

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 14th session of Committee II

13 June 2007: 14h00-17h30

Chairman: C.S. Cheung (China)

Secretariat: W. Wijnstekers
J. Barzdo
M. Jankowska
J. Sellar

Rapporteurs: J. Boddens Hosang
P. De Angelis
R. Mackenzie
C. McLardy

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Species trade and conservation issues

52. Asian big cats (continued)

Kenya and Malawi wished to associate themselves with the views of Swaziland expressed in the previous session.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, expressed serious concern regarding the perilous conservation status of Asian big cats. Acknowledging that the tiger was facing a greater-than-ever risk of extinction, they regarded enforcement to be the key challenge facing range States. They endorsed the draft decisions in document CoP14 Com II. 19, but could not support the draft decision proposed by the United States of America in relation to "intensive breeding", as they felt this definition was unclear and could arguably include animals bred within the European Community for zoological purposes. They added that the Standing Committee should review progress made to combat illegal trade in tiger parts and derivatives at its 57th meeting and report at CoP15.

Following consultation with the proponents of document CoP14 Com. II. 19, the United States revised their proposed text for the fourth draft decision directed to the Parties, to read:

- 14.XX Parties with intensive ~~tiger breeding~~ operations breeding tigers on a commercial scale shall implement measures to restrict the captive populations to a level supportive only to conserving wild tigers; to those that have the potential to contribute to internationally-recognized breeding conservation programmes; tigers should not be bred for trade in their parts and derivatives.

They proposal to amend the fifth draft decision directed to the Parties and incorporate it into the above-mentioned draft decision, to read: "All Parties especially those evaluating their domestic tiger trade control policies shall take into consideration the view of the Parties as expressed in Resolution Conf. 12.5."

India supported the revised draft decisions, as did China. However, China stressed that CITES is a mechanism to control only international trade rather than domestic trade, and proposed the addition of the word international before "trade" in the fourth draft decision.

Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, supported by the United States, disagreed with China's proposed amendment, and suggested that in the fourth draft decision "Parties" be replaced by range States. The Russian Federation, India, Nepal and Thailand could not support this amendment, noting the draft decision to restrict commercial breeding of tigers would not apply to non-range States.

IUCN-The World Conservation Union supported the draft decisions proposed by range States with the amendments proposed by the United States, and offered to facilitate the proposed workshop to agree on a global conservation strategy for tigers, subject to funding.

The Global Tiger Forum and WWF, speaking also on behalf of the International Tiger Coalition, shared concerns regarding declining tiger populations and current conservation efforts, as did the Wildlife Trust of India, which also drew attention to the emerging illicit trade in Asian lion bone. The Traditional Chinese Medicine Association of China and the American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine did not see cultural heritage as being incompatible with endangered species conservation, and stressed that effective alternatives were being embraced by reputable Traditional Chinese Medicine traders globally. The China Wildlife Conservation Association noted the importance of public education in China on the need for tiger conservation.

The Chairman asked Parties to vote on the proposed amendments to the draft decisions in document CoP14 Com. II. 19. With regard to the amendment to replace "Parties" with range States, the vote was 42 in favour, 29 against and five abstentions (vote 1). The proposed amendment was thus rejected.

On the inclusion of the word international before "trade", the vote was 19 in favour, 47 against and 11 abstentions (vote 2). The proposed amendment was thus rejected and document CoP14 Doc. 52 was noted.

The Chairman asked for agreement on all the decisions in document Com. II. 19, as amended, including the amendment of Bhutan. These were approved.

At the request of several Parties, the results of votes were displayed on the screen confirming that the keypads were functioning. China expressed their regret that CITES had diverged from its international trade remit, and requested that their view be formally noted. The Secretariat observed that the decisions accepted by the Committee would have important financial implications for the Convention, and substantial external funding would be need to be sought.

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 of the Budget Working Group (BWG), introduced document CoP14 Com. II. 31, which had been prepared on the basis of document CoP14 Doc. 7.3 (Rev. 1). He pointed out that no consensus had been reached in the BWG on the nominal increase in the CITES budget, but two options had resulted, namely Option 1 proposed by the Netherlands for an increase of 21.56 %, and Option 2 for a zero nominal increase.

