

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 II

05 June 2007: 14h20-17h00

Chairman: C.S. Cheung (China)

Secretariat: W. Wijnstekers  
J. Barzdo  
M. Jankowska  
D. Morgan  
J.-C. Vasquez

Rapporteurs: J. Boddens Hosang  
S. Ferriss  
T. Inskipp  
W. Jackson

**Administrative matters**

7. Financing and budgeting of the Secretariat and of meetings of the Conference of the Parties

7.3 Costed programme of work for the Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011

The Chairman reopened discussion on document CoP14 Doc. 7.3 (Rev. 1).

Malaysia said they were unable to support the creation of new posts in the Secretariat for dealing with timber and fisheries and suggested that priority be given to funding existing projects, particularly in developing countries. Kuwait and Mexico expressed concern about a possible increase in budgetary requirements. Australia believed the proposed increases were unrealistic, calling for consideration of in-kind contributions by Parties and prioritizing of activities.

The United States of America proposed the establishment of a working group, with limited regional representation, chaired by Mr Colman O'Criodain (Ireland), to consider the budget for the next triennium. This was supported by Zambia, on behalf of the Southern African Development Community.

The Chairman was in favour of a limited working group and proposed to close the debate and establish the composition of the group. China, Japan, Norway and Switzerland opposed this proposal and wished to continue the debate in the full Committee. A vote was taken (vote 1) on the Chairman's proposal, resulting in 26 Parties in favour of closing the discussion, 31 against and seven abstentions. The proposal was therefore rejected.

Argentina considered that the format of the costed programme of work made comparisons difficult and requested that the budget for the 2009-2011 triennium be presented in the format

used for the previous triennium. Similar comments were expressed by France, Japan and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The United Kingdom added that MIKE and some other projects should be included in the core budget. The Secretary-General provided a justification for the current format of the table but agreed to provide a new document presenting the estimated costs of the work programme in the format used in Annex 1 to document Doc. 7.1 (Rev. 1).

A vote was held (vote 2) to decide whether the working group would be open-ended or of limited composition. The result was 50 Parties in favour of an open-ended group, 21 in favour of a limited group, and one abstention. The following Parties indicated their wish to join the budget working group: Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United Kingdom, the United States, Zambia and Zimbabwe. The Chairman also invited the European Commission, IUCN and TRAFFIC to join the group. He left it to the Chairman of the Budget Working Group, Mr O'Cruidain, to decide on the acceptance of further participants.

The Chairman asked that the working group report on its progress every morning, that it liaise with the Strategic Vision Working Group, and that consideration be given to budgetary implications arising from the reports of the scientific committees [in documents CoP14 Doc. 8.2 and Doc. 8.3 (Rev. 1)] and from Committee I.

## **Strategic matters**

### **12 Review of the scientific committees**

Australia introduced document CoP14 Doc.12.

New Zealand and the Chairman of the Animals Committee supported the recommendations of the Standing Committee in Annex 1 of the document. Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, the Chairman of the Plants Committee and the Co-Chairmen of the Nomenclature Committee supported the recommendation to include the work on nomenclature in working groups of the Animals and Plants Committees. Germany suggested that the chairmen of these working groups should be able to convene intersessional meetings independently.

The suggestion to nominate independent Chairmen of the scientific committees was supported by Indonesia, but opposed by China and by Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community.

The Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees opposed the deletion from Resolution Conf. 12.11 (Rev. CoP13) of some of the core tasks of the scientific committees, including the work on the Review of Significant Trade and the Periodic Review of the Appendices. Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, also opposed a number of the amendments in Annexes 2 and 3.

The recommendation of the Secretariat to prepare a proposal to merge the Animals and Plants Committees was opposed by Argentina, China, Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, India, Indonesia, Mexico, New Zealand, and the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees.

Mexico expressed surprise at the Secretariat's comment on paragraph 6.a) regarding the perceived conflict of interest in the assignment of scientific consultants, noting that most committee members were not involved in fund raising. The Co-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee supported the positions of Germany and the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees.

A working group, to be chaired by Germany, was convened with a mandate to study the Annexes to the document, the proposed amendments to the Resolution outlined in paragraph 6, and the draft decision. Budgetary implications would be referred to the budget working group. Members of the

group would include the Chairmen of the Animals, Plants and Nomenclature Committees, the members of the Animals and Plants Committees, and the Secretariat.

### 13. Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity

The Chairman of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP14 Doc. 13.

India remarked that CITES should apply the Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity only within the context of the Convention. Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, agreed with the Secretariat that the Addis Ababa Principles could be more broadly applicable but within limits and therefore suggested adding the words where appropriate at the end of the proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.4 in point B of the Secretariat's comments. Switzerland supported this suggestion.

Malaysia generally supported the recommendations in the document. However they were concerned that the amendments proposed by Germany and the Secretariat did not sufficiently reflect the recommendations in the Annex. This view was shared by Botswana and the United States. Malaysia also noted that not all the Addis Ababa Principles were relevant to CITES.

Kenya supported the recommendations of the Animals and Plants Committees and believed that any amendment to Resolution Conf. 10.4 should more closely reflect the recommendation in paragraph 5 of the Annex of document CoP14 Doc. 13. Argentina and the Secretariat agreed the text could be further improved. The United States suggested using text from recommendation 5 to amend Resolution Conf. 10.4, as follows: "Acknowledges the use of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity as a voluntary additional tool that can be used in making NDFs".

Australia disagreed with several of the recommendations in the Annex and suggested further deliberations in a working group.

The Chairman requested Germany, the United States, the Secretariat and the Chairmen of the Animals and Plants Committees to draft a revised recommendation and report back to the Committee.

### 14 CITES and livelihoods

Document CoP14 Doc. 14 was introduced by Argentina.

China and Mexico supported the document and draft decisions and Mexico additionally noted that implementation should be on a voluntary basis at the national level. Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Community, supported the Secretariat's recommendation to shorten and simplify the text of the draft decisions and, supported by Mexico, stressed that adoption of these draft decisions should not lead to changes in the current CITES listing criteria. The United Kingdom reported that concerns had been raised by Parties and NGOs that the draft decisions in the document would raise the priority of livelihoods over species conservation, and noted that this was not the intention of the wording in these decisions. Mexico suggested that the activities outlined in the draft decisions should not be funded by the CITES Trust Fund but instead external funding should be sought.

Conclusion of this item was deferred and the meeting was adjourned at 17h00.

**Costed programme of work for the Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011**

Result of vote 1 on the Chairman's proposal to close the debate and establish the composition of a working group.

Result of vote 2 on whether the working group would be open-ended or of limited composition.

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

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

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

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

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