



# CITES 2004

Analysis of Working Documents to be Discussed at the 13<sup>th</sup> CoP to CITES · Bangkok, Thailand, 2-14 October 2004 · Prepared by the Species Survival Network

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
CoP13 Doc. 10  Strategic Vision  CITES Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A Strategic Vision and Action Plan through 2005 was adopted at CoP11</li> <li>• At the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the CITES Standing Committee, it was decided that the Secretariat should submit a draft decision to CoP13 to extend the time validity of the current Strategic Plan through 2007 and to develop a proposal for consideration at CoP14 for a Strategic Vision and Action Plan through 2004</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contains a draft decision to CoP13 to extend the time validity of the current Strategic Plan through 2007 and to develop a proposal for consideration at CoP14 for a Strategic Vision and Action Plan through 2014</li> </ul>	<b>SUPPORT</b>
CoP13 Doc. 11.1  Review of the scientific committees  Australia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP12) establishes the Plants and Animals Committees (the 'scientific committees' of CITES) and provides terms of reference for their work</li> <li>• The cost of Plants and Animals Committee meetings has increased significantly in recent years, from about 50,000 CHF in 1997 to about 90,000 CHF in 2002</li> <li>• While the CITES Strategic Vision emphasizes scientific assessment as one of three key goals, the other two—capacity building and enforcement—are not as well supported</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes that the Standing Committee be directed to review the scientific committees—using Terms of Reference developed by a working group at CoP13—in order to examine and report on: the most effective and efficient means of providing scientific advice to the Convention and to the Parties as appropriate; the resources required to adequately support the provision of scientific advice having regard to the resources necessary to adequately support other key activities, including capacity building and enforcement; an effective process of regular review of the provision of scientific advice; and the mandate of a scientific committee</li> </ul>	<b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN supports efforts to reduce the cost of Committee meetings and to use funds saved for capacity-building, enforcement and the significant trade review process</li> <li>• SSN supports efforts to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of scientific committees, but would not support combining Animals and Plants Committees into one</li> <li>• SSN would not support any recommendation that would reduce participation in scientific committee meetings by Parties or observers</li> </ul>
CoP13 Doc. 11.3  Standard nomenclature and operation of the Nomenclature Committee  Mexico	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 11.1 establishes the terms of reference for CITES Committees, including the Nomenclature Committee</li> <li>• RC 12.11 replaced the list of separate standard references for nomenclature of different animal and plant taxa with the <i>Checklist of CITES species</i>, compiled by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 2001, and its updates accepted by the Nomenclature Committee, which became the sole standard reference for nomenclature under CITES</li> <li>• However, some confusion has remained as to the status of taxon-specific works previously regarded as standard references</li> <li>• At the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee (Geneva 2003), the Chairman presented document AC19 Doc. 20.1, regarding the role of standard taxonomic and nomenclatural references, and amendment of the appendices as a consequence of nomenclatural changes; it recommended a review of the terms of reference of the Nomenclature Committee, restructuring and formalizing the process whereby CITES nomenclature is changed and the process whereby a new reference is presented to the CoP; the Secretariat opposed the document, making a number of objections and suggesting that many of its points were unnecessary</li> <li>• Also during the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee, Mexico presented AC19 Doc. 20.2 in relation to standard taxonomy and nomenclature for birds, stating that it was</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft resolution to revise RC 12.11 would: require the Secretariat to consult with the Nomenclature Committee before making orthographic changes to names, and report these to the Parties; replace paragraph g) under RECOMMENDS with "whenever the name of a taxon to be used in the Appendices to the Convention changes, the Secretariat in consultation with the Nomenclature Committee, shall verify that this change will not alter the scope of protection for fauna or flora under the Convention"; if the scope of a taxon is redefined, the Nomenclature Committee will evaluate the implications of this and make a recommendation to the CoP, rather than simply advising the Secretariat; in the case of a disagreement over a taxonomic authority, the Nomenclature Committee will make a recommendation to the CoP, following the procedure for adoption and updating of standard nomenclature references under Resolution Conf. 11.1 [as revised by Mexico's draft], rather than making a determination; adds new paragraph k): "while adopting, modifying or updating the name of a taxon to be used in the Appendices to the Convention and applying any of the recommendations above, an evaluation of the implications on the implementation of the Convention must be made"; gives taxon-based checklists adopted by the Conference of the Parties equal status with the Checklist of CITES species</li> <li>• Draft resolution to revise RC 11.1 would: increase the</li> </ul>	<b>SUPPORT IN PART</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN supports the ideas that recommendations of the Nomenclature Committee should be made transparently, and that the practical consequences of any change should be evaluated and communicated clearly to the CoP before adoption</li> <li>• SSN also has no objection to appointing Animals and Plants Committee members to the Nomenclature Committee as recommended</li> <li>• However, we believe that certain changes proposed here would make the operation of the Nomenclature Committee unnecessarily cumbersome</li> <li>• All changes recommended by the Animals Committee (except orthographic changes) are already submitted to the CoP for final approval</li> <li>• RC 12.11 was intended to make access to the correct nomenclature easier by adopting a single standard reference prepared specifically for CITES; giving other references "equal status" removes this benefit; references underlying checklist entries should be identified as sources in the checklist</li> <li>• Requirement that new references be peer-reviewed would eliminate the use of many important references in use by scientists (e.g. Wilson and Reeder for mammals) that are published as separate books rather than as articles in peer-reviewed journals</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>inappropriate that, for certain taxa, alternative references be used that are not peer-reviewed, do not originate from a collegial body and are not fully recognized worldwide; the Secretariat pointed out that now that there was only a single standard reference, Mexico's recommendations were "unwarranted and inappropriate"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parties have expressed concerns that the significance of nomenclatural changes (i.e. to the wording of domestic laws) is not always made clear before these changes are adopted</li> <li>At the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Plants Committee, a Working Group recommended, <i>inter alia</i>, that plant 'taxon based' checklists should have at least equal status with the UNEP/WCMC Checklist of CITES species; that references and checklists recommended by the Nomenclature Committee should be put to the CoP for formal approval and adoption; that a provision be made for alternative representatives on the Nomenclature Committee, and that an opportunity for regional input to the Committee is ensured; that any proposal for adopting or amending checklists or references be distributed at least 150 days prior to the CoP, and that the implications be clearly outlined in the relevant proposal</li> </ul>	<p>membership of the Nomenclature Committee from two to four, adding to the co-chairs selected by the CoP, two individuals appointed by the Animals and Plants Committees, among the regional representatives of each; proposals for candidates as co-chair to be supported by the relevant governments; set out terms for the qualifications of the co-chairs; require that appointees from the Plants and Animals Committees shall represent the co-chair at the meetings where they cannot be present; and ensure communication with the members of the Plants and Animals Committees and their input to the Nomenclature Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft also establishes new procedure for reviewing taxonomic references: proposals for new references can originate from implementation problems with current standard references, from recent publication of papers or monographs or from amendment proposals of taxa for which a standard reference has not been adopted, and shall be founded on peer reviewed and worldwide recognized taxonomic publications; Nomenclature Committee will analyze the proposals, consulting with taxonomists and with the Animals and Plants Committees, and submit to the Secretariat a document with its comments and recommendations regarding the updating or adoption of nomenclature references, including the implications of these changes; Nomenclature Committee will present its recommendations to the Plants and Animals Committees before submitting them for adoption by the CoP; Checklist of CITES species shall be updated according to the changes in the current standard references or the adoption of new ones and the new publications included as part of the official taxonomic reference for CITES species</li> <li>Secretariat to include reasonable travel funds for Nomenclature Committee members in its budget</li> </ul>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 12.1.1</p> <p>Achieving greater synergy in CITES and CBD implementation</p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community) and Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CITES Secretariat and the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1996, which