adoption

of Resolution Conf. 13.5. They contended that translocation of animals to other range States and the resultant tourism would be viable alternatives to hunting and would contribute to the range-wide conservation of this critically endangered species.

In response, Namibia introduced document CoP14 Inf. 43, responding to the issues raised by Kenya. They also explained that the quota of five individuals, which represented 0.4 % of their population, remained sustainable, and requested that Parties reject the proposal.

South Africa reiterated that the export quota was a scientific effort to deal with population problems by enhancing genetic management and providing economic returns; that Parties overwhelmingly supported adoption of the quota at CoP13; and, that they concurred with Namibia's responses in document CoP14 Inf. 43. They noted that populations within South Africa had increased by 8.3 % between 2003 and 2005; that actual exports in 2005 and 2006 (three and four animals respectively) were within the export quota; that the poaching figures provided in document CoP14 Inf. 39 erroneously included data on white rhinoceros; and that most of the proceeds generated had benefited formal State conservation projects and local communities. South Africa also requested the Parties to reject the proposal.

Rwanda, as a range State of black rhinoceros, and the Democratic Republic of the Congo supported the proposal, agreeing that crossborder translocation of surplus individuals could boost their natural populations and promote tourism.

Botswana and Japan considered that Kenya's allegations had been adequately addressed by Namibia and South Africa and rejected the proposal.

Kenya requested a vote but expressed concerns that with insufficient time remaining in the session had truncated the debate. Following a vote, the proposal was rejected, with 15 votes in favour, 65 against and 11 abstentions.

Following some announcements by the Secretariat, the session was adjourned at 17h10.

Black rhinoceros export quotas for Namibia and South Africa

Result of the vote on the repeal of Resolution Conf. 13.5.

Key: 0 = did not vote, 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = abstain

Parties	Vote
Afghanistan AF	0
Albania AL	0
Algeria DZ	1
Antigua and Barbuda AG	2
Argentina AR	0
Australia AU	2
Austria AT	2
Azerbaijan AZ	0
Bahamas BS	1
Bangladesh BD	0
Barbados BB	0
Belarus BY	0
Belgium BE	2
Belize BZ	0
Benin BJ	0
Bhutan BT	0
Bolivia BO	0
Botswana BW	2
Brazil BR	2
Brunei Darussalam BN	0
Bulgaria BG	2
Burkina Faso BF	2
Burundi BI	2
Cambodia KH	0
Cameroon CM	0
Canada CA	2
Cape Verde CV	0
Central African Republic CF	0
Chad TD	0
Chile CL	2
China CN	2
Colombia CO	0
Comoros KM	0
Congo CG	0
Costa Rica CR	2
Côte d'Ivoire CI	1
Croatia HR	1
Cuba CU	2
Cyprus CY	0
Czech Republic CZ	0
Democratic Republic of the Congo CD	1
Denmark DK	2
Djibouti DJ	0
Dominica DM	3

Parties	Vote
Dominican Republic DO	2
Ecuador EC	3
Egypt EG	0
El Salvador SV	0
Equatorial Guinea GO	0
Eritrea ER	1
Estonia EE	2
Ethiopia ET	3
Fiji FJ	3
Finland FI	2
France FR	2
Gabon GA	0
Gambia GM	0
Georgia GE	0
Germany DE	2
Ghana GH	0
Greece GR	2
Grenada GD	3
Guatemala GT	2
Guinea GN	0
Guinea-Bissau GW	0
Guyana GY	2
Honduras HN	2
Hungary HU	2
Iceland IS	2
India IN	0
Indonesia ID	2
Iran (Islamic Republic of) IR	0
Ireland IE	2
Israel IL	1
Italy IT	1
Jamaica JM	3
Japan JP	2
Jordan JO	0
Kazakhstan KZ	0
Kenya KE	1
Kuwait KW	3
Lao People's Democratic Republic LA	2
Latvia LV	2
Lesotho LS	0
Liberia LR	0
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya LY	0
Liechtenstein LI	0
Lithuania LT	0

Parties	Vote
Luxembourg LU	2
Madagascar MG	3
Malawi MW	0
Malaysia MY	2
Mali ML	0
Malta MT	2
Mauritania MR	0
Mauritius MU	3
Mexico MX	2
Monaco MC	0
Mongolia MN	2
Montenegro ME	0
Morocco MA	0
Mozambique MZ	0
Myanmar MM	0
Naam	4
Namibia NA	2
Nepal NP	2
Netherlands NL	2
New Zealand NZ	2
Nicaragua NI	0
Niger NE	1
Nigeria NG	0
Norway NO	2
Pakistan PK	2
Palau PW	1
Panama PA	0
Papua New Guinea PG	0
Paraguay PY	0
Peru PE	0
Philippines PH	0
Poland PL	0
Portugal PT	2
Qatar QA	2
Republic of Korea KR	2
Republic of Moldova MD	2
Romania RO	2
Russian Federation RU	0
Rwanda RW	1
Saint Kitts and Nevis KN	2
Saint Lucia LC	2
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines VC	0
Samoa WS	0
San Marino SM	0
Sao Tome and Principe ST	0
Saudi Arabia SA	0
Senegal SN	0
Serbia RS	1
Seychelles SC	0
Sierra Leone SL	0
Singapore SG	2
Slovakia SK	2

Parties	Vote
Slovenia SI	2
Solomon Islands SB	0
Somalia SO	0
South Africa ZA	2
Spain ES	0
Sri Lanka LK	0
Sudan SD	0
Suriname SR	2
Swaziland SZ	2
Sweden SE	2
Switzerland CH	2
Syrian Arab Republic SY	0
Thailand TH	2
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia MK	0
Togo TG	1
Trinidad and Tobago TT	0
Tunisia TN	2
Turkey TR	2
Uganda UG	0
Ukraine UA	0
United Arab Emirates AE	3
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland GB	2
United Republic of Tanzania TZ	2
United States of America US	2
Uruguay UY	0
Uzbekistan UZ	0
Vanuatu VU	1
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) VE	3
Viet Nam VN	0
Yemen YE	0
Zambia ZM	2
Zimbabwe ZW	2