

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



Eighteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties  
Geneva (Switzerland), 17 - 28 August 2019

Summary record of the seventh session for committee I

20 August 2019: 19h00 - 21h45

Chair: R. Hay (New Zealand)

Secretariat: I. Higuero  
I. Camarena  
T. De Meulenaer  
K. Gaynor  
D. Kachelriess

Rapporteurs: B. Austin  
J. Caldwell  
A. Caromel  
F. Davis  
R. Mackenzie  
E. Vovk

**Strategic matters (cont.)**

12. Securing better implementation of marine fish species listings in the Appendices

Antigua and Barbuda introduced document CoP18 Doc. 12 and emphasized that paragraph 1 c) of the draft resolution it proposed was not intended to compromise the sovereign right of Parties to submit proposals for including marine species in the CITES Appendices, but urged Parties to consider the difficulties associated with the implementation of CITES listings of marine fish species, and undertaking a review of the conservation effectiveness of all marine fish species listing.

Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Brazil, (speaking also on behalf of Argentina, Belize, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, Peru, the Dominican Republic and Uruguay), Canada, the European Union, Fiji, Gabon, Israel, Maldives, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Somalia, Sri Lanka, and the United States of America strongly opposed the adoption of the draft resolution in document CoP18 Doc. 12. They expressed the view that, if adopted, it would set a dangerous precedent and would compromise the sovereign rights of Parties to propose species for listing under CITES as set out in the Convention; that marine species did not constitute a distinct category to be treated differently from other taxa; and that there were already existing CITES processes in place to review listings, such as the Periodic Review. They also considered that for a number of marine species, their inclusion in CITES Appendix II had resulted in conservation benefits, such as improved protection, data collection and management. Mexico also generally opposed the draft resolution in document CoP18 Doc.12 but saw some value in a review of the effectiveness of CITES listings. Mexico further suggested a review of the Memorandum of Understanding between CITES and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), which had not been reviewed since its implementation, in order to better integrate the views of CITES Parties into FAO expert technical assessments.

Japan expressed support for the draft resolution, stating that recent CITES listings of certain commercially exploited fish species had resulted in negative impacts on both the conservation status of the species and the communities dependent on their use. It further believed that rather than a CITES listing, fisheries

management was the right tool to address any issues for these species. . The Russian Federation supported the proposal to suspend future listings of marine species on the CITES Appendices. Cambodia, Indonesia, the Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, and Saint Lucia and the Solomon Islands expressed support for document CoP18 Doc. 12, highlighting their own implementation challenges and needs, but considered that further work was required. China suggested that the Animals Committee conduct a review of currently listed marine species. In case there would not be a majority for the draft resolution in document CoP18 Doc. 12, Cambodia, Mexico, Saint Kitts and Nevis and the Solomon Islands, echoed by OPES OCEANI, suggested that an intersessional working group be established to consider whether a review of CITES-listed marine fish species was necessary and to report to CoP19.

The Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) urged CITES to increase efforts to protect threatened species that would be vulnerable to overexploitation and provided the example of Parties in Oceania converting their Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) into shark sanctuaries following the listings of shark species on Appendix II. SPREP and Earthtrust International, also on behalf of the Species Survival Network (SSN), opposed the adoption of document CoP18 Doc. 12. TRAFFIC, Wildlife Conservation Society and World Wildlife Fund (WWF), the last of these speaking also on behalf of Animal Welfare Institute, the Blue Resources Trust, Centre for Biological Diversity, Defenders of Wildlife, Humane Society International (HSI), Natural Resources Defense Council, OCEANA Inc. and Zoological Society of London (ZSL), also strongly opposed the adoption of CoP18 Doc. 12, noting that difficulties in implementing effective CITES Appendix listings for other taxonomic groups did not preclude future listings from being proposed.

The Global Guardian Trust, IWMC-World Conservation Trust, Southeast Asian Fisheries Development Center (SEAFDEC) and China Aquatic Products Processing and Marketing Alliance supported a review of existing marine listings.

The draft resolution in document CoP18 Doc. 12 was not agreed.

#### 92. Appendix-I listed species

The Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP18 Doc. 92, on behalf of the Animals and Plants Committees. He noted that, due to lack of resources, the Secretariat had not been able to implement Decision 17.22, directing it to commission a rapid assessment of the conservation status of, and legal and illegal trade in, species included in Appendix I. The Committees had agreed that it was important to continue this work and had asked the Secretariat to submit draft decisions to this end.

China, Peru, and the United States of America supported the draft decisions in Annex 1. The United States noted that, while useful, the existing data sources referred to in paragraph 11 of the document would not assist in sufficiently narrowing the range of taxa included within the scope of the assessment. It suggested that additional criteria be applied, such as biological characteristics, and species traded in high volumes (as in the Review of Significant Trade). China suggested that Parties' implementation reports could also be a useful source of data for the assessment.

The draft decisions as presented in Annex 1 to document CoP18 Doc. 92 were accepted and it was agreed to delete Decisions 17.22 to 17.25.

#### 104. Review of Resolution Conf. 10.9 on *Consideration of proposals for the transfer of African elephant populations from Appendix I to Appendix II*

Germany, on behalf of the Standing Committee, introduced document CoP18 Doc. 104 which set out work undertaken by the Standing Committee to implement Decision 16.160 (Rev. CoP17). The Standing Committee had concluded that Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II* provided sufficient guidance when considering proposals for the transfer of African elephant populations from Appendix I to Appendix II, so Resolution Conf. 10.9 was no longer required. Accordingly, document CoP18 Doc. 104 proposed the repeal of Resolution Conf. 10.9.

Botswana, China and the United States of America expressed support for the Standing Committee's proposal.

It was agreed to repeal Resolution Conf. 10.9 and to delete Decision 16.160 (Rev. CoP17) as the Standing Committee had fulfilled its mandate.

## Maintenance of the Appendices

### 99. Standard nomenclature

The Nomenclature Specialist of the Plants Committee, Mr. Noel McGough, introduced document CoP18 Doc.99, and its annexes. He drew the attention of Parties to proposed revisions to Decision 18.DD in Annex 7 to the document as follows:

The Secretariat shall, in close cooperation with the nomenclature specialist of the Plants Committee:

- a) subject to availability of external resources, undertake the development of an annotated CITES Checklist of *Dalbergia* spp., taking into consideration:
  - i) relevant elements of paragraph 7 of document CoP18 Doc. 99, as well as the pertinence of including a distinction between timber and non-timber species of *Dalbergia* spp.;
  - ii) the required research and other work needed for the production of such a Checklist; and
  - iii) aspects related to its publication; and
- b) report on progress or results of this process to the Plants Committee at its regular meetings and seek its advice and input.

Having concluded and noting that he was presenting his last report to the Conference of the Parties as Nomenclature Specialist for the Plants Committee, he thanked his colleagues from various organizations and all those who had helped him over the last 30 years in CITES.

The Secretary-General paid tribute to the extensive contribution that Mr. Noel McGough had made to the work of CITES over many years. She wished him well in future endeavours and presented him with a gift. Mexico, on behalf of the CITES Parties, also made a presentation to him.

The meeting adjourned at 21h45.