

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 11th session of Committee I

12 June 2007: 09h05-12h00

Chairman: G. Leach (Australia)

Secretariat: T. de Meulenaer
D. Morgan
S. Nash
M. Schmidt

Rapporteurs: J. Caldwell
S. Ferriss
W. Jackson
C. McLardy

The Chairman opened the session and reminded delegates to intervene following a vote if it appeared that theirs had not been recorded owing to faulty equipment, and to also consult with the technicians to confirm the reason for the failure.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation issues

64. Bigleaf Mahogany: report of the Working Group

The Chairman of the Plants Committee and the Chairman of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group introduced document CoP14 Doc. 64 (Rev. 1), explaining that the draft decisions in Annex 2 were proposed for consideration by the Committee. The Chairman of the Plants Committee noted that effective and standard policies for making non-detriment findings were not yet in place in many range States. However she believed that, as a result of the ongoing work, trade in mahogany could become a model example of sustainable use of tree species. The Chairman of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group noted that national reports had been received from all range States except Belize, and that the actions taken in response to Decision 13.58 were summarised in Annex 1. He also reported on a workshop on non-detriment findings that was held in Cancun, Mexico, in April 2007.

The Secretariat noted that agreement had been reached in session 4 of Committee I under agenda item CoP14 8.3 on a decision relating to non-detriment findings for timber and medicinal plant species. It suggested postponement of discussion on the draft decisions in Annex 2 regarding non-detriment findings until it had explored possibilities of harmonizing them with the decisions agreed previously. The Chairman concurred.

The Chairman of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group, supported by Honduras, requested that the word "manejo" should be used instead of "planes de ordenación" in the Spanish version of

Annex XX. Honduras suggested that “multi-institutional” should be changed to “inter-institutional” in paragraph 1 a) of Annex XX. Peru suggested that the text in paragraph 1 b) and 1e) iii) of Annex XX could be amended, and suggested to establish a drafting group. The Chairman of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group considered the proposed amendments to be minor, and suggested that he spoke bilaterally with Honduras and Peru and return to the session for conclusion of the item. This was agreed.

57. Tortoises and freshwater turtles

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 57, noting that it had complied with Decision 13.37 but was unable to comply with Decision 13.36 as no biennial reports had been received at the time of writing the document.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and Malaysia supported the Secretariat’s recommendations. Malaysia noted that they had established a zero quota for the export of all wild-caught freshwater turtles and tortoises. Madagascar requested Parties and non-governmental organisations to assist them in their efforts to stop the illegal trade in tortoises from their country. Highlighting illegal trade in south-east Asia, TRAFFIC outlined the need for more effective enforcement of trade controls and science based limits for legal trade.

The Chairman proposed the establishment of a small drafting group to draft text to allow the Secretariat’s recommendations to be implemented. The group, chaired by Germany, would include Malaysia, the Secretariat and TRAFFIC.

65. Report of the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group

Document CoP14 Doc. 65 was introduced by the Secretariat, who observed that the co-ordinator of the Working Group was not present at the meeting. It noted that a new decision would need to be agreed if the mandate of the Working Group was to be maintained, a suggested text of which was presented in paragraph C of the Secretariat’s comments.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, asserted that the bushmeat trade was not confined to Africa, but was also a problem in Asia and South America. They supported the decision proposed by the Secretariat, and proposed that the following supplementary text be added:

The Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group is encouraged to continue its work, also by collaborating with the Convention on Biological Biodiversity Liaison Group on non-timber forest resources, and to report to the Standing Committee on progress made in implementing national action plans relating to the trade in bushmeat and other initiatives it takes regarding this subject. A report on the subject of bushmeat should be submitted to the 15th of the Conference of the Parties.

TRAFFIC, also speaking on behalf of WWF, were concerned that the activities of the Working Group were limited and that little progress had been made on implementing Phase 2 of the programme. They supported the draft decision proposed by Germany.

