

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 second session of Committee II

15 March 2010: 14h15 – 16h30

Chairman: W. Dovey (New Zealand)  
Secretariat: J. Barzdo  
J. Vasquez  
M. Yeater  
Rapporteurs: L. Garrett  
T. Inskipp  
K. Malsch  
A. Mathur

9 Review of the scientific committees

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 9 and drew attention to paragraph 5, containing a proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP14) on *Establishment of committees*, and to the need for financial provision in case the amendment were adopted.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the proposal, which was agreed.

13. Cooperation between Parties and promotion of multilateral measures

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 13 and referred to document CoP15 Inf. 43, prepared by UNEP-WCMC, which provided more information on this subject. The benefits of having a full picture of all stricter domestic measures adopted by the Parties was stressed and it was recommended that the remit of the working group should be expanded to cover these aspects. This suggestion was supported by Australia. It was noted that in February 2010 a legislative workshop for francophone countries from North, West and East Africa had identified the need for a harmonized interpretation of Article XIV, paragraph 1, of the Convention regarding stricter domestic measures.

Israel felt that there was too much emphasis on stricter domestic measures in the document. In their opinion, higher priority should be given to reducing the number of existing reservations. Noting this, the Secretariat stated that an effort had been made to achieve a balance in the treatment of these two kinds of departure from the Convention's requirements.

The United States of America did not support any further work on this issue because the adoption of stricter domestic measures by Parties was legitimate under the Convention, although they did support the continuation of Decision 14.30 to achieve consistency in Resolutions. The Chair noted that the intention was for Parties to review their own stricter domestic measures and reservations to determine whether they still needed to be retained.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the recommendation of the Secretariat to retain Decisions 14.28 and 14.30 and to revise Decision 14.29, as shown in the Annex to document CoP15 Doc. 13. Malaysia, IWMC World Conservation Trust and Safari Club International

Foundation expressed support for the document, although the second speaker noted that the correction to the date in Decision 14.29 had not made in the French text.

Argentina proposed that, in Decision 14.28, the words and necessary be inserted after 'effective'. This was agreed.

With this amendment, the proposed revisions of Decisions 14.28 and 14.29 in the Annex to document CoP15 Doc. 13 were agreed, together with the retention of Decision 14.30 unamended.

#### 14. CITES and livelihoods

The Chair of the Working Group on CITES and Livelihoods introduced document CoP15 Doc. 14, referencing the two papers produced by UNEP-WCMC under contract to the Secretariat.

UNEP-WCMC introduced Paper 1: *Rapid Assessment Tools: Tools to assess the impact of the implementation of CITES listings on livelihoods of the poor* and Paper 2: *Addressing Livelihood Impacts: Guidelines to address the impact of the implementation of CITES listings on livelihoods of the poor*. They noted that it was important to take into account other processes that were under development, especially those within the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Brazil, supported by St. Lucia, agreed with the promotion of a broader approach that included sustainable use and conservation, supporting the idea that livelihoods should be considered in the process of making decisions to list species in the Appendices. However, they believed that the Working Group would benefit from a greater contribution from other developing countries. St Lucia requested to be involved in the Working Group, noting that sustainable use was essential, and that alternative livelihoods were not always palatable. They agreed that it was critical to take into account the impact of CITES on the livelihoods of the poor, particularly for Small Island Developing States. This was supported by Grenada, who requested that traditional knowledge be taken into account.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the continuation of the Working Group, commending its work and the production of the voluntary toolkit and guidelines to assess and address the impact of the implementation of CITES listings. Although they fully supported the draft decisions in Annex 2, they felt that the draft resolution in Annex 1 was premature. They suggested that the Standing Committee and the Working Group review Annex 1, taking into account the final development of the toolkit and voluntary guidelines and make recommendations at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Botswana also supported the continuation of the work of the Working Group. However, regarding the draft decision directed to the Secretariat in Annex 2, they proposed an amendment to indicate that the revised draft documents should be submitted for approval at the 61st meeting of the Standing Committee. This was agreed.

The United States agreed with Brazil on the importance of balancing sustainable use and conservation, and that the Working Group should review the draft resolution. They expressed concern that the Working Group should not move towards broader themes more relevant to the Convention on Biological Diversity, but should focus on core CITES issues.

Malaysia and Mexico generally supported the draft decisions and the draft resolution, and Mexico suggested an amendment to the resolution so that the document reflects the importance with regard to cooperation between *ex-situ* breeding operations and conservation efforts *in situ* in the context of CITES livelihoods.

Peru also supported the draft decisions in Annex 2 of the document. They and St Lucia agreed that the draft resolution in Annex 1 should be reconsidered and revised by the Working Group, while remaining within the scope of the Convention.