was endorsed by CBD CoP3 in 1996 (Decision III/21) and welcomed by CITES CoP10 in 1997 (RC 10.4, Cooperation and Synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity); the MOU was amended in 2001 to make provision for the development of joint work plans and to incorporate the first of these plans</li> <li>At CBD CoP7, the CBD adopted decision VII/26 which invites the CITES Secretariat to join the Liaison Group among biodiversity related Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) to enhance coherence and cooperation in their implementation</li> <li>An expert workshop promoting CITES-CBD synergy, organized by TRAFFIC and IUCN, the IUCN Environmental Law Centre, and Fauna Flora International, took place at Vilm, Germany, from 20-24 April 2004</li> <li>Report of the workshop contains a series of findings and recommendations which could require the revision of the work program of the MOU between CITES and the CBD or a review of RC 10.4; several priority areas of increased synergy were identified</li> <li>World Summit on Sustainable Development set target of achieving by 2010 a significant reduction in the rate of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document contains report of the Vilm workshop as an Annex; the proponents endorse in principle the overall objectives of the workshop and recommend a substantive discussion of the report with a view to adopting some of its recommendations; it is also proposed that the Liaison Group established through CBD Decision VII/26 considers the attached report and its recommendations</li> <li>Draft decision states that: "the report of the Vilm expert workshop promoting cooperation and synergies between CITES and the CBD shall be transmitted to the CITES Animals, Plants and Standing Committee for further consideration and action; the Secretary General of CITES shall be requested to transmit the report to the Executive Secretary of the CBD in order to revise—based on the findings and recommendations of the report—the Work Plan attached to the MOU between both Conventions; and the CITES Secretariat shall report back to the 53rd meeting of the CITES Standing Committee on progress made on the revision of the agreed work plan between both conventions and in the implementation of the recommendations made in the report attached to this document"</li> <li>Workshop noted differences between the Conventions, including different perceptions and approaches and responses to <i>ex-situ</i> commercial captive breeding, conservation benefits and benefit-sharing; identified cross-</li> </ul>	<p><b>UNDER REVIEW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN strongly agrees that the Parties should seek better synergies and cooperation between the CBD and CITES, and therefore supports the EU proposal in principle; SSN believes many (but not all) of the recommendations from the Vilm workshop would make a valuable contribution to improved collaboration between the Conventions</li> <li>SSN notes, however, that the Vilm report includes many recommendations on a diverse range of topics and activities, and that not all Parties may agree with all recommendations</li> <li>For this reason, SSN believes that the specific recommendations in the report require close examination, and that each recommendation should be evaluated on its own merits, before the CITES Parties commit themselves to any changes in current practice</li> <li>We are also concerned about the proposed adoption within CITES of terminology that is weakly defined—or not defined at all—within the CBD; the relationship between such terminology and the obligations of CITES Parties spelled out in the Convention text needs to be more fully considered</li> <li>SSN agrees with the recommendation in the Vilm report that the CITES Parties should establish a process to review the Addis Ababa Principles on Sustainable Use of Wildlife recently adopted by the CBD to determine which, if any, of those principles may be applied or adapted to the CITES context</li> <li>SSN does not support the recommendation in the Vilm report that the CITES Parties adopt the CBD's definition of "sustainable use"; the</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>biodiversity loss; CBD Conference of the Parties has established goals and sub-targets for focal areas in order to help assess progress towards the 2010 target, including Target 4.3 (“No species of wild flora or fauna endangered by international trade”)</p>	<p>cutting mechanisms involving sustainable use, access and benefit-sharing, linking of site-based, thematic and species-based approaches; also suggested cooperation on plant conservation, invasive alien species, compliance and enforcement, taxonomy, incentives for research and monitoring, harmonization of reporting, GEF and other financial strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participants stressed that existing processes, for example the committees of the two Conventions, should be used as much as possible to achieve the aims identified, rather than creating new structures</li> </ul>	<p>obligations of Parties with respect to listed species are defined by the Convention itself, including the requirements that trade in listed species not be detrimental to the survival of that species (Articles III(3)(a) and IV(2)(a)) and that any such trade be so limited as to maintain that species throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystem in which it occurs (Article IV(3)); to the extent that additional terminology is required in the implementation of the Convention, the necessary terms should be identified and defined by the CITES Parties themselves, taking into account the particular requirements of CITES and incorporating, as appropriate, relevant guidance from other contexts, including the CBD</p>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 12.1.2</p> <p>Sustainable use principles and guidelines</p> <p>Namibia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CITES Secretariat and the Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in 1996, which was endorsed by CBD CoP3 in 1996 (Decision III/21) and welcomed by CITES CoP10 in 1997 (RC 10.4, Cooperation and Synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity); the MOU was amended in 2001 to make provision for the development of joint work plans and to incorporate the first of these plans</li> <li>CBD CoP7 adopted a series of principles and guidelines for the sustainable use of biological diversity (the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines—CBD CoP7 Decision VII.12); drafted at a workshop held in Addis Ababa in May 2003</li> <li>CBD intends to test the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines through a series of case studies</li> <li>According to Article 2 of the CBD, “Sustainable use” means the use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity, thereby maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations</li> <li>World Summit on Sustainable Development set target of achieving by 2010 a significant reduction in the rate of biodiversity loss; CBD Conference of the Parties has established goals and sub-targets for focal areas in order to help assess progress towards the 2010 target, including Target 4.3 (“No species of wild flora or fauna endangered by international trade”)</li> </ul> <p>NB: The text of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines in the Annex to this document is incomplete; it omits the introductory paragraphs and the section on “Underlying Conditions for Sustainable Use” present in the full text as included in CBD Decision VII.12</p>	<p>The draft Resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Welcomes the adoption of Decision VII.12, which adopted the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, and notes that these Principles and Guidelines can be utilized in the implementation of CITES Article IV and other relevant provisions of the Convention</li> <li>Directs the Secretariat to distribute the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines to all CITES Management and Scientific Authorities; to incorporate work on these Principles and Guidelines into its work plan, with reference to CITES non-detriment findings and capacity building, and to report to meetings of the Standing Committee and CoP14 on progress; and to incorporate these Principles and Guidelines into its capacity building program for CITES Scientific Authorities</li> <li>Directs the Animals and Plants Committees to develop case studies on how these Principles and Guidelines could be used in specific cases of exports of CITES Appendix II species, and to report back to CoP14</li> <li>Urges the Parties to adopt as a working definition the definition of sustainable use contained in the Articles of the Convention on Biological Diversity; to utilize these Principles and Guidelines when adopting non-detriment-making processes and making CITES non-detriment findings; to share experiences on sustainable use internally within their countries, particularly between CITES Management and Scientific Authorities, and their CBD Focal Points; and endeavor to ensure that their CITES Management and Scientific Authorities participate, through their country’s CBD Focal Points, in the work of the CBD and its Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) on these Principles and Guidelines</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN notes that the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use of Wildlife recently adopted by the CBD were not based on rigorous scientific data and their operability and impact have yet to be evaluated or tested by the CBD; the Principles and Guidelines make recommendations on an immense range of policy development and implementation activities that have not been subjected to scrutiny by the CoP or the Scientific Committees to determine which portions, if any, are relevant and appropriate to CITES</li> <li>The draft Resolution, which amounts to an adoption of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, is therefore premature; no resolution on the subject, or incorporation of the Guidelines into CITES work plans, should be adopted until there has been full discussion and evaluation within the CITES context</li> <li>SSN agrees with the recommendation in the Vilim report that the CITES Parties should establish a process to review the Addis Ababa Principles to determine which, if any, of those principles may be applied or adapted to the CITES context</li> <li>It is neither necessary, nor an effective use of scarce resources, for the CITES Secretariat to distribute the CBD Principles to the Management and Scientific