

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 third session of Committee II

16 March 2010: 09h15 - 12h00

Chairman: W. Dovey (New Zealand)
Secretariat: J. Barzdo
S. Nash
M. Silva
J. Vasquez
M. Yeater
Rapporteurs: J. Caldwell
C. Lippai
K. Malsch
A. Mathur

16 Capacity building

16.1 Report of the Secretariat

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 16.1, highlighting the importance of collaboration and partnership to capacity building. It drew attention to the two recommendations in the document, namely that Parties be encouraged to make use of training materials and that Decision 14.10 on *Support to Master's programmes* be maintained.

Guatemala and Panama expressed thanks to the Secretariat for capacity building within their region. Colombia noted that they had offered to host a workshop and requested assistance from the Secretariat to obtain financial support, as it was important for their whole region to be involved. Saudi Arabia encouraged all Parties to make use of the available materials and to conduct additional workshops, and stressed the need for training materials in Arabic and other languages.

Support for the continuation of Decision 14.10 was voiced by Antigua and Barbuda, Chile, China and South Africa. Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, fully supported the regional and national approaches to capacity building and urged the Parties to continue to support such activities. They noted the importance of the Master's course at the University of Andalusia. Antigua and Barbuda, China, Mali and South Africa remarked upon the usefulness of the Andalusia course, and Mali believed that such a course could be offered by universities in Africa. Fiji stressed the importance of capacity building to small developing countries as the risk of trade suspensions was a major threat to their economy.

Australia, on behalf of the Oceania region, proposed a draft decision, directed to the Secretariat, to support capacity building, as follows:

15.xx The Secretariat shall:

- a) seek funding to convene a capacity building workshop and regional meeting for the Oceania region before the 62nd meeting of the Standing Committee, in order to improve regional implementation of the Convention; and

- b) subject to availability of funds, invite the Parties of the Oceania region, non-party States, regional intergovernmental organizations and observers, as may be appropriate.

Jordan thought that the regional approach to capacity building was very important, as were partnerships with other sectors such as NGOs. They believed that monitoring the effectiveness of the training framework should be carried out to ensure that resources were not wasted. This view was shared by Benin who stressed the lack of the equipment and technology in Africa that was necessary to access online training materials. The Democratic Republic of the Congo supported the proposed draft decision from Australia but wanted to see more workshops in the African Region. Kenya pointed out the need to strengthen CITES implementation throughout Africa and for more capacity building. They suggested the adoption of a draft decision similar to the one proposed by Australia and undertook to provide wording at a subsequent session.

The Secretariat recognized the difficulties encountered in the African region but stressed that many advances in e-learning stemmed from that region.

The recommendation to maintain Decision 14.10 and the draft decision proposed by Australia were accepted.

17. Incentives for the implementation of the Convention

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 17 and presented the two draft decisions in the Annex.

The United States questioned the priority of the work on incentives, given the budgetary constraints and the Secretariat's volume of work. They noted that, despite the efforts made by the Secretariat, Parties did not appear to be very interested in pursuing the outlined issues as there had been no response to related Notifications. They did not support the draft decisions or continued work on this subject.

Israel opposed the draft decisions and the associated budget to produce a training package for the private sector. They also opposed the commercialization of the CITES logo and use of the Secretariat's time on this issue, noting that the Convention existed to regulate trade and not to certify commercial wildlife traders.

New Zealand considered the work on this subject valuable and innovative but shared the concerns expressed about the costs.

Argentina referred to paragraphs 13 and 14 of the document and requested clarification of the term 'minimum requirements' and 'achievable criteria'. Regarding payments for ecosystem services, they felt that clear terms of reference were required before organizing a workshop as proposed in the draft decision directed to the Secretariat. From the perspective of a developing country, they thought it would be difficult to implement a streamlined standard operating procedure. They expressed particular concern about the e-permitting process and the creation of bigger differences between Parties. Benin shared this concern as the necessary tools were not always readily available to implement such a system in African countries. They proposed closer synergy with other MEAs to avoid duplication of effort.

Mexico noted the value of the document but did not agree with the draft decisions, particularly with regard to the Convention acting as a certification body. Furthermore, Mexico pointed out that environmental services were not covered by this Convention. They felt that it was more important to direct efforts and finances to improving ways to establish non-detriment findings, as this was a more urgent and important element for effective implementation of the Convention. Malaysia concurred, adding that payment for ecosystem services was being addressed by the CBD and the United Nations Framework Convention to Combat Climate Change.

Chile acknowledged the complexity of the issues surrounding payments for ecosystem services and considered it was not appropriate to convene a workshop at this time.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, noted their support for the subject of payment for ecosystem services, a voluntary certification scheme and development of a training package for the private sector. However, they asked for clarification of the draft decision directed to the Standing Committee regarding 'legal-acquisition findings' and whether this excluded the element of non-detriment

findings. They suggested that legal-acquisition findings could be strengthened to assist Parties to make non-detriment findings and suggested additional text that would clarify this.

