

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 seventh session of Committee I

18 March 2010: 09h20 - 12h20

Chairman: J. Donaldson (South Africa)  
Secretariat: R. Bolješić  
D. Morgan  
S. Nash  
Rapporteurs: J. Caldwell  
L. Garrett  
T. Inskipp  
J. Robinson

The Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries of the Maldives noted that his country was attending CoP15 as a non-Party observer to learn about the CITES process, and noted that they would be joining the Convention during the following year. He reported that the Maldives had banned shark fishing and shark finning and had thus effectively created a large shark sanctuary in the Indian Ocean. They hoped that this they demonstrated their commitment to shark conservation, and they encouraged other Parties to protect shark species similarly.

The Committee noted this interjection.

68. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

The United States of America introduced proposal CoP15 Prop. 3, noting that the main threat to *Ursus maritimus* was the impact of climate change on their habitat. They hoped that their proposal would stimulate a dialogue on this species and the consideration of climate change in the context of CITES decision-making. They noted that, in 2008, the IUCN had categorized the species as Vulnerable based on a population decline of 30 % over some 45 years. They were concerned that trade had had, or may have, a detrimental effect on this species. They further believed that poaching was increasing, for example in the Russian Federation. Although international trade for commercial purposes would not be allowed, subsistence hunting and sports trophy hunting would not be prohibited if the species were to be listed on Appendix I.

Egypt, Mali, Qatar, Rwanda, Yemen and the Defenders of Wildlife were in support of the proposed transfer to Appendix I, noting that, in light of climate change, a precautionary approach should be adopted to limit compounding threats. Defenders of Wildlife believed that there was a significant commercial trade in luxury goods, e.g. wall hangings and rugs and thought that an Appendix-I listing was essential to remove this additional pressure.

Canada, Denmark (on behalf of Greenland), Iceland, Norway, Spain (on behalf of the European Union and its Member States) and Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated opposed the transfer of the species to Appendix I. Canada drew attention to document CoP15 Inf. 11 which illustrated current management practice and trade in the species. They did not believe that the species met the biological criteria for a CITES Appendix-I listing, a view, they reported, that was shared by the CITES Secretariat, IUCN, TRAFFIC and WWF. They felt that it was not threatened by international trade, noting that there had been no increase in trade over recent years. They highlighted that the proposal was based upon projected population data which were insufficient to justify an Appendix-I listing. They also reiterated that the trade was not market-driven, but

based on an adaptive co-management quota system for subsistence hunting. Canada introduced a senior representative of indigenous communities who noted the cultural importance of polar bears as a source of food and clothing, and that an Appendix-I listing would not stop traditional harvest of the species and might severely impact livelihoods. Although Memoranda of Understanding had been signed between Greenland and Canada (2009), and Canada and the United States (2008) to improve management of their polar bear populations, they felt that the proposal did not take into account the current adaptive management of the species.

The Greenland Government drew attention to the fact that proposals to amend the CITES Appendices should be based on the conservation status of the species concerned. They felt that proposals should take account of the contribution that CITES controls can make towards improvement of the conservation status of a species, while acknowledging the efforts of those countries that had implemented effective conservation measures. Greenland reported that the annual quotas, established since 2006, were set in accordance with international agreements and on the basis of scientific advice. It also stated that the total catch of polar bears was significantly reduced and had been below the set quota since 2006, and that the regulation on CITES export permits had been in place since 1983, whilst the Home Rule order had been revised and strengthened in 2004.

Furthermore, the Greenland Government had decided on a voluntary export ban in April 2008 on all Greenland polar bear populations, and Canada had decided on a voluntary export ban for Kane Basin and Baffin Bay populations in 2009. They also reiterated that polar bears did not fulfil the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I as there was no “marked on-going decline”, projected future decline was not 50 %, polar bear populations were greater than 5,000 individuals, and there were well-established national and regional management measures in place. However, Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, urged Canada to proceed with caution and to continue to review hunting quotas.

The Chair noted that arguments for and against the proposal were equally split and asked the United States how they wished to proceed. The United States explained that the proposal was not intended to be a criticism of polar bear management by range States and asked for a vote. The result of the vote was 48 Parties in favour, 62 against with 11 abstentions. The proposal was thus rejected.