Authorities when the Principles have not yet been considered by the CoP or the scientific committees</li> <li>SSN does not support the recommendation that the CITES Parties adopt the CBD’s definition of “sustainable use”; the obligations of Parties with respect to listed species are defined by the Convention itself, including the requirements that trade in listed species not be detrimental to the survival of that species (Articles III(3)(a) and IV(2)(a)) and that any such trade be so limited as to maintain that species throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystem in which it occurs (Article IV(3)); to the extent that additional terminology is required in the implementation of the Convention, the necessary terms should be identified and defined by the CITES Parties themselves, taking into account the particular requirements of CITES and incorporating, as appropriate, relevant guidance from other contexts, including the CBD</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 12.2</p> <p>CITES listing of whale stocks and the International Whaling Commission</p> <p>Japan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Since implementing a moratorium on commercial whaling in 1986, the International Whaling Commission (IWC) has been conducting a Comprehensive Assessment of whale stocks and negotiating a Revised Management Scheme (RMS) to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>set safe whaling quotas using a mechanism called ‘the RMP’;</li> <li>provide a Monitoring, Supervision and Control regime for commercial whaling should the IWC (a two-thirds majority is required) decide to lift the moratorium</li> </ol> </li> <li>CITES responded to the IWC’s Moratorium by listing all</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>States that some whale stocks do not meet CITES’ biological criteria for listing on Appendix I and should be transferred to Appendix II</li> <li>States that CITES has not transferred these stocks to Appendix II because the IWC has not yet completed and implemented its Revised Management Scheme (RMS)</li> <li>States that the RMS has not been adopted by the IWC because of political problems which have been transported to CITES</li> <li>Urges the IWC to complete and implement the RMS</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Japan, Norway and Iceland have killed over 12,000 whales for commercial purposes since 1986 despite the Moratorium</li> <li>In 2003, the IWC described Japan and Iceland’s scientific whaling as contrary to the spirit of the Moratorium and the will of the Commission</li> <li>The CITES Secretariat, the IUCN and TRAFFIC have consistently opposed proposals to transfer any whale species from Appendix I to Appendix II at CoP9, CoP10, CoP11 and CoP12</li> <li>The draft resolution conflicts with RC11.4 and will undermine the authority and credibility of the IWC: CITES has no jurisdiction over the</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>whales covered by it on Appendix I</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC. 11.4 recommends that CITES Parties agree not to trade commercially in any specimen protected by the IWC</li> </ul>		<p>management of whaling and cannot usurp or pre-empt the content or timing of the IWC's decisions; it is not up to CITES to suggest to another Convention the speed of its decision-making process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The majority of IWC members negotiate the RMS in good faith, but Norway, Iceland and Japan reject supervision and compliance mechanisms which are commonplace in other fisheries regimes</li> <li>• The CITES Secretariat said in response to proposals to resume trade in whale products at CoP11 and CoP12 that "Article XV, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention requires that coordination with any conservation measures enforced by the ICRW be ensured. That coordination is best ensured by maintaining CITES Appendix-I listing for whale stocks that are subject to zero catch quotas under the ICRW"</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 12.3</p> <p>Revision of Resolution Conf. 12.4 on Cooperation between CITES and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources regarding trade in toothfish</p> <p>Australia</p>	<p>RC 12.4 promotes cooperation between CITES and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) regarding trade in toothfish (<i>Dissostichus</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 12.57 directs Parties to report to the Secretariat their use of the <i>Dissostichus</i> Catch Document used by CCAMLR and their verification requirements for such Catch Documents</li> <li>• Decision 12.58 directs the Secretariat to compile the information on the use of and verification requirements for <i>Dissostichus</i> Catch Documents provided by Parties and send this information to CITES Parties and to CCAMLR yearly, and report on this at the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revises RC 12.4 to provide for ongoing cooperation and reporting between CCAMLR and CITES</li> <li>• Incorporates the actions in Decisions 12.57 and 12.58 so that they are ongoing requests</li> <li>• Changes 'illicit' to 'illegal' in the term 'illegal, unreported and unregulated fishing' (IUU), as is conventional</li> <li>• Acknowledges that IUU fishing represents a threat to the Southern Ocean ecosystem, including the conservation of Patagonian and Antarctic toothfish</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cooperation between CCAMLR and CITES should be ongoing</li> <li>• IUU fishing is a key threat to the Southern Ocean ecosystem and CITES should cooperate with CCAMLR to address it</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 12.4</p> <p>Cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations</p> <p>Japan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article XV, paragraph 2, provides that the Secretariat shall, in respect to proposals to amend the listing on the Appendices of a marine species, "consult with inter-governmental bodies having a function in relation to those species, especially with a view to obtaining scientific data these bodies may be able to provide and to ensuring coordination with any conservation measures enforced by such bodies"</li> <li>• RC 9.24, on listing criteria, recommends that its text and Annexes be fully reviewed before CoP12 with regard to the scientific validity of the criteria, definitions, notes and guidelines and their applicability to different groups of organisms</li> <li>• FAO has identified several issues related to CITES listing, implementation, and treaty interpretation</li> <li>• Decision 12.7 directed the Standing Committee, on the basis of the recognition by the Conference of the Parties of the primary role of FAO and regional fisheries management organizations in fisheries management and the role of CITES in regulating international trade, to work with FAO in the drafting of a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between CITES and FAO, to establish a framework for cooperation, to be presented in draft form for consideration at the 25th meeting (February 2003) of COFI and, if possible, the 49th meeting of the Standing Committee</li> <li>• At its 25th meeting, FAO Committee on Fisheries (COFI) was unable to reach consensus on a draft of MOU text, but agreed to continue work and to delegate the authority to</li> </ul>	<p>Document presents current FAO draft text as adopted by 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting of COFI-FT as an annex; argues that if MOU has not been concluded further direction may be needed to the Standing Committee since Decision 12.7 has essentially expired</p> <p>The FAO draft text:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognizes the primary role of sovereign States, FAO and regional fisheries management organizations [RFMOs] in fisheries conservation and management, and that for marine species, the CITES Secretariat has an obligation to consult inter-governmental bodies having a function in relation to those species</li> <li>• Notes that CITES cannot replace traditional fisheries management and the particular importance of consulting all relevant bodies associated with the management of the species when considering amendments to CITES appendices</li> <li>• Believes that there is a need to strengthen the process in CITES for scientific evaluation of proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II concerning commercially-exploited aquatic species</li> </ul> <p>Its terms require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Fisheries Department of FAO and the CITES Secretariat will send each other general information of common interest</li> <li>• FAO will be invited as an observer to CITES meetings that</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document as presented requires no decision from Conference of the Parties (except for a possible Decision extending or replacing Decision 12.7)</li> <li>• Draft text may be out of date by the time of the CoP, as negotiations are continuing and the matter will be discussed at SC 51</li> <li>• Listing Criteria may be finalized at CoP13, so clause in draft referring to revision process may be no longer relevant</li> <li>• Text prepared by SC Chair and CITES Secretariat (Notification 2003/030) is preferable; better recognizes that CITES and FAO have equivalent and equally valid roles in conservation of marine species; FAO draft gives FAO and RFMOs "primary" role</li> <li>• FAO's views on listing criteria or proposals should not take priority over those of other relevant intergovernmental bodies</li> <li>• Any MOU between CITES and FAO should be developed with equal input by both organizations, not left to FAO's discretion as suggested by the proposal and the COFI document</li> <li>• Reference to "exploited aquatic species" is ambiguous; FAO technical consultations addressed only commercially exploited fish and invertebrate species; involvement of FAO in scientific review of other "aquatic" species may exceed FAO's mandate and interfere with work of IWC and other bodies</li> <li>• Requirement that Secretariat incorporate FAO recommendations "to the greatest extent possible" should be removed; FAO opinions should not be substituted for the Secretariat's independent assessments of species proposals</li> <li>• CITES Secretariat noted at Second Technical Consultation that most effective way to ensure effective consideration of FAO issues</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>finalize a MOU to COFI Sub-Committee on Fish Trade (COFI-FT). COFI also agreed a process for FAO to provide advice to CITES on proposals to