Both draft decisions were accepted by consensus.

62. Sea cucumbers

The Netherlands, as Chair of the Working Group on Sea Cucumbers, introduced document CoP14 Com. I. 1 informed delegates that the Group had agreed on draft decisions that reflected those proposed by the Animals Committee, and that two new elements were included: one on socio-economic aspects and livelihoods; and the other on closer cooperation between FAO and CITES on mobilizing support for capacity-building initiatives. Ecuador, as a member of the Working Group, expressed support for the decisions and stressed the need for information such as biological and market data in order to make educated decisions. They added that results of the FAO project regarding commercially-exploited species would be sent to the Secretariat for forwarding to interested Parties.

Norway opposed the draft decisions, citing their concerns about expanding the scope of CITES, as well as the role of the Secretariat in the implementation of national action plans. The Secretariat clarified that it would only convey information to the FAO, and that how this was addressed could not be anticipated. The Secretariat added that both the FAO and the Secretariat had been involved in the Working Group and that the proposed decisions had been agreed by both.

The draft decisions were accepted after a vote, with 77 in favour, four against, and 10 abstentions (see Annex).

Amendment of the Appendices

68. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

The Chairman reintroduced proposals CoP14 Prop. 36 and 37 on *Taxus* spp., which had been deferred from a previous session. The United States requested additional time to consult with other Parties and the proposals were deferred again.

Species trade and conservation issues

53. Elephants

53.3 Monitoring of illegal hunting in elephant range States

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 53.3, reminding delegates that the MIKE baseline information was defined at SC53, and added that at SC55 the Standing Committee had agreed that the baseline information presented at the meeting was complete for all sites (45 in Africa, 18 in Asia). The Secretariat stressed that MIKE is a sample-based programme, and according to the IUCN, monitors between 35-43% of total African elephants and between 27-35% of Asian elephants. It noted that at the sub-continental level, rates of illegal killing of elephants was highest in Central Africa, and said the analysis identified the following factors which affect these rates in Africa: sub-region, human access to sites, corruption index of country, actual levels of protection, and type of ecosystem. The Secretariat observed that corruption index is the only factor correlating with illegal killing of elephants in Asia.

The Secretariat outlined the funding situation of MIKE, shown in paragraphs 7-10 in the document, and informed delegates that funding received from the European Commission to support MIKE in Africa until 2011 was for: training, equipping sites with GPS; undertaking elephant population surveys and studies of elephant meat and ivory trade; improving analysis of MIKE data; collaborating with IUCN and ETIS; convening meetings of MIKE stakeholders in Africa; and establishing the MIKE coordination office in Nairobi and its African subregional support units. The Secretariat explained that the development of MIKE in Asia remained problematic.

The Secretariat also outlined recent MIKE activities as indicated in paragraphs 11-14 of the document, including sub-regional meetings and meetings of the MIKE-ETIS Technical Advisory Group, and stated that it would like to bring together all African elephant range States involved in MIKE to discuss progress, lessons learned, and the way forward. It noted that the MIKE approach to elephants was being applied by range States for other species, and suggested that it might also be used by other species-specific projects such as for rhinoceroses or great apes.

The United States enumerated its financial contributions to MIKE, called for efficient capacity-building in range States, and expressed discomfort at the change in the administrative arrangements of MIKE. He looked forward to seeing how the Central Coordination Unit's move to UNEP in Nairobi would allow timely assistance to range States and accountability to donors, and encouraged the Secretariat and MIKE to expedite the recruitment of qualified replacements for the sub-regional officers. He welcomed the proposed visit of the MIKE Coordinator to the United States.