Switzerland, as the Depositary Government, introduced proposal CoP15 Prop. 7 to delete *Anas oustaleti* from Appendix I. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the proposal, noting that the taxon, which was still subject to taxonomic debate, was thought to be extinct in the Mariana Archipelago. They explained that hybrids should only be included in the Appendices if they were well-defined and formed stable populations, which was not the case with this taxon. The proposal was accepted by consensus.

Mexico introduced proposal CoP15 Prop. 8 to transfer *Crocodylus moreletii* from Appendix I to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild specimens. They amended their proposal to make it more precise by adding the words for commercial purposes after “with a zero quota for wild specimens”. They noted that responses to questions from the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group were included in document CoP15 Inf. 34. They were aware that any change to the zero quota in the future would require the submission of a new proposal to the Conference. Guatemala was opposed to the proposal, based on the lack of knowledge of the population and population trends in their country, the serious threats to the species posed by deforestation and pollution, and the likelihood of illegal cross-border trade taking place. Nicaragua, on behalf of the Central American countries and also the Dominican Republic, was opposed to the proposal, citing the lack of knowledge about the species in Guatemala and Belize and the potential for illegal trade in the region. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, spoke in favour of the proposal, noting a population increase in Mexico in recent years and that there were adequate mechanisms in that country for trade controls. They had some concerns about hybrids with *C. acutus* but were satisfied that the risks were being minimized. The United States noted the issues of capacity; however, they felt that the species no longer met the criteria for listing in Appendix I and supported the proposal. China also supported the proposal. In view of the stated opposition, the Chair called for a vote; and Mexico requested that the vote be split, with the Mexican and Belize populations being treated separately from the Guatemalan population. Guatemala spoke in favour of this suggestion and the transfer of the Mexican and Belize populations to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild specimens for commercial purposes was accepted by consensus. Mexico then withdrew the proposal in relation to the population of Guatemala.

Egypt introduced proposal CoP15 Prop. 9 relating to the transfer of the Egyptian population of *Crocodylus niloticus* from Appendix I to Appendix II, and presented an amendment and insert with a zero quota for commercial purposes after “Appendix II” and delete the rest of the wording.

They emphasized the good scientific information regarding the status of the species in Egypt, the great deal of effort made in improving CITES implementation, and reiterated the fact that there had been no legal trade in the species from Egypt and any illegal trade had been dealt with appropriately.

Indonesia and Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, opposed the proposal. Indonesia sought clarification on whether the proposal had been submitted in time for consideration at CoP15, and pointed out that the issues outlined in documents SC54 Doc. 20, SC57 Doc. 20 and SC58 Doc. 23 had not yet been fully resolved. The Chair confirmed that the proposal had been submitted in time. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, recognized the efforts made by Egypt in contributing to the conservation of the species and the future potential for its utilization in Egypt, but expressed concern regarding the lack of data presented in the proposal and the lack of compliance capacity. They suggested that the proposal should be based on well-established progress, rather than actions not yet carried out.

China, Japan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the Sudan, Tunisia, Uganda, Yemen, and Wildlife Management International all expressed support for the proposal. The Sudan, echoed by many Parties, drew attention to the problems associated with rising crocodile numbers. They stated that more surveys were required to determine accurate population estimates and felt that the proposal should be reviewed at CoP16 in light of further information gained from these studies. Uganda considered that the population no longer met the criteria for listing in Appendix I and noted the need to help Egypt use the species to benefit communities, thereby stimulating appreciation of, and adding value to the animal. China added that the transfer to Appendix II would encourage improved management and benefit local livelihoods and economies. Japan considered that the data were sufficient and listing in Appendix I was no longer appropriate. Tunisia recognized Egypt's efforts and placed trust in Egypt's efforts to preserve the species. Wildlife Management International ended by highlighting their work with Egypt in preparing the proposal and in developing a management plan for the species.

As consensus was not reached, the proposal went to vote. There were 60 votes in favour, 38 against and 7 abstentions and the proposal was therefore rejected.