amend the Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At its 49th meeting (Geneva, April 2003), the Standing Committee instructed the Secretariat to issue a Notification to the Parties attaching a draft MOU prepared by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Chairman of the Standing Committee, and inviting comments, and mandated its Chairman to liaise with FAO on the development of an MOU</li> <li>• At its Ninth Meeting (Bremen, February 2004), COFI-FT adopted a proposed MOU, agreed on a process for attempting to reach agreement with CITES on its text, and agreed that the FAO proposal should form the basis of the final MOU; if CITES wishes to make additions, they could be considered but any changes should not weaken or diminish the FAO text</li> <li>• The second draft of the MOU from CITES was sent to the FAO Secretariat, but did not incorporate comments from Parties on the first draft</li> <li>• The issue of the MOU with FAO was withdrawn from the Agenda of the 50th meeting of the Standing Committee (Geneva, March 2004); negotiations could take place before the 51st meeting of the Standing Committee prior to CoP13</li> </ul>	<p>are of common interest and CITES will be invited as an observer to meetings of common interest held by the Fisheries Department of FAO, the FAO Committee on Fisheries or its subcommittees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FAO and CITES will cooperate as appropriate to promote capacity building in developing countries</li> <li>• FAO will continue to provide advice to CITES and be involved in the process of revision of the CITES listing criteria. These criteria will be the primary basis for the evaluation of proposals for amendment of the CITES Appendices by the FAO and CITES</li> <li>• CITES will inform FAO as soon as possible of all proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II concerning commercially-exploited aquatic species, to allow FAO to carry out a scientific and technical review of such proposals in a manner it deems appropriate and for the resulting output to be transmitted to the CITES Secretariat</li> <li>• CITES Secretariat will incorporate to the greatest extent possible the results of the FAO scientific and technical review of proposals to amend the Appendices, the responses from all the relevant bodies associated with management of the species in question, as well as the substance of the preambular paragraphs of this memorandum in its advice and recommendations to the CITES Parties</li> </ul>	<p>was to increase communication between FAO and CITES personnel within individual Party governments</p>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 13</p> <p>Economic incentives and trade policy</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 12.22 on Economic Incentives and Trade Policy sets out guidelines for the Secretariat to organize a technical workshop on wildlife trade policies, conduct a review of national policies regarding the use and trade of CITES-listed species, and compile and synthesize the information from the Parties in the form of a report, among other duties</li> <li>• A Workshop on this topic was held in December 2003 resulting in two sets of recommendations on methodologies for national wildlife trade reviews and economic incentives</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Doc. 13.13 provides the report of the Secretariat on the workshop, together with the recommendations of the working groups on national wildlife trade reviews and economic incentives and trade policy</li> </ul> <p>Draft decision directs the Secretariat:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to conduct national trade policy reviews and produce a report in accordance with the working group recommendations, report on progress at the 53<sup>rd</sup> and subsequent meetings of the Standing Committee and at CoP14, and submit a project proposal to Global Environment Facility to seek financial support for trade policy reviews in interested countries</li> <li>• to organize a second workshop to provide guidance to Parties on how economic instruments can be designed and used to: ensure that use of Appendix II species is sustainable; promote recovery of Appendix I species; halt or reverse declines of CITES listed species; support financing for the management and conservation of species in trade; contribute to poverty alleviation, sustainable use and ecosystem management; and strengthen a policy framework for sustainable management of species in trade</li> <li>• to continue cooperating with the CBD Secretariat and others to exchange experiences in design and use of economic incentives for sustainable management, compilation of case studies, best practices and lessons learnt, and the development of targeted recommendations, operational guidelines and associated instruments for sustainable use of wild flora and fauna</li> </ul>	<p><b>UNDER REVIEW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN generally supports the recommendations with respect to national trade policy reviews but believes information on the outcomes of reviews should be made available to the public</li> <li>• SSN notes that the proposals with respect to economic incentives are similar and in many cases identical to proposals included in the working documents on the Vilm Report and the CBD's Sustainable Use Principles; to avoid confusion or unnecessary duplication, SSN recommends that the proposed decision be considered together with the working documents from Ireland and Namibia relating to increased synergy between CITES and CBD and the utility of the CBD Sustainable Use Principles</li> <li>• SSN believes that consideration of economic incentives, however important, must be subordinate to the requirements of CITES, and consistent with the purposes of the Convention as set forth in its Preamble; SSN is also concerned that work on economic incentives may divert limited resources from more critical areas, such as effective enforcement</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 14</p> <p>Financing of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 12.26 directs the Secretariat to review mechanisms to finance the conservation of species of wild fauna and flora as well as capacity building for developing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides the analysis stipulated in Decision 12.26, including information garnered in response to Document 12.25</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE IN PART</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN does not agree with the implication in paragraph 46 of the Secretariat's document that Appendix II listings are preferable to</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>conservation of and sustainable international trade in species of wild fauna and flora</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<p>countries / countries with economies in transition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Document 12.25 invites Parties and observers to provide the Secretariat with best-practice methods for financing the conservation of species of wild fauna and flora.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Explains the financial requirements needed for effective CITES implementation and the various international financial resources available to help with funding (e.g. multilateral banks, bilateral aid agencies, the Global Environment Facility, the UN and international development agencies, private foundations and NGOs, and public or private sector partnerships)</li> <li>Reviews and compares national and international financial instruments and mechanisms</li> <li>States, in paragraph 46, "strict regulation of trade in specimens of Appendix-I species often does not generate any revenue to fund enforcement of the Convention, whereas a regulated trade regime under an Appendix-II listing could generate revenue (e.g. a commercial trade tax) to finance enforcement of the regime."</li> <li>States, in paragraph 48, "There may be a range of potential certification-based programmes at national or international level which could increase effectiveness of CITES implementation through the implementation of sustainable harvesting regimes"</li> </ul>	<p>Appendix I listings because they are more likely to generate taxable revenues from trade; any species that meets the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I should be listed on Appendix I if that species is or may be affected by trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN agrees that independent certification schemes, when properly managed and strictly controlled, can provide significant incentives for conservation; SSN agrees that, in a very limited number of circumstances, such schemes might be used to increase the effectiveness of CITES implementation with respect to some Appendix II species; however, the substantial economic and environmental risks associated with poorly designed or poorly implemented schemes would make their use inappropriate with respect to the vast majority of CITES listed species; SSN does not believe pursuance of such schemes would be an effective use of CITES limited resources at this time</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 16</p> <p>Review of Resolutions</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At CoP12 and the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee, the Secretariat committed itself to prepare revisions of Resolutions for consideration at CoP13 as part of the process of reviewing resolutions considered difficult to implement by the Parties, or that were not being implemented; at the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee, the Secretariat also reported its plans to prepare draft revisions of Resolutions where problems and inconsistencies had become apparent</li> <li>RC 4.6 (Rev. CoP12) establishes deadlines and other matters relating to submission of draft resolutions and other documents for meetings of the Conference of the Parties</li> <li>RC 5.11 defines the term "pre-convention specimen" and the relevant dates for determining if a specimen fits the definition; many Parties have taken stricter measures to avoid applying the pre-convention exemption</li> <li>RC 9.21 paragraph (a) requires that a "Party desiring a quota for a species included in Appendix I should submit to the Secretariat its proposal, with supporting information, at least 150 days before a meeting of the Conference of the Parties"</li> <li>RC 10.6 recommends that Parties take steps to inform tourists about CITES and related controls, and that tourist souvenirs, except live specimens, be treated as personal or household effects when