Burkina Faso, supported by Senegal, stressed that it was important to secure the support of local populations with regard to incentives for the implementation of the Convention as they lived alongside often dangerous wildlife and could be considered the 'managers of wildlife'. They encouraged the Secretariat to explore methods to tackle human wildlife conflict. They did not accept the draft decision, but suggested that the Convention should keep pace with globalization trends whilst retaining its focus on regulating international trade for conservation of wild species.

China emphasized the importance of considering the variety of practical abilities of Parties for effective implementation of the Convention and considered the draft decisions were premature in many respects. With regard to payment for ecosystem services, they noted that the concept was confined mainly to carbon sequestration and water purification, making it problematic to incorporate this concept into the Convention.

Guatemala supported the aspect of e-permitting and noted that this issue would be discussed in document CoP15 Doc. 30.

Humane Society International endorsed the position of Israel and the United States regarding the scope of work of the Convention and financial implications of the draft decisions. TRAFFIC, speaking also on behalf of IUCN, offered to collaborate with the Secretariat and provide technical expertise with regard to the ISSC-MAP and other initiatives to assist with the issues outlined in the document.

The Comisión Centroamericana de Ambiente y Desarrollo offered to share the results of their study on an economic assessment of the most important species in the Central American region.

The Secretariat informed delegates that a Memorandum of Understanding had been developed between the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and the Secretariat to provide the basis for its biotrade-related activities. It noted that many Parties already used incentives for benefit sharing from the sustainable use of natural resources such as gorillas in Rwanda, markhor in Pakistan and vicuña in South America and, in addition, that the recent policy review process had concluded that there was a need to involve communities and private sector stakeholders.

The Chair concluded that the draft decisions in the Annex to document CoP15 Doc. 17 were rejected.

18. Review of Resolutions

The Secretariat introduced document CoP15 Doc. 18.

The United States of America proposed an amendment to Resolution Conf. 11.10 (Rev. CoP14), which was not included in the document, that the definition of coral fragments (including gravel and rubble) be changed to read: "unconsolidated fragments of broken finger-like dead coral and other material between 2 and 30 mm ~~in diameter~~ measured in any direction, which is not identifiable to the level of genus." There being no objection, this was accepted.

The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre stated that a cubic rather than a two-dimensional diameter measurement would be more appropriate.

Mexico proposed an amendment to Resolution Conf. 4.6 (Rev. CoP13) that directs the Secretariat: "the Secretariat should provide the Conference of the Parties with a full analysis of all valid decisions and suggesting amendments, deletions, or maintenance of those decisions and indicating the justification for each of those."

This proposed amendment was accepted by consensus.

China, Iceland and Saint Lucia objected to the introduction of amendments to additional Resolutions from the floor and asked that discussions be confined to those included in the document. They noted that the implications of any changes would be difficult to assess without the text before them and that some Parties would need prior consideration and consultation with officials not present at the meeting. The Chair stated that no further additions of this sort would be accepted.

Annex 1

With regard to the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 5.10 on *Definition of 'primarily commercial purposes'*, in Annex 1 of document CoP15 Doc. 18, the United States proposed to retain the existing texts in paragraph 2 of the 'General principles' in the Resolution and in paragraph d) of the 'Examples'.

Canada agreed with the amendments recommended by the Secretariat, except regarding paragraph e) of the 'Examples', where they proposed the first two sentences be amended to read: "Imports of specimens of Appendix-I species for captive-breeding purposes ~~are a special case-raise special problems~~. Any import of such specimens for captive-breeding purposes should be in accordance with Resolution Conf. 10.16 and must be aimed as a priority at the long-term protection of the affected species, as required in Resolution Conf. 10.16 (Rev.)". This was agreed.

Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, and Chile supported the Secretariat's proposed amendments.

The proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 5.10 were accepted with the further amendment proposed by Canada.

Annex 2

The proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 7.12 (Rev.) on *Marking requirements for trade in specimens of taxa with populations in both Appendix I and Appendix II* were accepted by consensus.

Annex 3

Regarding the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.5 (Rev. CoP14) on *Trade with States not party to the Convention*, Spain, on behalf of the European Union and its Member States, proposed a further amendment to clarify the intention of the penultimate paragraph, so that it would read, "INSTRUCTS the Secretariat to seek, every two years, information on, and to include in its Directory, details of the designated competent authorities, scientific institutions and enforcement authorities of non-party States that were communicated by these States, together with the date on which the details were received." This was agreed.

The United States suggested that, paragraph b) under 'RECOMMENDS' be amended to read as follows: "Parties accept documentation from States not party to the Convention only if the details of the competent authorities and scientific institutions of such States that are included in the online CITES Directory were communicated less than two years previously unless the Secretariat confirms that it has more recent information." This was agreed.

The proposed amendments contained in Annex 3b) were accepted with the further amendments indicated above.

The session was adjourned at 12h00.