

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA



Fifteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Doha (Qatar), 13-25 March 2010

Summary record of the fourth session of Committee I

16 March 2010: 14h15 - 17h00

Chairman: J. Donaldson (South Africa)  
Secretariat: R. Bolješić  
D. Morgan  
Rapporteurs: C. Lippai  
K. Malsch  
A. Mathur  
C. McLardy

48. Snake trade and conservation management

The United States of America, also on behalf of China, introduced document CoP15 Doc.48. They drew attention to the current gaps in knowledge concerning the status of many snake species in the Asian region and the increasing levels of illegal trade in snakes to meet high consumer demands. They proposed holding a workshop to consider management and enforcement issues regarding snakes in the Asian region, with particular focus on East, South and Southeast Asia in order that recommendations on sustainable and lawful trade could be formulated. They announced that they would provide a significant proportion of the funds required to hold the workshop in order to limit the implications for the costed programme of work.

They agreed with the wording for the draft decision directed to the Standing Committee in the Secretariat's Comments. On the latter point, the Chair of the Animals Committee noted the need to ensure the timely submission of the workshop report to the Animals Committee to enable it to be adequately considered.

China added that some of the data included in the document had been updated. They reiterated the need for a workshop, offering to host it. They noted that the situation for management of snakes in China represented a substantial challenge, and that where status on populations was unclear, precautionary measures had been implemented such as limited harvesting quotas.

Malaysia and the Lusaka Agreement Task Force supported the draft decisions and the proposed workshop. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the formation of a working group to examine the snake trade, an issue they felt had long been overlooked. They suggested an amendment to the draft decision directed to the Animals Committee to read:

15.xx The Animals Committee shall consider the results of this workshop and provide their recommendations to the Standing Committee for their consideration.

The United States agreed with the amendment proposed by Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, and also suggested that the Standing Committee should have the flexibility to make independent recommendations on the workshop report.

Document CoP15 Doc.48 was accepted with the amendments suggested by Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, and the United States.

#### 49. Tortoises and freshwater turtles

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 49, outlining the Decisions that had been adopted at CoP14 relating to tortoises and freshwater turtles, and reported on progress to date. It acknowledged that the requests directed to the World Customs Organization (WCO) to create customs codes for specific CITES-listed taxa that had been channelled through the Secretariat had not been implemented.

It drew attention to the report produced by IUCN Species Survival Commission, Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group (IUCN-TFTSG) in Annex 2 of the document to assist with implementation of Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP13), and in particular, the analyses of biennial reports from Parties which are range States for these species. The Secretariat thanked the United States for providing funds for the production of the report. It noted that due to delays in establishing the contract with IUCN-TFTSG, it had not been possible for the Animals Committee to consider the report, and that whilst interim recommendations had been presented in Annex 2, the final conclusions and recommendation were available in document CoP15 Inf. 22.

The United States were concerned that work on customs codes had not progressed further and that this would impede effective enforcement efforts and impact negatively on the collection of trade data. They urged the Secretariat to work closely with the WCO to address the issue. With regard to the Secretariat's recommendation to consider whether the reporting requirements of Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP13) should be maintained, the United States noted that an identical recommendation had been submitted to CoP14 and rejected by the Parties. They opposed reducing any requirements for reporting progress in implementing Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP13) through biennial reports, and supported the interim recommendations of the IUCN-TFTSG.

Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, noted their support for the interim recommendations in the document.

No views had been provided by Parties on the revised report contained in document CoP15 Inf. 22. The Chair suggested formation of a working group to further consider and potentially draft a decision on the basis of document CoP15 Inf. 22 and the United States concurred. A working group was established comprising China, Spain on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, the United States, IUCN, Humane Society International, and ProWildlife.

#### 53. Conservation and management of sharks and stingrays

The Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP15 Doc. 53, briefly noting the Decisions relating to sharks and stingrays that had been adopted since CoP12. He thanked the outgoing Chair of the Shark Working Group, Mr Rod Hay (New Zealand), for the wisdom and expertise he had brought to the Animals Committee deliberations, particularly with regard to sharks.

New Zealand reminded the Committee of the broad mandate provided under Resolution Conf. 12.6 which not only concerned the relevancy of CITES to sharks and stingrays but also dealt with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and regional fisheries organizations.

He highlighted specific activities that had been conducted by the Animals Committee to address the 17 Decisions concerning sharks (14.101 to 14.117) adopted at CoP14. He drew attention to the recommendations within the report, which included commodity codes, improvements in data collection and monitoring, and increased collaboration with regional fisheries management organizations (RFMOs). He also pointed out a list of priority shark species identified by the Animals Committee contained in Table 1 and in the Annex, noting the significant overlap in species identified by the FAO as a priority for monitoring of fisheries and trade. He thanked the Secretariat for incorporating the recommendations into the proposed decisions and amendments to the resolution contained in their comments. On behalf of the Animals Committee, he recommended the adoption of these draft decisions and the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.6.