entering States other than the State of usual residence or when leaving States other than the State of export</li> <li>RC 12.9 defines "personal or household effects"; sets maximum limits for applying this exemption for caviar, rainsticks and other products; recommends that Parties take steps to prohibit the sale of souvenirs made from Appendix I specimens at border crossings, and inform travelers of CITES requirements</li> <li>RC 10.16 (Rev.) on specimens of animals bred in captivity notes in its Preamble (paragraph 5) that Article VII, paragraph 5, applies to Appendix I specimens covered by a certificate of captive breeding whether or not the purpose is commercial</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annexes contain proposed revisions of RCs 4.6 (Rev. CoP12), 5.11, 9.21, 10.6 and 12.9, 10.16 (Rev.) &amp; 12.10, 11.11 and 11.21, as follows:</li> <li>RC 4.6 (Rev. CoP12): minor editorial changes; resolutions and decisions to enter into force 90 days after the meeting that adopts them, rather than on their transmission by notification to the Parties, unless otherwise specified</li> <li>RC 5.11: new resolution proposed to replace 5.11 recommends that: date from which CITES provisions apply to a specimen is date on which the species concerned was first included in the Appendices; date of acquisition is date of removal from the wild or of production in a controlled environment, or if unknown, any subsequent and provable date on which it was first possessed by a person; that Parties include on all pre-Convention certificates either the precise date of acquisition of the specimens concerned or a certification that the specimens were acquired before a specific date; calls on Parties to take any necessary measures in order to prevent excessive acquisition of specimens of a species between the date at which the CoP approves the inclusion of that species in Appendix I and the date at which the inclusion takes effect</li> <li>RC 9.21: paragraph (a) to read "a Party <i>wishing the Conference of the Parties to establish</i> a quota for a species included in Appendix I, <i>or to amend an existing quota</i>, should submit to the Secretariat its proposal, <i>with supporting information including details of the scientific basis for the proposed quota</i>, at least 150 days before a meeting of the Conference of the Parties" [changes in italics]</li> <li>RCs 10.6 and 12.9: consolidation of these resolutions includes all relevant text of both; makes minor editorial changes; transfers paragraph in 12.9 requesting the Secretariat to develop a process for exempting certain specimens from permitting requirements to Decisions</li> <li>RCs 10.16 (Rev.) and 12.10: removes contradiction between these two resolutions by removing the words "and may therefore be authorized whether or not the purpose is commercial" from the Preamble to RC 10.16 (Rev.); revises</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT IN PART</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN supports in particular the draft resolution replacing RC 5.11; adopting a consistent interpretation of pre-convention specimen should be a considerable aid to enforcement and implementation, and greatly reduce potential opportunities for abuse of the exemption</li> <li>SSN also strongly supports adding to RC 9.21 the requirement that quota proposals must provide the scientific basis for the proposed quota</li> <li>SSN supports all other proposed changes, except in the following cases:</li> <li>RC 4.6 (Rev. CoP12): if proposed changes adopted, existing requirement that Secretariat should communicate adopted resolutions and decisions to Parties should be retained</li> <li>RC 11.21: examples of specimen annotations under paragraph b(ii) provide useful clarification and should be retained, in corrected form if necessary</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 12.10 on guidelines for a procedure to register and monitor operations that breed Appendix-I animal species for commercial purposes states that Article VII, paragraph 5, applies only to not for profit transfers between two operations involved in a cooperative conservation program, but does not make clear what rules apply in other cases</li> <li>RC 11.11 on trade in plants, in reference to hybrid specimens, refers in paragraph (a) under DETERMINES to annotation °608, which no longer exists; the annotation text still appears next to the listing for Orchidaceae spp.</li> <li>RC 11.21 sets out rules governing the adoption, use and interpretation of annotations to the Appendices; text reflects presentation of the Appendices in use before CoP12</li> </ul>	<p>RC 12.10 to clarify that all Appendix I specimens not covered by Article VII paragraph 5 as indicated are to be traded in accordance with Article III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 11.11: replaces reference to annotation °608 with "(see the annotation to Orchidaceae spp. included in Appendix II)"</li> <li>RC 11.21: proposed editorial changes bring the Resolution in line with changes to the presentation of the Appendices; deletes examples of specimen annotations ("live animals, live plants, or specified parts or derivatives") in paragraph b(ii) under AGREES on grounds that they are misleading and perhaps unnecessary</li> </ul>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 19.1</p> <p>Leopard: export quota for Namibia</p> <p>Namibia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leopard, <i>Panthera pardus</i>, is on Appendix I</li> <li>Article III states that, for species on Appendix I, the Management Authority of the State of import shall issue an import permit only after the Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species</li> <li>RC 9.21 states that whenever the CoP has set an export quota for a species listed on Appendix I, this satisfies the requirements of Article III regarding the finding that the export and the import will not be detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the quota is not exceeded</li> <li>Namibia's annual CITES export quota for leopard has been 100 since 1992.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes to increase Namibia's annual CITES export quota for leopard to 250</li> <li>States that the proposed increase in the export quota is based on a 2003 leopard population estimate of 8,039 (5,469 – 10,610), and cites a study that indicates that an annual off-take of 5 percent of the population would be 'conservative and sustainable'</li> <li>5 percent of 8,039 would allow the annual off-take of 402 (273-531) leopards; however, Namibia is proposing a lower quota of 250 based on a 'worst case scenario' of the lowest leopard density recorded extrapolated over the known range of the species in Namibia, giving a population estimate of 5,185 leopards and permitting a 5 percent off-take of 259 leopards</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In proposing a scientifically-based export quota, the proponent has failed to take into account the off-take of leopards shot as 'problem animals' or unauthorized illegal killing</li> <li>According to the document, in 2003, 145 leopards were shot as 'problem animals' and 106 were 'trophy hunted', for a total of 251 leopards; this is an off-take of 4.8 percent, within the range of the 5 percent off-take (of 8039) the proponent considers to be 'conservative and sustainable'</li> <li>There is no evidence in the document that increasing the number of leopards 'trophy hunted' decreases the number shot as 'problem animals'; indeed, both numbers increased each year between 1998 and 2003 and the number of 'problem animals' killed annually increased significantly in the wake of each significant increase in trophy exports</li> <li>According to data in the working document, between 1997 and 2003, approximately 62 percent of the total number of leopard taken were shot as 'problem animals'; if the ratio of 'problem animal' to trophy kills remains constant, therefore, increasing the export quota to 250 would be expected to increase the total off-take to approximately 400 leopards, well above the 259 Namibia has proposed can be taken annually based on a 'worst case scenario'</li> <li>A precautionary approach would use the minimum population size, 5,469, to calculate 5% off-take; this would yield 273 animals total; considering that 62 percent of this figure (169 animals) should be allocated to 'problem animal' control, this means that the leopard export quota should not exceed 104</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 19.2</p> <p>Leopard: export quota for South Africa</p> <p>South Africa</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leopard, <i>Panthera pardus</i>, is on Appendix I</li> <li>Article III states that, for species on Appendix I, the Management Authority of the State of import shall issue an import permit only after the Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species</li> <li>RC 9.21 states that whenever the CoP has set an export quota for a species listed on Appendix I, this satisfies the requirements of Article III regarding the finding that the export and the import will not be detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the quota is not exceeded</li> <li>South Africa's annual CITES export quota for leopard has been 75 since 1992.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes to increase South Africa's annual CITES export quota for leopard to 150</li> <li>States that the total number of leopards in South Africa is not known, but is believed to be increasing, and provides estimates for three populations, including Kruger National Park, which in total have 1,350 leopards</li> <li>No justification is provided for the proposed increase in the export quota, except that the quota is too low to adequately address demand</li> <li>States that approximately 100 leopards are killed as 'problem animals' each year</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not provide a scientific justification for an increase in the export quota</li> <li>A similar proposal from Namibia cites a study that indicates that an annual off-take of 5 percent of the population would be 'conservative and sustainable'</li> <li>5 percent of the minimum known number of leopards in South Africa, which is 1,350 leopards, would allow for the annual off-take of 67 animals, a number that is smaller than the current export quota</li> <li>It would appear that the current level of annual off-take is approximately 175 leopards (100 as 'problem animals' and 75 as trophies); this represents about 13 percent of the minimum known number of leopards in South Africa (1,350), and far exceeds the 5 percent off-take considered by some to be 'conservative and sustainable'</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 19.3</p> <p>Black rhinoceros:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Black rhino, <i>Diceros bicornis</i>, is on Appendix I and is listed as Critically Endangered (IUCN 2003)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes an annual export quota to Namibia for five <i>D. bicornis</i> hunting trophies</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critically Endangered species should be managed so as to utilize all the genetic variability available</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