The Chairman of Committee II added that lengthy discussions had been held between the Bureau and the 'Friends of the Chair', which had resulted in some progress but no consensus. He asked the Committee whether the matter could be settled by consensus or whether it required a vote.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, on behalf of the English-speaking countries in the Caribbean, voiced their concern on the current impasse and noted that a zero nominal increase would negatively affect the implementation of the Convention, particularly in developing countries where capacity building was essential. South Africa and Zimbabwe agreed with this view.

The Netherlands noted that a significant increase was needed if the Secretariat was to implement essential activities, including capacity building. They offered to collaborate with Parties to reach a compromise since the majority of the BWG had not supported Option 1. Germany, on behalf of the European Community and its Member States, and Switzerland also expressed their support for Option 1.

Japan supported a zero nominal increase but considered that Option 2 required further improvement. They added that the Secretariat had suggested a 100 % increase in contributions, expressed the view that the Secretariat was hiding information and that Japan's request for more information had been ignored and that they had not been invited to attend informal discussions between Germany, the United States and the Secretariat. They, too, hoped to reach an agreement by consensus.

The Secretary-General stressed that the Secretariat had not proposed a 100 % increase in contributions, since the Parties were expected to decide on activities and sources of funding. He pointed out that all previous budgets had been decided by a vote and that in view of the importance of funding, the terms of reference for the Trust Fund required a three-quarters majority rather than a two-thirds majority. Finally he pointed out that anything less than a 15 % increase would imply staff cuts, a severe decrease in activities including translation services, and limited documentation at meetings. Any fundraising efforts would be ineffective without a stable Secretariat.

China believed that an increase of more than 3 % for the core budget would be unrealistic and that external funding should be sought for the majority of activities. They were against voting to settle the matter.

Mexico stated that deliberations in the working group reflected the complexity of the matter and called for transparent use of resources. They recognized the challenge of reallocating scarce resources and resetting priorities as a result of budgetary constraints. They noted that the Strategic Vision had also called for the efficient use of resources. The Secretary-General responded that it was up to the Parties to set priorities, and that this mandate had been allocated to the Working Group but not achieved. He noted that the Strategic Vision also requested the Secretariat to ensure that its programme of work for 2008-2013 supported the implementation of the Strategic Vision.

TRAFFIC, on behalf of IUCN and WWF, suggested a need for alternative and innovative approaches to fundraising including approaching the private sector. They called on Parties to support an increase in contributions as an interim measure, and offered to collaborate to find solutions.

In light of the discussion regarding the two options presented in the document, the Chairman proposed that the Committee consider a compromise increase of 10 %, with a strong appeal to Parties to pledge additional non-earmarked funds to the Trust Fund. The Secretary-General explained the potential repercussions for the Secretariat and CITES meetings should the Committee agree to only a 10 % nominal increase, and stressed that an increase of at least 15 % would be needed to prevent the loss of several staff and to maintain the ability of the Secretariat to carry out its work.

Belgium, Nigeria, Senegal, the United Republic of Tanzania and Zambia supported the proposal to increase the budget by 15 % noting that critical services provided by the Secretariat would

not otherwise be available. Belgium highlighted the importance of maintaining the CITES website in all three languages. Italy supported the Netherlands's proposal of 21.56 %.

The United States did not support either a 10 % or a 15 % increase. Japan opposed a 10 % increase, noting that Parties required more budgetary details from the Secretariat in advance. Mexico and Indonesia supported the zero nominal increase option, with Mexico suggesting the need to be creative in finding new ways to use available funds. Indonesia said that increasing the budget contributions could hinder national implementation efforts of developing countries.

A vote was taken on the proposal to increase the budget by 15 %, resulting in 47 in favour, 28 against, and 12 abstentions (vote 3). As the required three-quarters majority was not attained, the proposal was rejected. The voting record was displayed for review.

