

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 seventh session of Committee I

8 June 2007: 09h05-12h00

Chairman: Greg Leach (Australia)

Secretariat: T. De Meulenaer
D. Morgan
M. Schmidt

Rapporteurs: J. Boddens Hosang
J. Caldwell
T. Inskipp
R. Mackenzie

The Chairman introduced the day's work programme, pointing out that proposal CoP14 Prop. 3 had been withdrawn by Uganda on adoption of an export quota under agenda item 37, related to species in Appendix I. He announced that Spain would represent the European Community on the Periodic Review Working Group.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Amendment of the Appendices

68. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

Continuing the discussion on proposal CoP14 Prop. 1 regarding *Nycticebus* spp., Germany on behalf of the European Community and its Member States noted that the species met all criteria for Appendix-I listing and welcomed the proposal. Japan, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Qatar, Thailand and the United States of America agreed. The Japan Wildlife Conservation Society, also speaking on behalf of Asian Conservation Alliance and the Species Survival Network, and ProWildlife also voiced support for the proposal noting substantial illegal trade in the region. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

The United States introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 2, noting that *Lynx rufus* did not warrant listing in Appendix II due to well-managed and growing wild populations in the United States, Canada and many areas in Mexico. Furthermore, most of the trade was in whole skins and adequate tools for distinguishing skin pieces from similar species were available. Should the proposal be accepted, the United States would list the species on Appendix III and conduct workshops on the techniques for identifying skins. Qatar supported the proposal, as did Canada who added that they would also list the species on Appendix III if the proposal were accepted.

Mexico stated that their country made up 30 % of the species' range and that the status of their population was poorly known. They drew attention to the difficulty of identifying skin pieces between similar species, the relatively old data quoted in the proposal, and that the Felidae were

currently subject to a periodic review by the Animals Committee. They therefore believed the proposal to be premature. These views were echoed by Humane Society International. The problem of look-alike species was also voiced by Germany on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, India, Norway, Serbia and the Documentation Center for Species Protection.

Following a vote the proposal was rejected by 28 votes in favour, 63 against and 9 abstentions (vote 1).

Administrative matters

8. Committee reports

8.2 Report of the Chairman of the Animals Committee

The Chairman of the Animals Committee drew attention to the recommendation, in the Annex to his report, to continue the Committee's work regarding the Periodic Review of the Felidae.

The recommendation was accepted.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Amendment of the Appendices

68. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

Bolivia introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 8 requesting that the annotation regarding some of their populations of vicuña be both amended and extended to all their populations. They pointed out the healthy state of vicuña populations in Bolivia and that illegal hunting had been reduced.

Peru, speaking on behalf of Central and South America and the Caribbean, supported the proposal as did Germany on behalf of the European Community and its Member States. Kenya and Zimbabwe were in favour of the benefits the Bolivian management approach provided to local communities. Argentina and Chile, members of the Convention for the Conservation and Management of the Vicuña, also supported and called upon importing countries, particularly the Member States of the European Community, to strengthen measures to combat illegal trade.

The proposal was accepted by consensus.

In presenting proposal CoP14 Prop. 9, Algeria pointed to the decrease in numbers of *Cervus elaphus barbarus* in their country, as well as in Morocco and Tunisia. They believed the species filled the biological criteria for listing in Appendix I, and that any trade could lead to extinction of the subspecies. Israel and Morocco agreed, noting in particular that it was difficult to identify material at the subspecies level. China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kuwait, Mali, the Sudan and the Species Survival Network supported the proposal.

Tunisia, as a range State, believed the population was increasing and was not subject to international trade or poaching, however they fully supported the proposal. They pointed out that their population was listed in Appendix III. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, stated that neither biological nor trade criteria for Appendix-I listing were met and opposed the proposal. Japan, Norway and the United Arab Emirates agreed with this, as did IWMC – World Conservation Trust.

Following a vote the proposal was rejected with 52 votes in favour, 50 against, and 5 abstentions (vote 2).

Algeria introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 10 for inclusion of *Gazella cuvieri* in Appendix I, noting that other range States were in favour. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, Egypt, Madagascar, Mali, Morocco, South Africa, the Sudan and Tunisia all supported the proposal. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, Japan and the United Arab Emirates opposed the proposal on the basis that it did not fulfil the trade criteria for an Appendix-I listing. Germany, on

behalf of the European Community and its Member States, also mentioned that they believed that the biological criteria may be met for *Gazella cuvieri*. Following a vote the proposal was rejected, the result being 54 in favour, 46 against and four abstentions (vote 3).

Proposal CoP14 Prop. 11 was withdrawn by its proponent, Algeria, on the basis of consultations with other range States. They informed the Committee that an in-depth study of the biological criteria would be undertaken and a proposal might be made at a later date. Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic noted that they were range States of *Gazella dorcas*, and Israel indicated that it would wish to be involved in any study undertaken.