export quota for Namibia  Namibia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The population in the wild declined by over 90 percent in sixty years reaching a low of 2410 in 1995; better protection has allowed the population to increase to 3100 (IUCN 2003) but this figure is very low compared to estimated population of 65,000 in 1970; much greater population increases will be needed before long-term viability of the species is assured</li> <li>There are 1134 black rhino in Namibia, all of the subspecies <i>D. b. bicornis</i></li> <li>Threats include poaching for the international rhino horn trade; horns are used for traditional Chinese medicine and for ornamental purposes (carved handles for ceremonial daggers worn in some Middle East countries)</li> <li>Article III states that, for species on Appendix I, the Management Authority of the State of import shall issue an import permit only after the Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species</li> <li>RC 9.21 states that whenever the CoP has set an export quota for a species listed on Appendix I, this satisfies the requirements of Article III regarding the finding that the export and the import will not be detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the quota is not exceeded</li> <li>The CoP has not set export quotas for this species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current population estimate for black rhino (<i>D. bicornis bicornis</i>) in Namibia is 1134; the population is increasing at a rate of at least 5 percent per year</li> <li>Namibia intensively manages its black rhino populations with the goal of increasing the number of rhinos, including by creating female-biased populations, which are more productive; this management strategy results in a 'surplus' of males (animals that can no longer contribute effectively to a viable breeding population or whose presence adversely affects the breeding performance of populations)</li> <li>Removal of 'surplus males', particularly 'post-reproductive males', through controlled hunting would be sustainable and all revenue would be reinvested in conservation programs through a government trust fund</li> </ul>	the genetic variability available <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removal of animals from the breeding pool through trophy hunting or other consumptive uses will reduce the gene pool and reduce specimens available for reintroduction efforts</li> <li>Despite the presence of 'surplus males' in Namibia, the subspecies <i>D. bicornis bicornis</i> exists in other range States where their numbers are greatly reduced (South Africa, where there are 50) (International Rhino Foundation 2002) or where the subspecies has gone extinct (Angola and Botswana) (<i>ibid</i>), and where additional genetic material may be important</li> <li>Allowing export of rhino trophies, including horn, will send a confusing message to the public that it is acceptable to export rhino horn for sport, but not for medicinal or traditional ceremonial purposes and may increase threats to the Critically Endangered subspecies <i>D. bicornis longipes</i></li> </ul>
CoP13 Doc. 19.4  Black rhinoceros: export quota for South Africa  South Africa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Black rhino, <i>Diceros bicornis</i>, is on Appendix I and is listed as Critically Endangered (IUCN 2003)</li> <li>The population in the wild declined by over 90 percent in sixty years reaching a low of 2410 in 1995; better protection has allowed the population to increase to 3100 (IUCN 2003) but this figure is very low compared to estimated population of 65,000 in 1970; much greater population increases will be needed before long-term viability of the species is assured</li> <li>There are 1179 black rhino in South Africa; 1094 of those in South Africa are of the subspecies <i>D. b. minor</i> (2002, International Rhino Foundation)</li> <li>Threats include poaching for the international rhino horn trade; horns are used for traditional Chinese medicine and for ornamental purposes (carved handles for ceremonial daggers worn in some Middle East countries)</li> <li>Article III states that, for species on Appendix I, the Management Authority of the State of import shall issue an import permit only after the Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species</li> <li>RC 9.21 states that whenever the CoP has set an export quota for a species listed on Appendix I, this satisfies the requirements of Article III regarding the finding that the export and the import will not be detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the quota is not exceeded</li> <li>The CoP has not set export quotas for this species</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes an annual export quota to South Africa for ten <i>D. bicornis minor</i> hunting trophies</li> <li>The population of black rhino in South Africa is increasing at a rate of 6.7 percent per year</li> <li>South Africa intensively manages its black rhino populations with the goal of increasing the number of rhinos, including by creating female-biased populations, which are more productive; this management strategy results in a 'surplus' of males (animals that can no longer contribute effectively to a viable breeding population or whose presence adversely affects the breeding performance of populations); only adult males that meet one of several criteria, such as that they are 'post-reproductive', would be hunted</li> <li>Revenue is expected to result in better protection and management of the species</li> </ul>	<b>OPPOSE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Critically Endangered species should be managed so as to utilize all the genetic variability available</li> <li>Removal of animals from the breeding pool through trophy hunting or other consumptive uses will reduce the gene pool and reduce specimens available for reintroduction efforts</li> <li>Despite the presence of 'surplus males' in South Africa, the subspecies <i>D. bicornis minor</i> exists in other range States where their numbers are greatly reduced or where the subspecies has gone extinct, and where additional genetic material may be important: extant populations exist in Malawi (7 individuals), Swaziland (10), Tanzania (16), and Zimbabwe (524, although this is a 2002 estimate and the number may have been greatly reduced in recent years) (2002, International Rhino Foundation); populations once existed in Mozambique, Angola, Botswana and Zambia (<i>ibid</i>)</li> <li>Allowing export of rhino horn trophies will send a confusing message to the public that it is acceptable to export rhino horn for sport, but not for medicinal or traditional ceremonial purposes and may increase threats to the Critically Endangered subspecies <i>D. bicornis longipes</i></li> </ul>
CoP13 Doc. 20  Trade in vicuña cloth  CITES Secretariat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paragraph (b) of RC 11.6, regarding trade in vicuña cloth, recommends that any State that is a member of the Convenio para la Conservación y Manejo de la Vicuña (Vicuña Convention) that exports vicuña cloth should "inform the Secretariat on an annual basis about the quantity of products exported, the number of animals sheared and the local populations to which they belong"</li> <li>Paragraph (a) of RC 11.6 recommends that Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides information from Argentina, Bolivia, Chile and Peru required in RC 11.6</li> <li>Secretariat recommends that RC 11.16 be repealed or that paragraph (b) be deleted because the information requested could be incorporated into annual reports</li> <li>Peru recommended the Secretariat: a) request information from Italy on export permits for vicuña products received and vicuña products re-exported; b) prepare a report on all</li> </ul>	<b>SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN supports Peru's recommendations to the Secretariat; the Secretariat should assist Parties to better implement the Convention when requested to do so; Peru's recommendations will lead to better overall trade control of vicuña wool, cloth and products; the Vicuña Convention cannot act alone on this matter; bilateral discussions between Peru and Italy would not yield the comprehensive results required to improve implementation of the Convention regarding trade</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>Authorities authorize the import of vicuña cloth only if the reverse bears the logotype corresponding to the country of origin and the trade mark VICUÑA-PAIS DE ORIGEN or if it is cloth containing pre-Convention wool of vicuña</p>	<p>export permits issued for vicuña wool, cloth and manufactured products, indicating the commercial brand marks used; and c) explore whether commercialised products of vicuña fibre, except for cloth, are using the mark VICUÑA-PAIS DE ORIGEN and are indicating the composition in percentage of vicuña fibre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secretariat recommends that Peru recommendation (a) be implemented on a bilateral basis and that Peru recommendations (b) and (c) be addressed in the Vicuña Convention</li> </ul>	<p>in vicuña wool, cloth and products</p> <p><b>OPPOSE THE FOLLOWING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN does not support the Secretariat's recommendation that RC 11.6 be repealed or that paragraph (b) of the Resolution be deleted; RC 11.6 paragraph (a) contains an important trade regulatory measure and paragraph (b) allows COPs to review trade in vicuña specimens; while trade information is already included in annual reports, such reports are not reviewed by COPs; RC 11.6 supports efforts under the Vicuña Convention to control trade</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 22</p> <p>National laws for implementation of the Convention</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 8.4 sets out four minimum requirements for CITES implementing legislation</li> <li>Under the National Legislation Project, implementing legislation has been analyzed