

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 third session for Committee II

19 August 2019: 09h14 - 12h00

Chair: C. Hoover (United States of America)

Secretariat: M. Hitziger
D. Morgan
H. Okusu
L. Yuan

Rapporteurs: A. Caromel
F. Davis
R. Mackenzie
J. Vitale

Strategic matters (cont.)

15. Cooperation with organizations and multilateral environmental agreements

15.6 Cooperation between CITES and the World Heritage Convention

Norway introduced document CoP18 Doc. 15.6, pointing out that many UNESCO sites are designated on the basis of species that are also listed by CITES and that implementation of both CITES and UNESCO could benefit from formalising the existing collaboration between the two conventions through a Memorandum of Understanding by adopting the draft resolution and decisions presented in the annexes to the document, with the amendments suggested by the Secretariat.

The United States of America cautioned that any mandate should consider the resources needed by the Secretariat and should not detract from core CITES work. They believed that the proposed resolution was not needed, but proposed the following edits if the resolution was accepted:

1. ~~URGES ENCOURAGES~~ the CITES Secretariat and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to engage in closer cooperation, as appropriate and subject to availability of external resources, on sites and species of mutual concern;
3. ~~URGES ENCOURAGES~~ the CITES Management and Scientific Authorities of those Parties that are also Party to the UNESCO World Heritage Convention to cooperate with their respective World Heritage Focal Points;
4. ~~ENCOURAGES INVITES~~ donors to support projects activities that benefit the objectives of both CITES and the UNESCO World Heritage Convention; and

Regarding the draft decisions, they believed that further discussion was needed before developing a joint programme of work that would require additional resources, and suggested retaining draft decisions 18.BB and 18.CC, and the following amendments:

18.AA Directed to the Secretariat

The Secretariat shall enter into dialogue with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre with a view to ~~agreement on~~ developing a Memorandum of Understanding and, if considered appropriate and subject to availability of external resources, a joint programme of work.

18.BB Directed to the Secretariat

The Secretariat shall submit a draft Memorandum of Understanding ~~agreed~~ with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre to the Standing Committee for its review, recommendations, and approval, ~~prior to the 73rd meeting of the Standing Committee~~.

18.CC Directed to the Standing Committee

The Standing Committee shall consider the draft Memorandum of Understanding transmitted by the CITES Secretariat on cooperation with the UNESCO World Heritage Centre and provide its recommendations or approval ~~if it is agreed shall report accordingly to the 19th meeting of the Conference of the Parties~~.

The European Union accepted the draft resolution as presented in the document and supported by WWF supported retention of draft decisions 18.BB and 18.CC to maintain an element of scrutiny by the Standing Committee. The European Union further expressed interest that joint programmes of work would also have scrutiny. The Secretariat explained that in the past the Standing Committee had not examined draft MoUs between itself and other secretariats in detail. Canada and the European Union expressed their support for the United States' amendments to the draft resolution and to draft decision 18.AA and agreed that the programme of work needed Standing Committee oversight.

The draft resolution presented in Annex 1 as amended by the Secretariat in paragraph B and the United States of America was accepted. The draft decisions presented in Annex 2 as amended by the United States of America were accepted.

Species specific matters

95. Guidance materials, activities and tools aimed at enhancing Parties' capacity to regulate bushmeat trade

The Secretariat introduced document CoP18 Doc. 95, which outlined ongoing work on the bushmeat trade and recommended amendments to Resolution Conf. 13.11 (Rev. CoP17) on *Bushmeat*. The Secretariat confirmed that since document CoP18 Doc. 95 was submitted, Cameroon had provided written confirmation to the Secretariat that the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group had ceased to operate.

China, the European Union and Norway and supported the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 13.11 (Rev. CoP17) and the deletion of Decisions 14.73 (Rev. CoP17), 14.74 (Rev. CoP17), 17.112, and 17.113, further suggesting that the term 'bushmeat' be replaced by 'wild meat' in document CoP18 Doc. 73 on *Great apes (Hominidae spp.)* and within the CITES glossary to ensure consistency.

The European Union also proposed amendments to the text of paragraph 2.c) of the Resolution as follows:

- c) where appropriate, make use of the voluntary guidance for a sustainable wild meat sector in the tropics and subtropics, found in the Annex to Decision XIV/7 on Sustainable wildlife management adopted at the 14th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (Sharm El Sheikh, November 2018);

Norway, China, and the Convention on Biological Diversity supported amendments to Resolution Conf. 13.11 (Rev. CoP17) as presented in Annex 1 to document CoP18 Doc. 95. The United States noted that the issue of bushmeat emerged in CITES as a result of concern over international commercial demand driving illegal and unsustainable harvest, and did not want this origin to be lost in the change of wording

In response to a question from Cameroon, the Secretariat confirmed that there was no proposal to reconvene the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group.

The proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 13.11 (Rev. CoP17), as presented in Annex 1 and amended by the European Union were accepted. It was agreed to delete Decisions 14.73 (Rev. CoP17), 14.74 (Rev. CoP17), 17.112 and 17.113.