Egypt, supported by China, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Morocco, noted that the large number of species highlighted as 'Shark species of concern' within the Annex and the proposed management measures would create identification problems for Customs authorities and enforcement would be challenging. Morocco suggested initially looking at smaller groups of sharks with shared characteristics.

Egypt, supported by the United Arab Emirates, stressed the need for socio-economic factors, capacity building and enforcement to be considered.

The lack of species-specific reporting and insufficient data was deemed to be a problem by China and the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya. The latter voiced concerns that adopting any decisions based on such incomplete data would be problematic. They both emphasized the need for increased scientific study.

Noting the existing measures on sharks adopted by CITES, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) and other international agreements, Egypt highlighted the importance of developing synergies with other organizations in order to implement the proposed measures. This view was supported by Morocco and the United Arab Emirates. Morocco further stressed the need for CITES to strengthen collaboration with other international bodies, particularly FAO. Recognizing the shared objectives of achieving sustainable use of fish species, China stated that CITES was not the appropriate tool for management of shark fisheries. They outlined the need for further technological issues to be considered such as "Introduction from the Sea", formation of non-detriment findings and financial resources.

Brazil, noting their participation in the Workshop on South American freshwater stingrays and referencing paragraph c) of the draft decision, announced their intention to submit a proposal to include their populations of freshwater stingrays in Appendix III.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, expressed their support for the recommendations of the Animals Committee, the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.6 and the draft decisions. They highlighted the particular relevance of the addition of species-specific Customs codes for sharks in monitoring trade and encouraged the Secretariat to monitor the WCO discussions on the issue. Croatia and the United States also supported the document. South Africa too expressed support for the recommendations of the Animals Committee and the Secretariat's proposed amendments, but they were unconvinced of the need for a working group. Morocco suggested restructuring and revising the draft decisions and proposed amendments.

The Pew Environmental Group emphasized the importance of both the International Plans of Action for Sharks (IPOA-Sharks) and National Plans of Action (NPOA) for shark conservation. They drew attention to the United Nations Resolution 64/72 on Sustainable Fisheries which had been adopted following the submission of document CoP15 Doc. 53, which stressed the importance of IPOA-Sharks, the assistance of CITES and the introduction of precautionary measures where status was unclear, to prevent decline of vulnerable species. They further urged Parties to adopt the amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.6. These views were endorsed by Species Management Specialists. They urged Parties to develop and implement national action plans. They noted the amendments proposed by the Secretariat but, given current budgetary constraints, questioned the efforts of the Animals Committee to identify species for future listing on the Appendices and suggested that focus ought to be on those species already listed. Iceland echoed these concerns, and in light of the Convention's budgetary constraints, could not support the document.

FAO expressed concern about the limited progress on implementing IPOA-Sharks and pledged their continued support to Parties, the Convention and other organizations.

Argentina believed that the range States, flag States, Port Management States and RFMOs were responsible for the management of sharks and noted the existing Shark Management Plans in the Latin American region. However, they added that these plans had to be implemented to ensure regulated harvest of fish as well as management of breeding stocks. They pointed out that their Customs code had incorporated the 20 shark species into their national trade data records and they were complying with the European Union's catch certificate scheme; therefore they considered additional measures, such as those proposed in the document, to be redundant.

Australia commented on the efforts to combat Illegal, Unregulated and Unreported (IUU) fishing and was pleased to observe increasing emphasis on fish species within the Convention as well as implementation of national action plans. They encouraged Parties to engage intersessionally and supported the draft resolution.

Japan urged synergy with the other relevant organizations and shared the view expressed by the United Arab Emirates regarding capacity building and the need to obtain further data on shark populations. They concurred with the views expressed by China, Egypt, Iceland, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco and the United Arab Emirates, especially in terms of RFMOs' role in shark management.

WWF stressed that inclusion of fish species in the Appendices was not excluded by the text of the Convention and they urged Parties to adopt the draft resolution, noting that Parties had committed to the IPOA-Sharks.

Egypt expressed concern about the practical implications of the document, highlighting socio-economic issues, the need for research on shark biology, marketing and trade, as well as technical and financial support from donors. China added that implementation of the document could be compromised in developing countries that lacked capacity.

The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya disagreed with the logic of protecting endangered species before management tools had been developed and urged Parties to implement national action plans to prevent trade becoming illegal. The Russian Federation did not support the document but drew attention to the extensive research they had carried out on sharks. Morocco repeated the need to coordinate data from various sources in order to avoid any contradictory decision-making by other Conventions.

The Chair of the Shark Working Group intervened and noted that document CoP15 Doc. 53 contained some agreed draft decisions and proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.6 based on interventions by the Parties. The United States further supported that statement and requested a vote on individual draft decisions and proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.6, rather than on document CoP15 Doc. 53 in its complete form. The Chair began by trying to reach consensus on the draft decision for freshwater stingrays but that suggestion was opposed.

As there was no consensus, the draft decisions and revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.6 were put to a vote. The result of the vote was 52 in favour, 36 against and 11 abstentions (see annex). As it did not achieve the two-thirds majority, the draft decisions and revisions to Resolution Conf. 12.6 were rejected.