IWMC World Conservation Trust and the Wildlife Management Advisory Council supported the draft decisions, recognizing the relevance and importance of inclusion of livelihood issues in CITES decisions.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, proposed that insertion of the following paragraph a) before the existing paragraph a) in the draft decision in Annex 2, and re-lettering the subsequent paragraphs:

a) revise the draft resolution and make specific recommendations at CoP16.

This was agreed.

IUCN believed it would be valuable to have any toolkit used practically at national levels and that there was benefit in advancing similar work with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements. They expressed an interest in continuing in the Working Group.

The Chair concluded that there was insufficient support for the draft resolution in Annex 1 of document CoP15 Doc. 14, which was therefore rejected. However, the draft decisions in Annex 2 of the document were agreed as amended.

#### 15. National wildlife trade policy reviews

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 15, highlighting the progress made on the decisions of document CoP 14 Doc. 15 and noting the linkages between wildlife policy reviews and other CITES processes. They drew attention to the Synthesis Report summarizing the pilot country reviews provided in Annex 4. They said that the final framework for reviewing national wildlife trade policies would be available in April and a complete report in June. Emphasizing the voluntary nature of the framework, they noted that it was well received by governments and other sectors and could serve as a model for other auditing processes.

As pilot countries, Madagascar and Uganda spoke in support of the national policy review process. Madagascar recognized the need to strengthen the institutions to implement CITES within their country and emphasized that additional resources were required for effective implementation. They noted that radical solutions to combat illegal wildlife trade were merited. They appealed to the Parties to reconsider the restrictions on Madagascar's wildlife trade.

Uganda was grateful for the financial support provided by the European Union for the review process and expressed its willingness to share its experiences with interested Parties. They noted that the policy reviews provides an opportunity to identify policy impacts, enhance partnerships and inform future reviews.

Israel expressed concern that the priorities of the Convention appeared to be shifting; emphasizing the need for CITES to maintain its role as a regulator rather than a facilitator of trade.

The United Nations Environment Programme and United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNEP-UNCTD) Capacity Building Task Force on Trade, Environment and Development (CBTF) shared their lessons learned, noting that collaboration was the key to ensure effective utilization of resources. Given that the four pilot countries (Madagascar, Nicaragua, Uganda and Viet Nam) represent different regions with different national situations, each provided a unique perspective that enhanced South-South knowledge exchange. They commented that this process helped identify data gaps, fostered inter-ministerial interactions and provided an opportunity for other stakeholders, including NGOs and the private sector, to participate in policy formulation. They noted the minimal costs to governments and UN agencies of conducting national reviews. However, they stressed the need for additional resources to implement the recommendations of the existing policy reviews.

Sierra Leone informed the meeting of their national policy review process, which would provide the basis for new legislation. As part of the review process, livelihood issues were considered. They commented that many African nations required financial assistance to undertake conservation activities.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, supported the draft resolution in Annex 1 of document CoP15 Doc. 15, and the draft decision in Annex 2. They recognized the value of the CITES online discussion forum, and suggested that it be open to all interested parties including government agencies, the private sector and NGOs. They suggested there was a need for collaboration with importing countries, improved linkages with other MEAs and an enhanced relationship with the academic community.

Jamaica, supporting the draft resolution and the draft decision, informed the Parties that they would share their national wildlife trade policy review when available.

The Sudan conveyed the need for increased input from countries with capacity-building experience, and urged Parties to make capacity building a priority in the coming years.

Peru proposed the following amendments to the draft resolution in Annex 1:

- the first operative paragraph:

INVITES exporting and importing countries to carry out, on a voluntary basis, reviews of wildlife policy reviews on the use of and trade in specimens of CITES-listed species ...

- second operative paragraph:

ALSO INVITES Parties to carry out, on a voluntary basis, regional or subregional wildlife trade policy reviews in accordance with the realities of participating countries;

- fifth operative paragraph:

INSTRUCTS the Secretariat to facilitate the review of wildlife trade policies through raising the necessary funds and providing necessary technical cooperation, compile information voluntarily provided by the Parties regarding their wildlife trade policy reviews and make this information available to other Parties.

These amendments were agreed.

The International Environmental Law Project stressed that the reviews could be improved by considering land tenure and property rights. They applauded the transparency of governments during the review process but considered that the reviews were not detailed enough to bridge the gap between the benefits of sustainable trade and policy or legislative weaknesses.

The draft resolution in Annex 1, as amended, and the draft decision in Annex 2 were agreed by consensus.

The Chair closed the session at 16h30.