17. Rural communities

The Chair noted that agenda items 17.2 and 18.3 would be considered together and anticipated that a working group would be formed around documents on rural communities and CITES and livelihoods.

17.1 Report of the Standing Committee

Namibia, as Chair of the intersessional working group on rural communities and on behalf of the Standing Committee, introduced document CoP18 Doc. 17.1, highlighting that no consensus could be reached on the mechanism for engaging rural communities in CITES processes and thus the Standing Committee could not conclude its work as mandated. They invited the Parties to note the document and to consider whether to instruct the Standing Committee to continue the work and report to CoP19. The Chair drew attention to the Secretariat's proposed revisions to Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) and its recommendation to delete Decisions 17.28 to 17.30 and 17.57.

Canada expressed support for continued discussion on the engagement of communities and presented their experience as a potential constructive example to consider. Ethiopia, Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Senegal and the United States of America echoed Canada's need for clarification of the terminology. Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association recommended harmonisation of terminology in line with other Multilateral Environmental Agreements, and the Center for Biological Diversity, speaking also on behalf of the Eurogroup for Animals, the Natural Resource Defense Council, the Pan African Sanctuary Alliance, ProWildlife and the Species Survival Network, suggested the use of "local communities and indigenous peoples" as in other agreements.

The European Union, supported by China, India, Indonesia, Japan, Lesotho, Namibia, New Zealand, Somalia, South Africa, Uganda and the United Republic of Tanzania, expressed support for re-establishment of an intersessional working group of the Standing Committee to enable a report to be made to CoP19. Ethiopia expressed concern about duplication of work, and Uganda stressed that local communities bear the brunt of the effects of decisions to conserve species and need self-interest and empowerment in conservation efforts to encourage their participation. The Kenya Wildlife Conservancies Association presented an update on the situation in Kenya and suggested that any renewed working group be more inclusive of observers from communities. Mozambique and Eswatini supported the proposal submitted by Namibia. Liberia, on behalf of the African Elephant Coalition, and Senegal, repeated the call for representation of all stakeholders with equitable involvement of observers from different interest groups, if the working group were to be renewed. They urged Parties to encourage and facilitate engagement of vulnerable communities as observers in CITES.

The continuation of intersessional work was also supported by Amboseli Ecosystem Trust, Campfire Association, International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, International Professional Hunters Association, Inuit Circumpolar Council Canada (ICC) (also on behalf of Nunavut Tunngavik Incorporated and Makivik Corporation), Livelihood International (also on behalf of IWMC – World Conservation Trust), The People and Earth Solidarity Law Network, and World Leaders of Today. The Namibian Association for CBNRM Support Organizations (NACSO) speaking also on behalf of a large number of like-minded organizations emphasized the role of rural communities in effective implementation of CITES and recalled platforms and consultative mechanisms established in other multilateral environmental agreements. They called on the Parties to give high priority to find ways to include rural communities in CITES deliberations. The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) also pointed to relevant mechanisms in other international fora. The Center for Biological Diversity expressed concern about the implications of the proposals.

The European Union, India, Lesotho and Peru supported the proposed amendment by the Secretariat of Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17) on *CITES and livelihoods*. Mexico and the United States also supported the Secretariat's proposed amendments and suggested further changes.

The Chair suggested the formation of a working group to continue this discussion, with the following terms of reference: a) to revise or replace Decisions 17.28-17.30; b) to retain and consider revising Decision 17.57; and c) to consider the Secretariat's suggested revisions and additional suggestions to Resolution Conf. 16.6 (Rev. CoP17), paragraph 3(a)(i) and (ii) in paragraph B of its comments. In relation

to Decisions 17.28-17.30, he noted that Canada had text for proposed draft decisions and that these and the original decisions could form the basis for discussion. The Chair indicated that the terms of reference of the working group might be expanded in light of further discussions under agenda items 17 and 18.

17.2 Proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 4.6 (Rev. CoP17) and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17)

and

18.3 Proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17)

Namibia introduced document CoP18 Doc. 17.2, including proposals to amend Resolution Conf. 4.6 (Rev. CoP17) on *Submission of draft resolutions and other documents for meetings of the Conference of the Parties* and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17) on *Criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II* emphasizing that the intention was not to amend the listing criteria. China introduced document CoP18 Doc. 18.3, and drew attention to two information documents, CoP18 Inf. 2 and CoP18 Inf. 46. Document CoP18 Doc. 18.3 proposed an amendment to Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17).

Botswana, Mozambique and the United Republic of Tanzania supported the proposed amendments in document CoP18 Doc. 17.2. Mexico suggested further changes to the proposed amendments.

Gabon, Burkina Faso, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, the European Union, Israel, Kenya, Mauritania, Mexico, Niger, Nigeria and the United States of America all raised concerns with the proposed amendments in both documents, several noting they had amendments to propose. The United States opposed the proposed amendments and offered a decision to prepare non-binding guidance on consultations as an alternative.

The meeting adjourned at 12h00.