

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 sixth session of Committee II

7 June 2007: 14h05-17h35

Chairman: C.S. Cheung (China)

Secretariat: J. Barzdo
T. de Meulenaer
J. Sellar
J. Vasquez
M. Yeater

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

The Chairman called the session to order, proposing that the agenda item 18.2 be revisited on 8 June and that agenda item 27 be discussed in the morning session on 11 June.

Strategic matters

15. National wildlife trade policy reviews (continued)

The Chairman introduced document CoP14 Com. II. 1, presenting the revised text of four draft decisions contained in document CoP14 Doc. 15 and discussed in the third session of Committee II. The draft decisions were accepted as amended.

18. Cooperation with other organizations (continued)

18.2. Cooperation between CITES and ITTO regarding trade in tropical timber

Based on discussion of document CoP14 Doc. 18.2 during the fifth session of the Committee, and subsequent consultations, the United States of America had prepared a revision of the draft resolution, which would be circulated in writing.

19. Dialogue meetings

19.1 Terms of reference for CITES dialogue meetings (continued)

Discussion resumed from the previous session addressing textual amendments to the draft resolution contained in the Annex to document CoP14 Doc. 19.1.

Botswana proposed amending paragraphs b) and c) of the draft resolution to include the words amongst other things immediately preceding "a proposal," and to replace "a significant division" with a need for an exchange of views. These amendments were agreed.

India expressed the view that dialogue meetings should refer only to species proposals and suggested deleting "amongst other things" from the fourth preambular paragraph. The United States and Botswana noted that this proposal was in direct contradiction to Botswana's previous intervention on paragraphs b) and c). The Secretariat clarified that the text had been included in the preamble to refer to other potential issues addressed by dialogue meetings, which had previously included draft resolutions. With this clarification India withdrew its proposal.

Regarding the proposed Rules of Procedure in the Annex, concerning Rule 2, Guyana, supported by Kenya, proposed inserting a two-thirds majority of immediately before "the representatives of range States." Argentina preferred the original wording. The amendment was put to a vote and, with 27 Parties in favour, 36 against and 8 abstentions, it was rejected (vote 1).

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, explained they had voted against the amendment because it was important to reach consensus on such sensitive issues. Kenya had voted in favour, recalling that there had been little consultation with range States regarding the participants in previous dialogue meetings. The United States and Dominica considered the current wording ambiguous, and suggested that Rule 2 specify that consensus on potential participants be reached. The Secretariat proposed amending the text to read "...attendance is approved by a consensus of the representatives..." This amendment was agreed.

Under Rule 6, Kenya proposed adding after the first sentence, At least two thirds of the representatives of the range States of the species shall constitute a quorum for a dialogue meeting. This amendment was agreed.

Regarding the earlier proposal to amend Rule 8, the United States believed that meetings should not be funded from the CITES Trust Fund. Emphasizing their past and continued financial support of dialogue meetings, they, and Japan, suggested that these meetings be externally funded. Following further discussion, it was agreed not to amend Rule 8.

Senegal highlighted Rule 14 which specified that, if no consensus could be reached, decisions should be reached by a simple majority. Noting that this was an inconsistency in the French version of Rule 14, the Secretariat assured the Committee that this would be corrected in the final version of the draft resolution.

Recognizing the importance of maintaining confidentiality in decision-making, Guyana suggested amending the word "should" to shall in both instances in Rule 15. This was agreed.

Kenya proposed that, in Rule 16 the words "presented for agreement" be amended to read presented to the representatives of range States for agreement. This was agreed.

Following discussion of Rule 17, the United States, with support from Brazil and Chile, recommended the entire rule be deleted. This was agreed.

The Annex to document CoP14 Doc. 19.1 was accepted as amended.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Review of Resolutions and Decisions

20. Review of Resolutions

20.1. Resolutions relating to Appendix-I species

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 20.1, presenting draft consolidated resolutions in Annexes 2 and 4, pertaining to trophy hunting, and conservation and trade of Appendix-I species respectively.

Argentina, India, Kenya, Conservation Force, IUCN – The World Conservation Union, speaking on behalf of WWF and TRAFFIC, and Safari Club International, opposed the proposed consolidations, noting that it would be difficult to adapt merged resolutions to the varied and changing needs of threatened species. It was further added that no strategic value, enhancement of species conservation or simplification of monitoring and reporting would be gained from this proposal. Kenya added that confusion may arise in interpreting the consolidated documents.

The United States agreed that Annex 4 should be rejected, but supported the proposed consolidation in Annex 2.

Interventions regarding the content of the proposed consolidations were made by Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, Senegal, Humane Society International and International Environmental Law Project.

The draft consolidated resolutions in both Annexes were rejected.

20.2 General review

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 20.2.