Eritrea informed delegates that their country had no markets for ivory, and had promulgated a legally-binding instrument to regulate flora and fauna in 2006. Kenya noted that some range States did not understand the baseline information or its analytical framework, stressed that MIKE should be sustainable in the long-term, and that proper consultations should be carried out in the sub-regions. Uganda said that achievements of the MIKE programme were critical for national-level decision-making as well as for decisions made at the international level. Zimbabwe agreed with Kenya and Uganda, and with support from Zambia, stressed that the MIKE programme was not a substitute for robust wildlife law enforcement, political will, and sound management.

Thailand offered to share their experience of human-elephant conflicts and their work with neighbouring countries on this issue. As host of the MIKE Southeast Asian regional office, they looked forward to organizing the sub-regional meeting and urged support for the Asia programme. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, stressed the importance of sustained funding in order to ensure the viable future of MIKE, and announced that France was providing USD 50,000 for the MIKE South Asian sub-region.

Botswana, supported by South Africa, urged African range States to use the MIKE Phase II period until 2011 to incorporate monitoring in national plans so that this practice did not end when MIKE funding was exhausted. Viet Nam informed delegates that the training course organised by MIKE had provided inputs for a conservation action plan that had been prepared in their country.

The Secretariat thanked France for its contribution, and expressed optimism that the MIKE programme would improve and grow in the coming years. The report was noted.

53.2. Monitoring of illegal trade in ivory and other elephant specimens

TRAFFIC introduced document CoP14. Doc 53.2 assessing data gathered through the Elephant Trade Information System (ETIS), noting the volume of seizure data generated since 1989. They drew attention to patterns of illicit trade as summarized in the document; highlighted specific countries with greatest needs in terms of management, protection and enforcement; outlined links to emerging organized crime operations; and identified the importance of governance issues.

China could not support the report's conclusion that China was persistently implicated in high-volume illicit trade in ivory, and considered the report findings to be based on subjective and misleading information provided by NGOs. They drew attention to the Secretariat's report to the Standing Committee (document SC53 Doc. 20.1) verifying that China had implemented national legislation and domestic trade controls for internal ivory trade to meet the provisions in Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12). They expressed concern that the delay in designating China as a trading partner could stimulate the emergence of illegal trade and outlined a commitment to work in cooperation with range States to address illegal trade issues.

Nigeria responded to the presentation stating that their government had demonstrated political will to address the illicit ivory trade outlined in the report, and was in the process of enacting stringent national legislation to enforce CITES and had introduced a national wildlife and biodiversity conservation agency to enforce it. Thailand objected to the inclusion of text suggesting that countries with a significant domestic ivory market would not be considered to have Category 1 legislation and requested that this text be deleted from the report.

Senegal observed the inference that their country was 'involved' in illegal trade and wished to clarify a clear distinction between the involvement of citizens of a country in illicit activities as opposed involvement of the country itself. They reiterated that Senegal had fully protected elephants since 1966. Zambia acknowledged ETIS as an important tool for measuring trends in elephant trade and was gratified by the report's finding that the legal one-off sale in 1999 had not appeared to stimulate illegal trade in subsequent years. They

particularly noted the strong link between volume of seizures and effective domestic and international enforcement outlined in the report.

Botswana concurred with the view that governance issues need to be fully addressed in the context of conserving endangered species within CITES, and acknowledged the efforts made by Ethiopia in harnessing political will to turn around the problem of illegal trade markets within the country.

Further discussion on the report was deferred until a later session and the session closed at 12h00.

