

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 third session of Committee I

6 June 2007: 09h00-12h00

Chairman: G. Leach (Australia)

Secretariat: T. De Meulenaer
D. Morgan

Rapporteurs: J. Caldwell
S. Ferriss
J. Gray
T. Inskipp

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation issues

54. Rhinoceroses

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 54 and referred the delegates to the draft decisions and draft amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP13).

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, fully endorsed the draft decisions and draft amendments to the Resolution, requesting that the financial implications of adopting these be reflected in the costed programme of work for the triennium 2009-2011 in order to provide a sustainable basis for funding future work on this issue. They wished the issue of rhinoceros conservation to remain on the Standing Committee's programme of work until CoP15 and requested an amendment to paragraph d) of the third draft decision directed to the Secretariat to require that it report on progress towards the implementation of all three Decisions at the 57th and 58th meetings of the Standing Committee and at the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Qatar, supported by China, Japan, Namibia, Nepal, South Africa, Swaziland, the United States of America and TRAFFIC, endorsed the draft decisions and draft amendments to the Resolution. However, Qatar was concerned that it would be difficult for the Secretariat to secure the USD 130,000 needed to continue progress, and the United States suggested that budgetary implications should be referred to the Budget Working Group, while South Africa asked that these costs be reflected in the costed programme of work. China, Namibia, South Africa and Swaziland stressed the importance of confidentiality for information on rhinoceros horn stocks. TRAFFIC commended the document, referred the delegates to document CoP14 Inf. 41, and drew attention to progress in the implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP13).

Kenya was in broad support of the draft decisions and draft amendments to Resolution 9.14 (Rev. CoP13), but considered that the Resolution needed further strengthening, specifically by inserting text to require that Parties destroy their stocks of rhinoceros horn, unless for educational purposes.

They further considered that range State consultation over the findings presented in Annex 1 to document CoP14 Doc. 54 had been insufficient and suggested amendments to the Resolution to reflect this. They also proposed various amendments to the draft decisions. In response, the Chairman suggested a working group might be necessary, but Namibia responded that they did not agree with Kenya's proposed changes or with establishing a working group. In this they were supported by Botswana, Japan, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Following this, the draft decisions and amendments in document CoP14 Doc. 54, with the amendment proposed by Germany, were agreed by consensus.

47. Applications to register operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes

The Secretariat presented document CoP14 Doc. 47 regarding a request from the Philippines to register a captive-breeding operation for eight species of parrot, following which the Philippines gave an explanation of the issue from their perspective. They informed the delegates that they were withdrawing their reservations on *Amazona ochrocephala auropalliata* and *A. o. oratrix*.

Bolivia, Indonesia, New Zealand and the United States objected to registration of the operation. Bolivia objected on the grounds that they had not been consulted; that *Ara rubrogenys* was emblematic for Bolivia; and that the proposal was only for commercial purposes and not for *in situ* conservation. Indonesia was opposed because there was no evidence of compliance with Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP13) with respect to *Cacatua goffini*; there was high mortality of this species in the captive-breeding operation; and acceptance of the registration may trigger illegal trade. New Zealand stated that they had intelligence linking the captive-breeding operation to personnel previously involved in illegal trade, and the United States considered that there was insufficient documentation regarding legal acquisition of the founder stock.

Mexico supported the application from the Philippines, stating that they accepted the assertion that, for this transaction, it was not possible to obtain documents showing legal provenance of the parental stock with complete certainty. They said that registration of the operation could provide an excellent opportunity to promote cooperation between *ex situ* breeding operations and *in situ* conservation, as called for in Resolution Conf. 13.9, and the regularization of captive-breeding. They were supported by Brazil, who withdrew an earlier objection, in the light of new documentation.

Following a vote, registration of the captive-breeding operation for the eight taxa was agreed, with 50 votes in favour, 22 against and 16 abstentions.

However Iceland, Israel, Qatar, Saint Lucia and the United States claimed that their votes had not been registered by the electronic system. Saint Lucia had voted in favour of the registration of the captive-breeding operation and the other Parties against. In response, the Chairman said that the matter would be looked into.¹

51. Cetaceans

Japan introduced document CoP14 Doc. 51, noting that it referred to the Strategic Vision through 2007, which was to be replaced by the Strategic Vision: 2008-2013. They highlighted objective 1.4 of the new Strategic Vision, which concerns correctly reflecting the conservation needs of species in the Appendices. They suggested that the inclusion of cetacean species in Appendix I had taken place before detailed scientific criteria had been adopted, and that the listings had not been tested against the criteria outlined in Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13). In response to the comments in the document from the Secretariat, they noted that a review would provide a scientific basis to update Resolution Conf. 11.4 (Rev. CoP12) and that previous proposals to transfer species of whales from Appendix I to Appendix II had been rejected because of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) moratorium on commercial whaling rather than for scientific reasons. Furthermore, they remarked that amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.4 (Rev. CoP12) should be based on scientific findings and, therefore, that the Animals Committee was the most appropriate body to deal with the issue.