The Committee considered the proposed amendments to and consolidation of Resolutions contained in the Annex to the document. The Committee accepted the proposed amendments and consolidations in respect of: Resolutions Conf. 1.5 (Rev. CoP12), Conf. 9.5 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 9.10 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 10.4, Conf. 10.8 (Rev. CoP12), Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 11.10 (Rev. CoP12), Conf. 11.11 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 11.17 (Rev. CoP13), and Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13). It also accepted the final proposal in the document, to amend Resolutions Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP13), Conf. 10.15 (Rev. CoP12), Conf. 13.1 Annex 1 and Conf. 13.5.

With respect to the proposal relating to Resolution Conf. 1.3, Chile raised a question about the Spanish version of the proposed new text of paragraph d). The Secretariat undertook to check the Spanish text. The two proposals relating to Resolution Conf. 1.3 were accepted.

With regard to the proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 8.4, in response to a comment from Argentina, the Secretariat proposed that paragraph c) of the text under DIRECTS, be amended to read "to report its findings, recommendations or progress to the Standing Committee and at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties". This amendment to Resolution Conf. 8.4 was accepted.

The United States proposed additional amendments to the proposed amendments to Resolution 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) contained in the Annex. It proposed that the first paragraph of paragraph 4 to Annex 1 to the Resolution should read: "The MIKE and ETIS Technical Advisory Group will support the development and implementation of ETIS. ETIS will be managed and coordinated by TRAFFIC in consultation with the Technical Advisory Group (TAG)." The United States also proposed to delete the last sentence of paragraph 5 of Annex 1 to the Resolution. With these additions, the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) were accepted.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, agreed with the Secretariat that there was a contradiction between Resolutions Conf. 10.16 (Rev.) and Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP13). As a solution they proposed repeating in the preamble of Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP13) the second NOTING paragraph from the preamble of Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.). They proposed that paragraph b) under DETERMINES in Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP13) be deleted as it fell outside the scope of that Resolution. The United States proposed that the reference to the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in paragraph 7 of Annex 1 to Resolution Conf. 12.10 (Rev. CoP13) be deleted. These amendments were all accepted.

The Secretariat proposed to transfer the remaining operative paragraph of Resolution Conf. 11.6 (Rev. CoP13) into Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP13), under section XIV. This proposal was accepted.

The draft decision directed to the Standing Committee contained in paragraph 4 of document CoP14 Doc 20.2 was also accepted.

21. Review of Resolution Conf. 11.16 on ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II

The Chairman of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP14 Doc. 21, which proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.16 in order to simplify reporting requirements for Parties administering an approved ranching programme for a species that had been transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and Argentina remarked on incomplete reporting by Parties under Resolution Conf. 11.16 and noted that Committee I was addressing the definition of 'ranching'. The Chairman of the Animals Committee confirmed that the proposed amendments to the Resolution addressed only reporting requirements. Argentina suggested that reporting procedures should be streamlined. The United States noted that the proposed revision would modify important reporting requirements, and indicated that they had identified a number of categories of information that they considered should continue to be provided in annual reports rather than only upon request.

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela commented that the scope of the document seemed to extend beyond crocodile ranching operations. The Species Survival Network (SSN) cautioned against applying to all species an approach based on experience with crocodile ranching.

The Chairman established a drafting group chaired by the United States.

22. Review of Decisions

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 22.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, noted that Decision 10.2 (Rev. CoP11) remained relevant because of the potential for the non-commercial sale of ivory from government-registered stocks, and thus they proposed to retain the Decision. The Committee rejected the proposal to delete Decision 10.2 (Rev. CoP11).

Mexico objected to the proposed deletion of Decisions 12.90-12.93, Decisions 13.14-13.17 and Decision 13.53 proposed in document CoP14 Doc. 22. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, supported the deletion of those Decisions. The United States wished to retain Decisions 12.90-12.93 and Decisions 13.14-13.17. The Chairman therefore requested the Committee to vote on the Secretariat's proposals to delete these Decisions.

In relation to Decisions 12.90-12.93, the result of the vote was 41 in favour of their deletion and 26 against, with 13 abstentions (vote 2). The proposal to delete the Decisions was therefore rejected.

In relation to Decisions 13.14-13.17, the result of the vote was 45 in favour of their deletion and 28 against, with 7 abstentions (vote 3). The proposal to delete the Decisions was therefore rejected.

The proposal by the Secretariat to delete Decision 13.53 was accepted.

Regarding Decision 12.79, the Secretariat clarified that there was no proposal to delete this as the work required was not completed. Regarding Decisions 13.26 and 13.93, it noted that these related to work being conducted by Committee I, and no action was required in Committee II.

The proposal in Annex 2 to document CoP14 Doc. 22 to integrate Decision 9.15 into Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13) was accepted.

The Committee noted the contents of paragraph 7 of the document.

Compliance and enforcement issues

24. National laws for implementation of the Convention

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 24. It congratulated Bahamas, Cambodia, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and Ukraine for having recently reached Category 1 status. It noted that half of all Parties had now achieved Category 1 status, indicating good progress towards the National Legislation Project's goal. It drew attention to the draft decisions in the Annex to the document. The Chairman said that discussion of this item would continue in the next session.

