

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 eighth session of Committee II

8 June 2007: 14h15-16h15

Chairman: C.S. Cheung (China)

Secretariat: J. Barzdo
J. Sellar
J. Vasquez
M. Yeater

Rapporteurs: J. Boddens Hosang
S. Ferriss
W. Jackson
R. Mackenzie

Strategic matters

18. Cooperation with other organizations

18.2 Cooperation between CITES and ITTO regarding trade in tropical timber

Regarding document CoP14 Com. II. 5, Mexico commented that, in the second paragraph under "URGES" where the English version said "science", the Spanish version said "information". The Spanish version was to be corrected. With this amendment, the document was accepted. The International Tropical Timber Organization welcomed strengthened collaboration with CITES as a result of this decision.

16. Capacity building

The Chairman introduced document CoP14 Com. II. 4. The four draft decisions were accepted.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Trade control and marking issues

39. Purpose-of-transaction codes on CITES permits and certificates

The United States of America introduced document CoP14 Doc. 39. They said that that they had received some additional comments on the proposed changes to Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP13), and had revised their document, as shown in document CoP14 Inf. 49.

Argentina, Australia and Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, acknowledged the need to revise and simplify the codes. Germany, on behalf of the European

Community and its Member States, noted that the additional changes in document CoP14 Inf. 49 addressed some, but not all, of their concerns.

Argentina, supported by Ecuador, did not agree with the suggestion in the document that the purpose codes on import and export permits for a shipment could be different, and thought this would cause confusion. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and Canada, disagreed with this view. Canada remarked that although purpose codes were only required for trade in Appendix-I species, they agreed with the United States that there was value in recording such information for trade in specimens of Appendix-II species also.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, supported by Canada, proposed that a working group be formed to discuss the issue further and Australia expressed their interest in joining the group. The Chairman established a small working group to be chaired by the United States, and suggested that any other Parties wishing to participate contact the United States directly.

Compliance and enforcement issues

28. Internet trade in specimens of CITES-listed species

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, introduced document CoP14 Doc. 28. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland highlighted the need to assess the scope of Internet trade in CITES-listed species. They supported the draft decisions proposed by Secretariat in its comments in the document and agreed that these should replace the draft decisions in the Annex. The United States welcomed the proposed workshop to assess the scale of Internet trade and expressed their wish to participate. Madagascar concurred with this view.

CEEWEB remarked that there was substantial legal and illegal trade through the Internet in central and eastern Europe and welcomed the draft decision. IFAW welcomed the European Community's efforts to address this issue, and drew attention to eBay's recent announcement that it would not allow sales of ivory through its website.

Australia and the United Kingdom were concerned that the Secretariat might not have the relevant technical expertise that the implementation of the draft decision would require, but the Secretariat clarified that a consultant would be hired to do the necessary review. The United Kingdom therefore proposed that, in the draft decisions proposed by the Secretariat, in the draft decision directed to the Secretariat the words using the services of a suitably qualified consultant be inserted at the beginning. This was agreed. The draft decisions were accepted as amended.

29. National reports

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 29 and congratulated Parties on the improved reporting in recent years. It drew attention to document CoP14 Inf. 15, an analysis of the biennial reports undertaken by UNEP-WCMC. It noted that the collaboration envisaged to implement the first draft decision directed to the Standing Committee would have budgetary implications.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, appreciated the increased accessibility to biennial reports through the CITES website, but observed there was still room for improvement in terms of streamlining reporting obligations. They said that the experience of CITES with reporting formats should be shared with other multilateral environmental agreements in order to streamline and harmonize reporting requirements. They supported both draft decisions.

The United States said that the draft decision directed to the Standing Committee might ease reporting burdens and simplify reporting obligations, and they supported it, provided that funding was available. While supporting most of the second draft decision directed to the Secretariat, they expressed concern about the potential financial and capacity implications for some Parties as regards electronic permitting.

The draft decisions were accepted by consensus.

30. Reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants

Switzerland introduced document CoP14 Doc. 30, drawing attention to the growing volume of trade in artificially propagated plants, which resulted in quantities of data that were difficult to handle and required considerable resources. They noted a general feeling that reporting burdens on Parties should be reduced, and that much of the data on trade in artificially propagated specimens of Appendix-II species had not been included in the CITES trade database.

On this last point, the Secretariat noted that, because of inadequate resources, inclusion of these data in the database maintained by UNEP-WCMC had been suspended long ago for data submitted in printed form but, with more reports being submitted electronically, the volume of such data being included was now growing.

The United States agreed with the Secretariat's suggestion in the document to examine ways in which data on trade in artificially propagated plants could be summarized but, with Mexico, opposed the draft decisions contained in the document. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, saw the need for an expert review to identify detrimental trade that might be misreported, suggesting that this could be initiated immediately after CoP14, with a view to providing appropriate guidance at CoP15.

Switzerland offered to consult with the Parties that had made comments, and report back to the Committee. The Chairman agreed to this and the item was left open.

32. Incentives for implementation of the Convention

The Secretariat introduced document CoP14 Doc. 32 and drew attention to document CoP14 Inf. 35.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and Switzerland supported the draft decisions contained in the Annex, as well as cooperation with the UNCTAD BIOTRADE Initiative, highlighting the link with agenda item 14 on CITES and livelihoods. Senegal suggested that the draft decisions be considered in conjunction with agenda item 14. Uganda also expressed support for the BIOTRADE Initiative.

The United States, together with Argentina, Australia, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and Brazil, were not in favour of further work on incentives under CITES after CoP14. The United States noted the apparent lack of interest among most Parties in such activities, the cost implications, and the fact that incentives were not addressed in the Convention. Argentina stressed that economic incentives were a prerogative of Parties and, supported by Brazil, that any such measures should be compatible with international trade rules. Brazil further stressed that the consideration of incentives in environmental fora should not constitute a manner to legitimate the concession of subsidies to the production or export of commodities. They also expressed concern about duplication of work with the Convention on Biological Diversity. Ecuador was in partial agreement with these concerns, noting some domestic initiatives on trade in specimens of Appendix-II species, but emphasizing that Parties with weak economies had to consider other priorities. Honduras stated that it was important for the Conference to consider the role of CITES in sustainable development and the sustainable use of resources.

Seeing no consensus, the Chairman called for a vote to accept all of the draft decisions in document CoP14 Doc. 32 Annex. The result was 51 in favour, 22 against and 9 abstentions. The draft decisions were thus accepted.

The Chairman closed the session at 16h15.

**Result of the vote on the adoption of the draft decisions in document CoP14 Doc. 32 Annex
(Incentives for implementation of the Convention)**

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

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

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

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

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