Japan proposed a 3 % increase. The Netherlands suggested that, given the result of the previous vote, Japan's proposal did not appear to reflect the sentiment in the Committee. Supported by Senegal, they suggested that the 10 % increase be considered, emphasizing that it should be accompanied by firm pledges of non-earmarked funds. Mexico, supported by Peru, suggested the Committee first vote on a zero nominal increase and then on Japan's proposal for a 3 % increase.

A vote on the proposal to increase the budget by 10 % resulted in 50 in favour, 30 against, and nine abstentions (vote 4). The proposal was thus rejected. Kuwait noted a malfunction with their voting equipment. The voting record was displayed for review.

The Secretary-General, noting that only 89 of the more than 120 Parties with credentials were present in the Committee, suggested that the matter be decided in plenary session. Senegal agreed. In response to a point of order raised by the United States, Japan confirmed that it had not withdrawn its proposal for a 3 % increase.

The Netherlands, supported by Zimbabwe, called on Parties to reject a 3 % increase as inadequate. Germany said it would oppose a 3 % increase so that the matter could be referred to the plenary session.

A vote on the proposal to increase the budget by 3 % resulted in 35 in favour, 49 against, and nine abstentions (vote 5). The proposal was rejected and the voting record was displayed.

The Chairman announced that, in light of the voting results, he would not put Options 1 and 2 presented in document CoP14 Com. II. 31 to the Committee but that the issue of any budget increase would be referred to the plenary session.

The Chairman then asked Parties to consider the draft resolution on the costed programme of work for the Secretariat for the triennium 2009-2011 contained in document CoP14 Com. II. 31. He drew attention to the two versions of the draft resolution contained in Annexes 5 and 8 to the document which were identical except for the fourth operative paragraph, which set out the contributions from Parties required to cover the costed programme of work. On this basis, he suggested that the Committee review the text of the draft resolution contained in Annex 8, which related to the zero increase option, stressing that the Committee would not deal with the fourth operative paragraph as it would be referred to the Plenary. In response to a question from Argentina, the Secretariat indicated that it had not been possible to prepare a costed programme of work based on a zero nominal increase in the budget in the time available, but that the draft resolution provided for the Secretariat to develop a costed programme of work and present it for consideration of the Standing Committee at its 57th meeting.

The Chairman of the BWG identified and explained the substantive issues that the Committee would need to consider in the draft resolution. The Committee reviewed the draft resolution paragraph by paragraph, with the exception of the fourth operative paragraph.

Brazil proposed deleting the text in square brackets forming the 12th operative paragraph of the draft resolution, commencing with URGES. Mexico supported the retention of this text. A vote was held on Brazil's proposal to delete the paragraph. The result was 21 in favour and 27

against, with 17 abstentions, and the proposal was rejected (vote 6). Brazil then proposed an amendment to the retained paragraph, to replace the word URGES with RECOMMENDS. Argentina supported Brazil's proposed amendment, and additionally proposed to insert in the third line, after "proposals" the words with a facilitative approach. Both of these proposed amendments to the 12th operative paragraph were accepted by consensus.

In the 19th operative paragraph, commencing "INSTRUCTS the Standing Committee", the Chairman of the BWG proposed inserting an additional subparagraph after subparagraph b) to read to develop a roadmap to put the CITES Trust Fund Budget on a sustainable footing. Japan supported this amendment, and sought clarification as to the rules of procedure that would govern the work of the proposed Finance and Budget Subcommittee to be established by the Standing Committee. The Secretariat indicated that the Rules of Procedure of the Standing Committee would apply and, in response to a further query from the Chairman of the BWG, confirmed that the Standing Committee could amend its Rules of Procedure at any time.

The Republic of Korea proposed an amendment to subparagraph a) ii) in the 19th operative paragraph to insert, after the words "budgetary documents", taking into account any proposals that would have budgetary implications. The Secretariat suggested that this was covered by subparagraph c). The Chairman of the BWG suggested instead inserting a new paragraph, immediately below the 19th operative paragraph, and directed to the Secretariat, to read INSTRUCTS the Secretariat, in consultation with proponent Parties where necessary, to advise the Conference of the Parties on proposals that have budgetary implications, including staff costs. The Republic of Korea therefore withdrew its proposed amendment. The Secretariat noted that the new paragraph proposed by the Chairman of the BWG could be incorporated into the 20th operative paragraph, which was directed to the Secretariat. With the amendments proposed by the Chairman of the BWG, and the editorial suggestion of the Secretariat, the 19th and 20th operative paragraphs were accepted.