Israel introduced proposal CoP15 Prop. 10, regarding transfer of *Uromastix ornata*, from Appendix II to Appendix I. They stated that they had attempted to consult the other range States, and although Egypt had responded in favour of the proposal, despite efforts, they had failed to consult with Saudi Arabia and Yemen. They added that Ukraine and Jordan had reported captive-breeding operations, which would be able to continue under an Article 7 exemption. They reiterated that the species could not withstand trade and requested that, if the issue went to vote, it be made by a secret ballot. Guinea Bissau expressed support for the proposal.

Japan, Saudi Arabia, Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, and the Sudan opposed the proposal. Japan commented that the 2004 Review of Significant Trade had indicated that international trade had not had a significant effect on the status of the species. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, commented that no information was provided on the population size in other range States; they also commented that biological criteria required for an Appendix-I listing were not met, adding that, with no information on the total population size, a decline could not be inferred. Saudi Arabia, as a range State of the species, also highlighted the lack of information regarding population size. They commented that the majority of the population occurred in Saudi Arabia and that they did not believe it was under threat. They added that there had been no trade from Saudi Arabia or export from any other range State, other than a small number from Yemen in 1999, and therefore they did not consider trade to be a threat. They further concluded that the population did not meet the biological criteria for listing in Appendix I.

In response to the large amount of opposition expressed for the proposal, the Chair clarified with Israel that a secret ballot would only be allowed if there were 10 Parties in support of this. With only one party expressing support, the secret ballot was not allowed and Israel then withdrew the proposal.

The session was adjourned at 12h20.

MOTION: Cop 15 Doc 68 Amex 2 Proposal 3  
*Ursus maritimus*

## VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 48  
 No : 62  
 Abstain : 11

## VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Europe	37	7	29	0	36
	Africa	34	14	11	5	30
	Asia	28	15	7	3	25
C/S	America & Carib,	24	9	11	2	22
	Oceania	5	2	3	0	5
	N America,	3	1	1	1	3

## THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

## MIC CARD DELEGATE INFORMATION

## VOTE

1	1	AF Afghanistan	Yes
3	3	DZ Algeria	Yes
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda	No
5	5	AR Argentina	Abstain
6	6	AM Armenia	Yes
7	7	AU Australia	Yes
8	8	AT Austria	No
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	Yes
10	10	BS Bahamas	No
11	11	BD Bangladesh	
14	14	BE Belgium	No
16	16	BJ Benin	Yes
17	17	BT Bhutan	
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	
20	20	BW Botswana	Abstain
21	21	BR Brazil	Abstain
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam	Yes
24	24	BF Burkina Faso	Abstain
25	25	BI Burundi	No
26	26	KH Cambodia	Yes
27	27	CM Cameroon	No
28	28	CA Canada	No
30	30	CF Central African Republic	Yes
32	32	CL Chile	Yes
33	33	CN China	No
34	34	CO Colombia	Yes
36	36	CG Congo	Yes
37	37	CR Costa Rica	Yes
39	39	HR Croatia	Yes
40	901	CU Cuba	No
42	42	CZ Czech Republic	No
44	44	DK Denmark	No
46	46	DM Dominica	No
47	47	DO Dominican Republic	Yes
48	48	EC Ecuador	No
49	49	EG Egypt	Yes