Algeria introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 12 for inclusion of *Gazella leptoceros* in Appendix I, drawing attention to the extra information in document CoP14 Inf. 23 (Rev. 1). Chad, Egypt, Germany on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, Israel, Kenya, Kuwait, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic and the United States supported the proposal. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, noted that all reported trade was in captive-bred specimens, but that there may be some unrecorded trade in hunting trophies. The United Arab Emirates believed that stronger protection measures were needed within range States. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

Brazil introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 13 (Rev. 1) to transfer its population of *Melanosuchus niger* from Appendix I to Appendix II. Bolivia, Botswana, China, the Dominican Republic, Germany on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, Guyana, Japan, Mexico, Peru on behalf of Central and South America and the Caribbean, Qatar, Viet Nam and TRAFFIC supported the proposal. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, stressed the importance of monitoring the results of the initial harvesting trials, and of addressing any difficulties arising from the split-listing of the species. Bolivia noted the need for cooperation to control illegal hunting and trade in light of the extensive border it shared with Brazil. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

Guatemala introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 14 to transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I the subspecies *Heloderma horridum charlesbogerti*, endemic to Guatemala. Brazil on behalf of 31 countries the Central and South America and the Caribbean region, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Germany on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, Kenya, the United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe supported the proposal. The United States also supported the proposal and noted that it was possible for experts to identify which subspecies of *Heloderma horridum* live juvenile specimens belonged. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, introduced proposal CoP14 Prop. 15 for inclusion of *Lamna nasus* in Appendix II. They drew attention to document CoP14 Inf. 48, which contained their comments on the FAO *Ad Hoc* Expert Advisory Panel's assessment of the proposal. Denmark supported the proposal, as a Member State of the European Community, but said that, if the proposal was adopted, a reservation would be entered in respect of Greenland, which opposed it. Israel supported the proposal.

Senegal requested clarification of the implications of the proposed annotation to the Appendix-II listing, regarding the 18-month delay in the entry into effect of the listing.

Canada opposed the proposal and drew the attention of the Committee to document CoP14 Inf. 29 in which they set out the framework of principles within which they assessed marine species listing proposals. In their view, CITES could be a tool for managing fish stocks threatened by international trade, provided the CITES listing criteria were met. However, they emphasized the need for domestic and regional fishery management measures on overfishing and bycatch issues to be identified and enforced. Supported by Norway, they noted that the proposal did not adequately address what measures were being taken within the European Community or the North East Atlantic Fisheries Commission. Iceland, echoed by Qatar, also opposed the proposal, noting that globally *Lamna nasus* did not meet the criteria for CITES listing. Qatar also raised potential identification difficulties related to shark products.

Ecuador, on behalf the Central and South America and the Caribbean region, opposed the proposal and called for better implementation of the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and

Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). Norway strongly opposed the proposal, stating that figures in the proposal were based on landing statistics rather than population data. They emphasized the importance of following the recommendations of the FAO Panel in relation to proposals to list commercially-exploited aquatic species.

After some announcements by the Chairman and the Secretariat, the session was closed at 12h00.

Result of the votes

Vote 1: Deletion of *Lynx rufus* from Appendix II (agenda item 68, Proposal 2 from the United States) /
Vote 2: Inclusion of *Cervus elaphus barbarus* in Appendix I (agenda item 68, Proposal 9 from Algeria) /
Vote 3: Inclusion of *Gazella cuvieri* in Appendix I (agenda item 68, Proposal 10 from Algeria) / Key: 0 = did not vote, 1 = yes, 2 = no, 3 = abstain

Parties	Vote 1		Vote 2		Vote 3
Yes (1)	28	30.77%	52	50.98%	54
No (2)	63	69.23%	50	49.02%	46
Abstain (3)	9		5		4
Total votes	100		107		104
Afghanistan AF	0		0		0
Albania AL	0		0		0
Algeria DZ	1		1		1
Antigua and Barbuda AG	2		3		3
Argentina AR	2		3		1
Australia AU	2		2		1
Austria AT	2		2		2
Azerbaijan AZ	0		0		0
Bahamas BS	3		1		2
Bangladesh BD	0		0		0
Barbados BB	0		0		0
Belarus BY	0		0		0
Belgium BE	2		2		2
Belize BZ	0		0		0
Benin BJ	0		0		0
Bhutan BT	2		1		1
Bolivia BO	2		1		1
Botswana BW	1		1		1
Brazil BR	2		2		1
Brunei Darussalam BN	0		0		0
Bulgaria BG	2		0		0
Burkina Faso BF	0		1		1
Burundi BI	0		0		0
Cambodia KH	1		1		1
Cameroon CM	0		1		1
Canada CA	1		2		2
Cape Verde CV	0		0		0
Central African Republic CF	0		0		0
Chad TD	0		1		0
Chile CL	2		2		1
China CN	1		1		1
Colombia CO	1		0		2
Comoros KM	0		0		0
Congo CG	0		0		0
Costa Rica CR	2		1		1
Côte d'Ivoire CI	2		1		1

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

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

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