and categorized</li> <li>Decisions at CoP11 grouped Parties according to when legislation was analyzed, its category and the volume of CITES trade; each group was given a different deadline by which to enact legislation</li> <li>At the 46<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee, Parties were required to submit legislation plans by certain deadlines</li> <li>Deadlines have been adjusted according to progress; some Parties have been subject to recommended trade suspensions for non-compliance, others have complied, others are in process of enacting legislation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides for continuation of the National Legislation Project, enabling the Secretariat to analyze legislation, revise categories and provide technical advice</li> <li>Sets deadline of SC53 for Parties with uncategorized legislation to provide copies; and a three-month deadline after the Convention comes into force for new Parties to provide copies of their legislation</li> <li>Requires Parties in categories 2 and 3 to indicate progress by SC53</li> <li>Requires Nigeria and Paraguay to enact legislation by SC53</li> <li>Sets a deadline of 30 Sept 2006 by which Parties and dependent territories without a deadline should enact legislation</li> <li>Provides for compliance measures, including suspension of trade in CITES-listed species, and Secretariat reporting to the Standing Committee and the CoP</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The National Legislation Project has made steady progress since CoP11, although repeated adjustments of deadlines give cause for concern</li> <li>The Secretariat and Standing Committee should be urged not to adjust deadlines further, particularly for Parties whose legislation was analyzed in phases 1 and 2 of the project</li> <li>Parties should consider bringing forward to 31 December 2005 the deadline by which Parties and dependent territories without a deadline should enact legislation</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 23</p> <p>Enforcement matters</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This generalized document replaces the Secretariat's Report on Alleged Infractions that was prepared for Parties until CoP11 when the Secretariat changed the format</li> <li>Document notes that CITES Enforcement Expert Group, meeting in US in February 2004, considered "there are serious shortcomings in the enforcement of the Convention"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draws attention to RC 10.3, which recommends that Parties not accept export permits from Parties which have not designated a Scientific Authority</li> <li>Distributes statement and recommendations of CITES Enforcement Expert Group</li> <li>Provides guidance on submission of enforcement-related information by the public and NGOs to the Secretariat</li> <li>Requires Parties to submit to the Secretariat by 31 May 2005, via a form to be distributed, contact details for national wildlife law enforcement agencies</li> <li>Provides for reporting on compliance with this requirement</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN believes that the document should be amended to include language to improve efficiency of communication of enforcement-related information</li> <li>Does not address all recommendations of CITES Enforcement Expert Group; in order to do this, Secretariat's draft Decisions need to be adopted together with Kenya's proposed amendments to RC 11.3</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 24</p> <p>Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.3 on Compliance and enforcement</p> <p>Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 12.88 directs the Secretariat to convene a meeting of experts to: identify measures to improve the flow of enforcement-related data to and from relevant international, regional and national law enforcement organizations, CITES Management Authorities and the CITES Secretariat; to assist the coordination of investigations regarding violations of the Convention; and to help maintain appropriate levels of confidentiality regarding law enforcement information. Decision 12.89 directs the Secretariat to report to the Standing Committee on the outcome of the meeting, so that recommendations may be made for consideration at CoP13</li> <li>The meeting of the CITES law enforcement expert group occurred 2-6 February 2004 in Shepherdstown, USA and a number of recommendations made, many of which are not addressed by RC 11.3 on compliance and enforcement</li> <li>RC 11.3 also does not address other ways to improve compliance with the Convention including requiring Parties to prepare national plans and encouraging participation in</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amends RC 11.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommends that all Parties: "recognize the seriousness of illegal trade in wild fauna and flora and identify it as a matter of high priority for their national law enforcement agencies; formulate national action plans, incorporating timetables, targets and provisions for funding, designed to enhance enforcement of CITES, achieve compliance with its provisions, and support wildlife law enforcement agencies; provide wildlife law enforcement officials with parity in training, status and authority with their counterparts in Customs and police"</li> <li>Directs the Secretariat to use funds for: "the provision of enforcement related information to Parties through CITES Alerts, the TIGERS database (Trade Infraction and Global Enforcement Recording System), and detailed Reports on Alleged Infractions to meetings of the Conference of the Parties using the format agreed in Decision 10.122"</li> <li>Recommends that: "Parties, as a matter of urgency inform the Secretariat of contact details of their relevant</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN agrees that illegal wildlife trafficking should be given more attention at the highest levels and believes the proposed amendments would make a substantial and important contribution to strengthening the enforcement and effective implementation of the Convention</li> <li>Concerning the proposed expansion of the CITES Tiger Enforcement Task Force, SSN supports this as a long-term goal. However, since the existing Task Force is experiencing funding and communication problems and has been unable to fulfill its expanded remit to include all Asian big cat species, SSN recommends that the Secretariat as a matter of priority should draw up, in consultation with Task Force members, for consideration by the Standing Committee, a work plan and funding proposal to enable implementation of the current remit, with a view to further expansion in the future</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>regional law enforcement bodies (e.g. Lusaka Agreement)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 9.31 directs the Secretariat to provide reports on infractions to each CoP. Between 1987 and 1997, the Secretariat compiled a detailed Report of Alleged Infractions, made available at each CoP. Decision 10.122 directed the Secretariat to make a distinction in future reports between alleged infractions of the provisions of the Convention and non-compliance with provisions in CoP Resolutions. Since CoP10, details on alleged infractions has not been included in the report</li> </ul>	<p>national law enforcement agencies responsible for investigating illegal trafficking in wild fauna and flora; Parties work together within their regions to develop appropriate mechanisms for cooperation and coordination between wildlife law enforcement agencies at a regional level; the remit of the CITES Tiger Enforcement Task Force be expanded to encompass illegal trade in specimens of other species, focusing initially but not exclusively on species in Appendix I; [and] Parties that have not already done so consider nominating officials from relevant national enforcement agencies to participate in the Interpol Wildlife Crime Working Group”</p> <p>“Urges the Parties, inter-governmental and non-governmental organization to provide, as a matter of urgency, funds and expertise to enable enforcement-related training or the provision of training materials, focusing on developing countries and countries with economies in transition, preferably on a regional or sub-regional basis, and provide funds to ensure that wildlife law enforcement personnel in such countries are adequately trained and equipped”</p> <p>“Urges ICPO-Interpol to: appoint a dedicated officer specializing in wildlife crime within the ICPO-Interpol General Secretariat in Lyon, France; support the attendance of a representative from the Interpol Wildlife Crime Working Group at meetings of the Conference of the Parties to CITES; and take steps to establish an international association of wildlife law enforcement officers to assist with the dissemination of technical advice and information to wildlife law enforcement staff”</p>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 25</p> <p>Guidelines on compliance with the Convention</p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In CoP12 Doc. 26, the Secretariat proposed to draft a set of Guidelines on Compliance with the Convention for consideration by the Standing Committee</li> <li>SC 50 Doc. 27 presents the second draft of these Guidelines, incorporating comments and suggestions submitted by Parties</li> <li>Although in need of further work, this second draft is broadly reflective of existing CITES compliance mechanisms</li> <li>SC 50 did not agree the draft and established a closed working group to recommend a process for negotiating the Guidelines</li> <li>SC 50 decided to continue the closed working group as the “nucleus” of an inter-sessional working group to develop the Guidelines, in which other Parties, non-Parties, observers and NGOs could participate, with a view to adoption at CoP14</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tables SC 50 Doc. 27 for discussion at CoP13, taking into account SC 50 recommendations and deliberations of the inter-sessional Working Group on compliance</li> <li>Requests that the CoP provides an opportunity for a substantive, open discussion and negotiation, ideally with a view to adopting the Guidelines</li> <li>Suggests a Compliance Working Group could work under the auspices of CoP13 and if necessary, continue after the conference</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>SUPPORT, IN PART</b></li> <li>SSN supports in principle an open and transparent process, and an exchange of views at CoP13 could be useful</li> <li>However, an open-ended working group under the auspices