With the amendments set out above, the draft resolution, including its Annex, contained in Annex 8 of document CoP14 Com. II. 31 was accepted, with the exception of the fourth operative paragraph.

The Chairman closed the session at 17h30.

Results of the votes

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

Parties	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Afghanistan AF	0	0	0	0	0	0
Albania AL	0	0	0	0	0	0
Algeria DZ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Antigua and Barbuda AG	2	1	3	3	3	1
Argentina AR	2	1	2	2	1	1
Australia AU	2	2	1	1	2	0
Austria AT	1	2	1	1	2	0
Azerbaijan AZ	0	0	0	0	1	0
Bahamas BS	2	2	1	2	3	0
Bangladesh BD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barbados BB	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belarus BY	0	0	0	0	0	0
Belgium BE	1	2	1	1	2	2
Belize BZ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Benin BJ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bhutan BT	2	2	0	0	0	0
Bolivia BO	2	3	0	2	1	0
Botswana BW	0	0	1	1	2	0
Brazil BR	0	0	2	2	1	1
Brunei Darussalam BN	0	0	0	0	2	3
Bulgaria BG	1	2	1	1	2	0
Burkina Faso BF	0	0	0	0	0	0
Burundi BI	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cambodia KH	0	1	1	2	1	0
Cameroon CM	2	1	0	0	0	0
Canada CA	0	2	2	2	1	2
Cape Verde CV	0	0	0	0	0	0
Central African Republic CF	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chad TD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Chile CL	2	1	2	2	1	1
China CN	2	1	2	2	1	0
Colombia CO	0	0	0	2	1	1
Comoros KM	0	0	0	0	0	0
Congo CG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Costa Rica CR	1	1	2	2	1	2
Côte d'Ivoire CI	0	1	1	1	2	3
Croatia HR	1	2	3	1	2	0
Cuba CU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cyprus CY	1	2	0	0	0	3
Czech Republic CZ	1	2	1	1	2	2
Democratic Republic of the Congo CD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denmark DK	1	2	1	1	2	0
Djibouti DJ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dominica DM	2	1	3	3	3	2
Dominican Republic DO	0	0	2	2	1	1
Ecuador EC	0	0	2	2	1	1

Parties	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Egypt EG	0	0	0	0	0	0
El Salvador SV	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equatorial Guinea GQ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Eritrea ER	1	2	1	1	2	1
Estonia EE	1	2	1	1	2	0
Ethiopia ET	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fiji FJ	2	2	1	1	2	2
Finland FI	1	2	1	1	2	3
France FR	1	2	2	2	1	0
Gabon GA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Gambia GM	0	0	0	0	0	0
Georgia GE	0	0	0	0	0	0
Germany DE	1	2	2	1	2	2
Ghana GH	0	0	0	0	0	0
Greece GR	1	2	1	1	2	0
Grenada GD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guatemala GT	0	0	2	2	1	0
Guinea GN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guinea-Bissau GW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Guyana GY	0	3	3	3	3	1
Honduras HN	2	3	2	2	1	3
Hungary HU	1	2	1	1	2	3
Iceland IS	3	3	3	1	3	0
India IN	2	2	0	1	1	0
Indonesia ID	2	2	2	2	1	3
Iran (Islamic Republic of) IR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ireland IE	1	2	1	1	2	3
Israel IL	0	0	2	1	1	2
Italy IT	1	2	1	1	2	2
Jamaica JM	2	2	2	1	2	3
Japan JP	2	1	2	2	1	2
Jordan JO	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kazakhstan KZ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Kenya KE	0	0	1	1	2	2
Kuwait KW	1	2	1	0	1	0
Lao People's Democratic Republic LA	1	2	1	1	1	0
Latvia LV	1	2	1	1	2	0
Lesotho LS	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liberia LR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya LY	0	0	0	0	0	0
Liechtenstein LI	0	0	1	1	2	0
Lithuania LT	1	2	0	0	2	0
Luxembourg LU	1	2	0	0	0	2
Madagascar MG	3	3	1	3	2	0
Malawi MW	2	0	0	0	0	0
Malaysia MY	2	0	2	2	1	1
Mali ML	0	0	0	0	0	0
Malta MT	1	2	1	1	2	3
Mauritania MR	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mauritius MU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mexico MX	2	1	2	2	1	0
Monaco MC	0	0	0	0	0	0