Result of the vote

Parties	Vote 1	Parties	Vote 1
Afghanistan AF	0	Eritrea ER	1
Albania AL	0	Estonia EE	1
Algeria DZ	0	Ethiopia ET	1
Antigua and Barbuda AG	1	Parties	Vote 1
Argentina AR	1	Fiji FJ	1
Australia AU	1	Finland FI	1
Austria AT	1	France FR	1
Azerbaijan AZ	1	Gabon GA	0
Bahamas BS	1	Gambia GM	0
Bangladesh BD	0	Georgia GE	1
Barbados BB	0	Germany DE	1
Belarus BY	0	Ghana GH	0
Belgium BE	1	Greece GR	1
Belize BZ	0	Grenada GD	0
Benin BJ	0	Guatemala GT	0
Bhutan BT	0	Guinea GN	0
Bolivia BO	0	Guinea-Bissau GW	0
Botswana BW	1	Guyana GY	3
Brazil BR	3	Honduras HN	1
Brunei Darussalam BN	0	Hungary HU	1
Bulgaria BG	1	Iceland IS	2
Burkina Faso BF	3	India IN	1
Burundi BI	0	Indonesia ID	1
Cambodia KH	1	Iran (Islamic Republic of) IR	0
Cameroon CM	1	Ireland IE	1
Canada CA	3	Israel IL	0
Cape Verde CV	0	Italy IT	1
Central African Republic CF	0	Jamaica JM	3
Chad TD	0	Japan JP	1
Chile CL	1	Jordan JO	0
China CN	1	Kazakhstan KZ	0
Colombia CO	1	Kenya KE	3
Comoros KM	0	Kuwait KW	1
Congo CG	0	Lao People's Democratic Republic LA	1
Costa Rica CR	1	Latvia LV	1
Côte d'Ivoire CI	0	Lesotho LS	0
Croatia HR	1	Liberia LR	0
Cuba CU	0	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya LY	0
Cyprus CY	0	Liechtenstein LI	0
Czech Republic CZ	1	Lithuania LT	1
Democratic Republic of the Congo CD	0	Luxembourg LU	1
Denmark DK	1	Madagascar MG	1
Djibouti DJ	0	Malawi MW	0
Dominica DM	1	Malaysia MY	2
Dominican Republic DO	1	Mali ML	0
Ecuador EC	1	Malta MT	1
Egypt EG	0	Mauritania MR	0
El Salvador SV	0	Mauritius MU	1
Equatorial Guinea GQ	0	Mexico MX	1
		Monaco MC	0

Parties	Vote 1
Mongolia MN	0
Montenegro ME	0
Morocco MA	0
Mozambique MZ	0
Myanmar MM	0
Namibia NA	0
Nepal NP	1
Parties	Vote 1
Netherlands NL	1
New Zealand NZ	0
Nicaragua NI	0
Niger NE	0
Nigeria NG	0
Norway NO	2
Pakistan PK	3
Palau PW	0
Panama PA	0
Papua New Guinea PG	0
Paraguay PY	0
Peru PE	0
Philippines PH	1
Poland PL	1
Portugal PT	1
Qatar QA	0
Republic of Korea KR	1
Republic of Moldova MD	1
Romania RO	1
Russian Federation RU	1
Rwanda RW	0
Saint Kitts and Nevis KN	3
Saint Lucia LC	1
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines VC	1
Samoa WS	0
San Marino SM	1
Sao Tome and Principe ST	0
Saudi Arabia SA	0
Senegal SN	0
Serbia RS	3
Seychelles SC	0
Sierra Leone SL	0
Singapore SG	0
Slovakia SK	1
Slovenia SI	1
Solomon Islands SB	0
Somalia SO	0
South Africa ZA	1
Spain ES	1
Sri Lanka LK	0
Sudan SD	0
Suriname SR	1
Swaziland SZ	0
Sweden SE	1
Switzerland CH	0
Syrian Arab Republic SY	0
Thailand TH	1

Parties	Vote 1
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia MK	0
Togo TG	0
Trinidad and Tobago TT	1
Tunisia TN	1
Turkey TR	1
Uganda UG	1
Ukraine UA	0
Parties	Vote 1
United Arab Emirates AE	2
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland GB	1
United Republic of Tanzania TZ	1
United States of America US	1
Uruguay UY	1
Uzbekistan UZ	0
Vanuatu VU	1
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) VE	1
Viet Nam VN	1
Yemen YE	3
Zambia ZM	0
Zimbabwe ZW	1