50	50	SV El Salvador	
53	53	EE Estonia	No
54	54	ET Ethiopia	Abstain
55	55	FJ Fiji	No
56	56	FI Finland	No
57	57	FR France	No
60	60	GE Georgia	Yes
61	61	DE Germany	No
62	62	GH Ghana	Yes
63	63	GR Greece	No
64	64	GD Grenada	No
65	65	GT Guatemala	Yes
66	66	GN Guinea	
68	68	GY Guyana	No
69	69	HN Honduras	Yes
70	70	HU Hungary	No
71	71	IS Iceland	No
72	72	IN India	Yes
74	74	IR Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Yes
75	75	IE Ireland	No
76	76	IL Israel	Yes
77	77	IT Italy	No
78	78	JM Jamaica	No
79	79	JP Japan	No
80	80	JO Jordan	Yes
82	82	KE Kenya	Yes
83	83	KW Kuwait	Yes
84	84	KG Kyrgyzstan	No
86	86	LV Latvia	No
88	88	LR Liberia	
89	89	LY Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Abstain
90	90	LI Liechtenstein	No
92	92	LU Luxembourg	No
93	93	MG Madagascar	No
94	94	MW Malawi	No
95	95	MY Malaysia	Yes
96	96	ML Mali	
97	97	MT Malta	No
98	98	MR Mauritania	Yes
99	99	MU Mauritius	No
100	100	MX Mexico	Abstain
101	101	MC Monaco	Yes
102	102	MN Mongolia	No
103	103	ME Montenegro	Yes
104	104	MA Morocco	Yes
106	106	MM Myanmar	
107	107	NA Namibia	No
108	108	NP Nepal	Yes
109	109	NL Netherlands	No
110	110	NZ New Zealand	No
111	111	NI Nicaragua	Yes
112	112	NE Niger	Yes
114	114	NO Norway	No
115	115	OM Oman	Abstain
116	116	PK Pakistan	Yes
118	118	PA Panama	Yes
122	122	PH Philippines	Abstain
123	123	PL Poland	No
124	124	PT Portugal	No
125	125	QA Qatar	Yes
126	126	KR Republic of Korea	No
127	127	MD Republic of Moldova	No
128	128	RO Romania	No
129	129	RU Russian Federation	No

132	132	LC	Saint Lucia	No
133	133	VC	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	No
134	134	WS	Samoa	No
138	138	SN	Senegal	No
139	139	RS	Serbia	Yes
141	141	SL	Sierra Leone	Yes
142	142	SG	Singapore	No
143	143	SK	Slovakia	No
147	147	ZA	South Africa	No
148	148	ES	Spain	No
149	149	LK	Sri Lanka	Yes
150	150	SD	Sudan	Yes
151	151	SR	Suriname	No
152	152	SZ	Swaziland	Yes
153	153	SE	Sweden	No
154	154	CH	Switzerland	No
155	155	SY	Syrian Arab Republic	Yes
156	156	TH	Thailand	No
158	158	TG	Togo	
160	160	TN	Tunisia	Yes
161	161	TR	Turkey	
162	162	UG	Uganda	No
165	165	GB	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	No
166	166	TZ	United Republic of Tanzania	Abstain
167	167	US	United States of America	Yes
168	168	UY	Uruguay	Yes
170	170	VU	Vanuatu	Yes
172	172	VN	Viet Nam	Abstain
173	173	YE	Yemen	Yes
174	900	ZM	Zambia	No
175	175	ZW	Zimbabwe	No

MOTION: CoP15 Doc.68 Annex2  
 Proposal 9 *Crocodylus niloticus*

## VOTE TOTALS:

Yes : 60  
 No : 38  
 Abstain : 7

## VOTE BREAKDOWN

	GROUP DETAILS		RESULTS OF VOTE			
	NAME	SIZE	Yes	No	Abstain	
	Europe	37	4	26	1	31
	Africa	35	22	4	0	26
	Asia	28	18	2	0	20
C/S	America & Carib,	24	13	4	4	21
	Oceania	5	2	1	2	5
	N America,	3	1	1	0	2

## THE INDIVIDUAL RESULTS WERE AS FOLLOWS

## MIC CARD DELEGATE INFORMATION

## VOTE

1	1	AF Afghanistan	
3	3	DZ Algeria	Yes
4	4	AG Antigua and Barbuda	Yes
5	5	AR Argentina	Abstain
6	6	AM Armenia	
7	7	AU Australia	Abstain
8	8	AT Austria	No
9	9	AZ Azerbaijan	Yes
10	10	BS Bahamas	No
11	11	BD Bangladesh	
14	14	BE Belgium	No
16	16	BJ Benin	
17	17	BT Bhutan	
18	18	BO Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	Yes
20	20	BW Botswana	Yes
21	21	BR Brazil	Yes
22	22	BN Brunei Darussalam	Yes
24	24	BF Burkina Faso	Yes
25	25	BI Burundi	
26	26	KH Cambodia	Yes
27	27	CM Cameroon	Yes
28	28	CA Canada	No
30	30	CF Central African Republic	
32	32	CL Chile	No
33	33	CN China	Yes
34	34	CO Colombia	Yes
36	36	CG Congo	Yes
37	37	CR Costa Rica	
39	39	HR Croatia	No
40	901	CU Cuba	Yes
42	42	CZ Czech Republic	No
44	44	DK Denmark	No
46	46	DM Dominica	Yes
47	47	DO Dominican Republic	Abstain
48	48	EC Ecuador	Yes
49	49	EG Egypt	Yes