¹ Subsequent checks showed that only Israel's vote had not been registered. Therefore the vote count was 50 in favour, 23 against and 16 abstentions.

The draft decisions in the document were opposed by Australia, who recognized the IWC as an authority on scientific information and management of cetaceans. Noting the unfavourable status of many cetacean species prior to the IWC moratorium, they recommended that no review should be undertaken by CITES while the moratorium was in place. Argentina, speaking on behalf of Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Mexico and Uruguay reiterated the primary competence of the IWC with regard to management and conservation of cetaceans. This was supported by Senegal. Brazil outlined the benefits of non-lethal use of cetaceans. Mexico stated that they would only consider supporting whaling if a Revised Management Scheme was completed. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, also opposed the draft decisions and drew attention to the draft IWC Resolution (IWC/59/19), circulated with document CoP14 Inf. 44.

Canada elaborated on the importance of CITES basing its decisions on the best available scientific information, and the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society, speaking on behalf of the Species Survival Network, noted that that proposals to list cetaceans in Appendix I had all followed the correct scientific procedure in place at the time. They also noted that the IWC had access to extensive scientific advice and expertise, and was better placed to review the status of the relevant species than CITES.

Norway supported the draft decisions, noting that Japan was prepared to provide the necessary resources for the relevant reviews. Saint Kitts and Nevis agreed with Japan's comments and supported the draft decisions. They were concerned that the decisions of IWC had been inconsistent and urged CITES to make its decisions independently. In their view, countries were losing faith in CITES procedures because decisions were increasingly made on a political basis. China, Greenland (Denmark) and IWMC-World Conservation Trust also supported the draft decisions.

Japan proposed to move to a vote and the proposal to adopt the draft decisions in the Annex to document CoP14 Doc. 51 was rejected with 26 votes in favour, 54 against and 13 abstentions.

The votes of the following Parties were reiterated because of possible failings in the voting procedure: Singapore was in favour of the draft decisions while Israel and the United States were opposed to them. Guinea stated they were in favour of the draft decisions but had been unable to vote because they had not been able to collect their voting card, even though their credentials had been approved.

Administrative matters

8. Committee reports

8.2 Report of the Chairman of the Animals Committee

Argentina referred to the discussion on paragraph 29 of document CoP14 Doc. 8.2, relating to species selected for periodic review, in particular the inclusion of *Balaenoptera physalus* (central stock of North Atlantic) which was decided by vote at the 22nd meeting of the Animals Committee. Argentina expressed concern about the fact that the review of one species of cetaceans would run counter to the guidelines for the periodic review adopted by the Standing Committee at its 51st meeting, which exclude species addressed under other reviews. They recommended that this stock be excluded from this review.

The Chairman, the Secretariat and the Chairman of the Animals Committee all supported the process undertaken by the Animals Committee.

Australia and the United States agreed with Argentina and suggested that the rejection of the draft decisions in document CoP14 Doc. 51 meant that this species should be removed from the periodic review. Brazil supported this view and pointed out that some species had been included in the periodic review in an unsatisfactory manner. The Chairman of the Animals Committee strongly objected to the comments of Brazil, emphasizing that the Animals Committee had followed the correct procedure in a transparent manner.

Australia proposed the following draft decision:

Directed to the Animals Committee

No periodic review of any great whale, including the fin whale, should occur while the moratorium by the International Whaling Commission is in place.

Suriname was opposed to the draft decision on the basis of the wording "while the moratorium by the International Whaling Commission is in place".

Given the lack of consensus, Norway proposed to move to a vote on this draft decision, the proposal was adopted with 59 voted in favour, 21 against and 13 abstentions. The votes of the following Parties were reiterated because of possible failings in the voting procedure: Israel was in favour of the draft decision; Singapore was opposed to it.

The session closed at 12h00.

Result of the votes

Vote 1: Proposal to add eight taxa to the entry in the Register of operations that breed Appendix-I animal species in captivity for commercial purposes under A-PH-501, Birds International, Inc., in the Philippines (agenda item 47) / Vote 2: Proposal to adopt two draft decisions in the Annex to document CoP14 Doc. 51 (agenda item 51) / Vote 3: Proposal from Australia for a draft decision concerning the undertaking of a periodic review of great whales (agenda item 8.2 / Key: 0 = did not vote, 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = abstain

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

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

² Note from the Secretariat: corrected after the meeting, originally indicated "0".

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

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