Summary record CoP15 Com. I Rec. 1 was adopted and the session was adjourned at 17h00.

MOTION: COP15 Doc.53  
Sharks and Stingrays

## VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 52  
No : 36  
Abstain : 11  
:

## VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Europe	36	27	3	2	32
	Africa	30	6	8	3	17
	Asia	27	6	15	2	23
C/S	America & Carib,	23	7	9	4	20
	Oceania	4	4	0	0	4
	N America,	3	2	1	0	3

## THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

## MIC CARD DELEGATE INFORMATION

## VOTE

1	1	AF Afghanistan	Yes
3	3	DZ Algeria	
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda,	No
5	5	AR Argentina	No
6	6	AM Armenia	
7	7	AU Australia	Yes
8	8	AT Austria	Yes
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	
10	10	BS Bahamas	Yes
11	11	BD Bangladesh	No
14	14	BE Belgium	Yes
16	16	BJ Benin	
17	17	BT Bhutan	Yes
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of),	Abstain
20	20	BW Botswana	Abstain
21	21	BR Brazil	Yes
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam,	Yes
24	24	BF Burkina Faso,	
25	25	BI Burundi	
26	26	KH Cambodia	No
27	27	CM Cameroon	No
28	28	CA Canada	Yes
30	30	CF Central African Republic,	
32	32	CL Chile	No
33	33	CN China	No
34	34	CO Colombia	Yes
36	36	CG Congo	
37	37	CR Costa Rica,	Yes
39	39	HR Croatia	Yes
40	901	CU Cuba	No
42	42	CZ Czech Republic,	Yes
44	44	DK Denmark	Yes
46	46	DM Dominica	No
48	48	EC Ecuador	Yes
49	49	EG Egypt	

50	50	SV El Salvador,	
53	53	EE Estonia	Yes
54	54	ET Ethiopia	Abstain
55	55	FJ Fiji	Yes
56	56	FI Finland	Yes
57	57	FR France	Yes
60	60	GE Georgia	
61	61	DE Germany	Yes
62	62	GH Ghana	Yes
63	63	GR Greece	Yes
64	64	GD Grenada	No
65	65	GT Guatemala	Abstain
66	66	GN Guinea	
68	68	GY Guyana	Abstain
69	69	HN Honduras	Yes
70	70	HU Hungary	Yes
71	71	IS Iceland	No
72	72	IN India	Abstain
74	74	IR Iran (Islamic Republic of),	
75	75	IE Ireland	Yes
76	76	IL Israel	Yes
77	77	IT Italy	Yes
78	78	JM Jamaica	Yes
79	79	JP Japan	No
80	80	JO Jordan	
83	83	KW Kuwait	No
84	84	KG Kyrgyzstan	No
86	86	LV Latvia	Yes
88	88	LR Liberia	No
89	89	LY Libyan Arab Jamahiriya,	No
90	90	LI Liechtenstein	Yes
93	93	MG Madagascar	Yes
95	95	MY Malaysia	No
96	96	ML Mali	
97	97	MT Malta	Yes
98	98	MR Mauritania	Yes
99	99	MU Mauritius	Abstain
100	100	MX Mexico	No
101	101	MC Monaco	Yes
102	102	MN Mongolia	Abstain
103	103	ME Montenegro	
104	104	MA Morocco	No
106	106	MM Myanmar	Yes
107	107	NA Namibia	No
108	108	NP Nepal	
109	109	NL Netherlands	Yes
110	110	NZ New Zealand,	Yes
111	111	NI Nicaragua	Abstain
112	112	NE Niger	No
114	114	NO Norway	No
115	115	OM Oman	No
116	116	PK Pakistan	No
118	118	PA Panama	
122	122	PH Philippines	No
123	123	PL Poland	Yes
124	124	PT Portugal	Yes
125	125	QA Qatar	No
126	126	KR Republic of Korea,	No
127	127	MD Republic of Moldova,	Abstain
128	128	RO Romania	Yes
129	129	RU Russian Federation,	No
132	132	LC Saint Lucia,	No
133	133	VC Saint Vincent and the Grenadines,	No
138	138	SN Senegal	

139	139	RS Serbia	Yes
141	141	SL Sierra Leone,	
142	142	SG Singapore	No
143	143	SK Slovakia	Yes
147	147	ZA South Africa,	Yes
148	148	ES Spain	Yes
149	149	LK Sri Lanka,	
150	150	SD Sudan	No
151	151	SR Suriname	No
152	152	SZ Swaziland	Yes
153	153	SE Sweden	Yes
154	154	CH Switzerland	Yes
155	155	SY Syrian Arab Republic,	Yes
156	156	TH Thailand	No
158	158	TG Togo	
161	161	TR Turkey	Abstain
162	162	UG Uganda	Yes
165	165	GB United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland,	Yes
166	166	TZ United Republic of Tanzania,	No
167	167	US United States of America,	Yes
168	168	UY Uruguay	
170	170	VU Vanuatu	Yes
172	172	VN Viet Nam,	No
175	175	ZW Zimbabwe	