Parties	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Mongolia MN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Montenegro ME	0	0	0	0	0	0
Morocco MA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mozambique MZ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Myanmar MM	0	0	0	0	0	0
Namibia NA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nepal NP	2	2	0	0	0	0
Netherlands NL	1	2	1	1	2	2
New Zealand NZ	2	2	1	1	2	2
Nicaragua NI	0	0	0	0	0	0
Niger NE	0	0	0	0	0	0
Nigeria NG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Norway NO	1	1	1	1	2	1
Pakistan PK	0	0	0	0	0	0
Palau PW	1	3	3	3	1	3
Panama PA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Papua New Guinea PG	0	0	0	0	0	0
Paraguay PY	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peru PE	0	0	2	2	1	1
Philippines PH	0	0	0	3	0	1
Poland PL	1	2	1	1	2	2
Portugal PT	1	2	1	1	2	2
Qatar QA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Republic of Korea KR	1	0	2	2	1	2
Republic of Moldova MD	0	0	1	0	1	1
Romania RO	1	2	1	1	2	2
Russian Federation RU	2	1	2	2	1	0
Rwanda RW	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Kitts and Nevis KN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saint Lucia LC	3	3	2	2	3	3
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines VC	0	0	2	3	3	3
Samoa WS	0	0	0	0	0	0
San Marino SM	1	2	3	3	2	0
Sao Tome and Principe ST	0	0	0	0	0	0
Saudi Arabia SA	0	0	0	0	0	0
Senegal SN	0	0	1	1	2	3
Serbia RS	1	2	3	3	3	0
Seychelles SC	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sierra Leone SL	0	0	0	0	0	0
Singapore SG	2	3	2	2	1	3
Slovakia SK	1	2	1	1	2	2
Slovenia SI	1	2	1	1	2	0
Solomon Islands SB	0	0	0	0	0	0
Somalia SO	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Africa ZA	1	1	1	1	2	1
Spain ES	1	2	1	1	2	2
Sri Lanka LK	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sudan SD	0	0	0	0	0	0
Suriname SR	3	1	3	1	2	3
Swaziland SZ	1	1	0	0	0	0
Sweden SE	1	2	1	1	2	0
Switzerland CH	0	0	1	1	2	2

Parties	Vote 1	Vote 2	Vote 3	Vote 4	Vote 5	Vote 6
Syrian Arab Republic SY	0	0	0	0	0	0
Thailand TH	2	1	3	2	1	2
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia MK	0	0	0	0	0	0
Togo TG	0	0	1	1	2	2
Trinidad and Tobago TT	2	2	3	2	2	0
Tunisia TN	0	0	0	0	0	0
Turkey TR	0	2	1	1	1	2
Uganda UG	1	1	3	1	2	0
Ukraine UA	2	3	1	1	3	1
United Arab Emirates AE	1	2	2	2	2	1
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland GB	1	2	2	2	2	2
United Republic of Tanzania TZ	2	0	1	1	2	2
United States of America US	1	2	2	2	1	1
Uruguay UY	0	0	2	2	1	1
Uzbekistan UZ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Vanuatu VU	0	0	0	0	0	0
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) VE	3	3	1	1	1	1
Viet Nam VN	2	1	1	1	1	1
Yemen YE	0	0	0	0	0	0
Zambia ZM	2	3	1	1	2	3
Zimbabwe ZW	0	0	1	1	2	2