50	50	SV	El Salvador	
53	53	EE	Estonia	No
54	54	ET	Ethiopia	Yes
55	55	FJ	Fiji	Yes
56	56	FI	Finland	
57	57	FR	France	No
60	60	GE	Georgia	Abstain
61	61	DE	Germany	
62	62	GH	Ghana	No
63	63	GR	Greece	No
64	64	GD	Grenada	Yes
65	65	GT	Guatemala	Yes
66	66	GN	Guinea	No
67	67	GW	Guinea-Bissau	No
68	68	GY	Guyana	Abstain
69	69	HN	Honduras	No
70	70	HU	Hungary	No
71	71	IS	Iceland	No
72	72	IN	India	Yes
74	74	IR	Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Yes
75	75	IE	Ireland	No
76	76	IL	Israel	
77	77	IT	Italy	No
78	78	JM	Jamaica	No
79	79	JP	Japan	Yes
80	80	JO	Jordan	Yes
82	82	KE	Kenya	Yes
83	83	KW	Kuwait	
84	84	KG	Kyrgyzstan	Yes
86	86	LV	Latvia	No
88	88	LR	Liberia	
89	89	LY	Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	Yes
90	90	LI	Liechtenstein	
92	92	LU	Luxembourg	No
93	93	MG	Madagascar	Yes
94	94	MW	Malawi	Yes
95	95	MY	Malaysia	Yes
96	96	ML	Mali	
97	97	MT	Malta	No
98	98	MR	Mauritania	Yes
99	99	MU	Mauritius	Yes
100	100	MX	Mexico	Yes
101	101	MC	Monaco	No
102	102	MN	Mongolia	Yes
103	103	ME	Montenegro	No
104	104	MA	Morocco	Yes
106	106	MM	Myanmar	
107	107	NA	Namibia	Yes
108	108	NP	Nepal	No
109	109	NL	Netherlands	No
110	110	NZ	New Zealand	No
111	111	NI	Nicaragua	Yes
112	112	NE	Niger	
114	114	NO	Norway	Yes
115	115	OM	Oman	Yes
116	116	PK	Pakistan	Yes
118	118	PA	Panama	Yes
122	122	PH	Philippines	
123	123	PL	Poland	
124	124	PT	Portugal	No
125	125	QA	Qatar	Yes
126	126	KR	Republic of Korea	Yes
127	127	MD	Republic of Moldova	No
128	128	RO	Romania	



129	129	RU Russian Federation	Yes
132	132	LC Saint Lucia	Yes
133	133	VC Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	Abstain
134	134	WS Samoa	Abstain
138	138	SN Senegal	No
139	139	RS Serbia	No
141	141	SL Sierra Leone	Yes
142	142	SG Singapore	Yes
143	143	SK Slovakia	No
147	147	ZA South Africa	Yes
148	148	ES Spain	No
149	149	LK Sri Lanka	
150	150	SD Sudan	Yes
151	151	SR Suriname	Yes
152	152	SZ Swaziland	
153	153	SE Sweden	No
154	154	CH Switzerland	No
155	155	SY Syrian Arab Republic	Yes
156	156	TH Thailand	No
158	158	TG Togo	
160	160	TN Tunisia	Yes
161	161	TR Turkey	Yes
162	162	UG Uganda	Yes
165	165	GB United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	No
166	166	TZ United Republic of Tanzania	
167	167	US United States of America	
168	168	UY Uruguay	
170	170	VU Vanuatu	Yes
172	172	VN Viet Nam	Yes
173	173	YE Yemen	Yes
174	900	ZM Zambia	Yes
175	175	ZW Zimbabwe	Yes