The Chairman closed the session at 17h35.

Result of the votes

Vote 1: Proposed amendment to Rule 2 of the Rules of Procedure of dialogue meetings (agenda item 19)
/ Vote 2: Deletion of Decisions 12.90-12.93 (agenda item 22) / Vote 3: Deletion of Decisions 13.14-13.17 / 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	0
Antigua and Barbuda AG	1	3	2
Argentina AR	2	2	2
Australia AU	1	2	2
Austria AT	2	1	1
Azerbaijan AZ	0	0	0
Bahamas BS	1	2	2
Bangladesh BD	0	0	0
Barbados BB	0	0	0
Belarus BY	0	0	0
Belgium BE	2	1	1
Belize BZ	0	0	0
Benin BJ	0	0	0
Bhutan BT	0	0	0
Bolivia BO	0	0	0
Botswana BW	1	2	2
Brazil BR	0	0	0
Brunei Darussalam BN	0	0	0
Bulgaria BG	0	1	1
Burkina Faso BF	2	0	0
Burundi BI	1	2	2
Cambodia KH	1	2	1
Cameroon CM	0	2	2
Canada CA	0	2	2
Cape Verde CV	0	0	0
Central African Republic CF	0	0	0
Chad TD	0	0	0
Chile CL	2	2	2
China CN	0	1	1
Colombia CO	0	2	2
Comoros KM	0	0	0
Congo CG	0	0	0
Costa Rica CR	0	1	1
Côte d'Ivoire CI	1	2	2
Croatia HR	2	1	1
Cuba CU	0	0	0
Cyprus CY	0	0	0
Czech Republic CZ	2	1	1
Democratic Republic of the Congo CD	0	0	0
Denmark DK	2	1	1
Djibouti DJ	0	0	0
Dominica DM	0	1	1

Parties	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Dominican Republic DO	0	0	0
Ecuador EC	0	2	2
Egypt EG	0	0	0
El Salvador SV	0	0	0
Equatorial Guinea GQ	0	0	0
Eritrea ER	2	2	1
Estonia EE	2	1	1
Ethiopia ET	0	0	0
Fiji FJ	1	2	1
Finland FI	2	1	1
France FR	2	1	1
Gabon GA	0	0	0
Gambia GM	0	0	0
Georgia GE	0	0	0
Germany DE	2	1	1
Ghana GH	0	0	0
Greece GR	2	1	1
Grenada GD	0	0	0
Guatemala GT	0	0	0
Guinea GN	3	0	0
Guinea-Bissau GW	0	0	0
Guyana GY	1	1	2
Honduras HN	0	0	0
Hungary HU	0	0	0
Iceland IS	0	3	0
India IN	3	0	2
Indonesia ID	0	0	0
Iran (Islamic Republic of) IR	0	0	0
Ireland IE	2	1	1
Israel IL	0	0	1
Italy IT	2	1	1
Jamaica JM	2	1	1
Japan JP	2	1	2
Jordan JO	0	0	0
Kazakhstan KZ	0	0	0
Kenya KE	1	3	1
Kuwait KW	0	1	1
Lao People's Democratic Republic LA	1	2	2
Latvia LV	2	1	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	0	0	0
Luxembourg LU	0	0	0
Madagascar MG	0	1	2
Malawi MW	0	0	0
Malaysia MY	3	3	0
Mali ML	0	0	0
Malta MT	2	1	1
Mauritania MR	0	0	0
Mauritius MU	1	2	1

Parties	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3
Mexico MX	1	2	2
Monaco MC	0	0	0
Mongolia MN	0	0	0
Montenegro ME	0	0	0
Morocco MA	0	1	2
Mozambique MZ	2	1	1
Myanmar MM	0	0	0
Namibia NA	0	0	0
Nepal NP	1	0	0
Netherlands NL	2	1	1
New Zealand NZ	2	1	1
Nicaragua NI	0	0	0
Niger NE	0	0	0
Nigeria NG	0	0	0
Norway NO	1	3	0
Pakistan PK	0	0	0
Palau PW	1	3	3
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	2	1	1
Qatar QA	3	1	1
Republic of Korea KR	2	0	0
Republic of Moldova MD	0	0	1
Romania RO	2	1	1
Russian Federation RU	0	3	3
Rwanda RW	0	0	0
Saint Kitts and Nevis KN	1	3	3
Saint Lucia LC	1	3	3
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	3	3
Seychelles SC	0	0	0
Sierra Leone SL	0	0	0
Singapore SG	3	1	1
Slovakia SK	2	1	1
Slovenia SI	2	1	1
Solomon Islands SB	0	0	0
Somalia SO	0	0	0
South Africa ZA	2	1	2
Spain ES	2	1	1
Sri Lanka LK	0	0	0
Sudan SD	0	0	0
Suriname SR	1	3	0
Swaziland SZ	2	2	1

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