of the CoP, to continue after the conference, could prove unwieldy and unproductive</li> <li>CITES already has a compliance system that has evolved through resolutions, decisions and practice and therefore differs from other multilateral environmental agreements that have developed detailed procedures shortly after entering into force</li> <li>The Guidelines on Compliance are attempting to reverse-engineer an existing system and risk weakening it substantially if negotiations are pushed too fast, particularly considering the misunderstandings of the system that seem to exist</li> <li>A more productive way forward would be to suspend negotiations on the Guidelines and request the Secretariat in cooperation with the Standing Committee to prepare an explanatory guide to the existing CITES compliance mechanisms citing case studies and results</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>CoP13 Doc. 26</p> <p>Conservation of and trade in great apes</p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All great ape species are listed on Appendix I</li> <li>Sumatran orang-utan, <i>Pongo pygmaeus abelii</i>, and three populations of gorilla are classified as Critically Endangered by IUCN; the other species and sub-species of great apes are classified as Endangered; almost all populations continue to decline drastically</li> <li>The Great Ape Survival Project (GRASP)—a WSSD Type II Partnership led by UNEP and UNESCO—seeks to bring world-wide attention to the ape crisis, raise funds for conservation, and develop a global conservation strategy for all great ape populations</li> <li>NOTE: Proponents are aware that parts of the draft resolution overlap with existing resolutions on Appendix I species, and suggest adopting a draft decision directing the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing Committee, to examine all species-specific Resolutions concerning Appendix I species with a view to preparing a consolidated Resolution concerning the enforcement of trade controls in all Appendix I species for consideration at the 14th Conference of the Parties</li> </ul>	<p>Draft Resolution:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urges Parties to adopt and implement legislation to protect great apes, including prohibition of commercial trade, with deterrent penalties; to strengthen enforcement; to eliminate sales of great ape meat; and to refrain from using great apes as diplomatic gifts</li> <li>Directs the Secretariat to work with Parties and GRASP on measures to reduce and ultimately eliminate illegal trade in great apes; to assist Range States in preparing and implementing National Great Ape Survival Plans with measures aimed at eliminating illegal trade; and, with GRASP, to prepare guidelines for the proper shipment and disposal of confiscated great ape specimens</li> <li>Directs the Standing Committee to review the implementation of this Resolution; to consider other measures including technical missions, organized with GRASP; and to report to each CoP</li> <li>Urges the Secretariat, Standing and Animals Committees to work closely with GRASP, and to develop other ways that CITES can contribute to conserving great apes and to increase public awareness of the threat posed by illegal trade</li> <li>Urges all Range States, other Parties and relevant organizations to join GRASP</li> <li>Calls upon all Parties to agreements such as the CBD and CMS to co-operate with GRASP</li> <li>Calls upon all governments and relevant organizations to assist in conserving great apes and stopping their illegal trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN supports adoption of the draft Resolution and agrees with proponents that conservation of great apes is an urgent matter</li> <li>Working with relevant NGOs and with GRASP provides an opportunity for Parties to benefit from technical expertise outside their individual governments. It also promotes synergy among CITES and other bodies dealing with this issue</li> <li>SSN believes that great ape range States should ban the use of great apes as diplomatic gifts</li> <li>However, SSN does not agree with the suggestion to adopt a Decision directing the Secretariat to prepare a consolidated resolution concerning enforcement and trade controls in all Appendix I species for consideration at CoP14; it is important to retain species-specific resolutions in order to make it easier to call political and public attention to the plight of particular species, such as the tiger, and address species-specific enforcement issues; SSN would support efforts to develop a properly funded enforcement program directed at illegal trade in Appendix I species, including the adequate funding and implementation of existing programs such as that directed at tigers</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 28</p> <p>Conservation of and trade in Asian big cats</p> <p>Secretariat on its own behalf and on behalf of the Standing Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 12.30 directs each range State to consider ways in which local communities might be encouraged to play a part in, and benefit from, the conservation of Asian big cats and their habitats, for example through eco-tourism, and directs range States to prepare a report on its approach to this matter for the 49<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee, so that concepts and initiatives can be shared among relevant Parties</li> <li>Decision 12.31 directs the Standing Committee to continue to review the progress in range and consumer States that were earlier subject to CITES Technical and Political Missions to ensure that recommendations made by the Missions continue to be implemented</li> <li>Decision 12.32 directs the Standing Committee to report at CoP13 upon the progress made by the range and consumer States of Asian big cat species, including recommendations regarding appropriate measures where no progress has been made</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports on the work of the Secretariat and the Standing Committee including: at their 49<sup>th</sup> and 50<sup>th</sup> meetings, the Standing Committee discussed reports received in relation to Decision 12.30; reports were received from thirteen Parties were discussed at Standing Committee meetings; the Secretariat is awaiting additional reports and will update CoP13 on this issue</li> <li>The Secretariat and the Standing Committee note that killing and illegal trade in Asian big cats remains a significant problem; the Secretariat identified establishment of specialized enforcement units and greater support for enforcement in general as being the two most important issues to address</li> <li>All relevant Parties were considered by the Standing Committee to have made progress and so the Committee did not consider it necessary to make recommendations in terms of Decision 12.32</li> <li>The CITES Tiger Mission Technical Team visited Thailand and expressed concerns about facilities registered as “zoological gardens” that are actually places of “public entertainment”; the Team expressed concern about “recent violations of the Convention where illicit trade in specimens of CITES-listed species, including some highly endangered Appendix I species, has occurred where the trade purported to be of a scientific nature but had significant commercial aspects”; the Team recommended that “the fraudulent or improper acquisition by zoos of specimens of CITES-listed species, particularly those in Appendix I, should be a matter of concern to the Convention”; in particular, the Team</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN agrees that establishing specialized enforcement units and increased support for enforcement are important to combating ongoing poaching and illegal trade; however, SSN is concerned that the international community has failed to provide adequate financial support for such efforts</li> <li>SSN is concerned that India has failed to establish an effective and meaningful specialized enforcement unit, and that India, Nepal and China have failed to undertake joint and meaningful action against cross-border trade in tiger and leopard skins</li> <li>With regard to trade in Appendix I specimens for zoos, SSN is concerned that such imports do occur and supports the Secretariat’s suggestion that a Notification be sent to Parties reminding them about the guidance on provided in RC 5.10</li> <li>SSN also agrees with the Secretariat that the evaluation of whether an import for commercial purposes must be carried out on a case-by-case basis; imports for zoos are not always non-commercial and it would not improve matters to define “zoo” within the CITES context</li> <li>SSN agrees that activities by unscrupulous animal dealers cannot effectively be addressed through registration of dealers</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		recommended that additional guidance be incorporated into RC 5.10 and the usefulness of registration of wildlife dealers who facilitate the acquisition of specimens for "zoos" should be examined	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 29.4</p> <p>Illegal ivory trade and control of internal markets</p> <p>Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Market surveys and ivory seizure data have demonstrated that there is ongoing and substantial illegal international trade in elephant ivory, as well as domestic markets and carving industries</li> <li>Regarding control of internal ivory trade, RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) recommends to those Parties in whose jurisdiction there is an ivory carving industry that is not yet structured, organized or controlled and to those Parties designated as ivory importing countries, that comprehensive internal legislative, regulatory and enforcement measures be adopted to: a) register or license all importers, manufacturers, wholesalers and retailers dealing in raw, semi-worked or worked ivory products; b) establish a nationwide procedure, particularly in retail outlets, informing tourists and other non-nationals that they should not purchase ivory in cases where it is illegal for them to import it into their home countries; and c) introduce recording and inspection procedures to enable the Management Authority and other appropriate government agencies to monitor the flow of ivory within the State, particularly by means of: i) compulsory trade controls over raw ivory; and ii) a comprehensive and demonstrably effective reporting and enforcement system for worked ivory. The Resolution urges the Secretariat, where possible, to assist Parties in improving these legislative, regulatory and enforcement measures and directs the Standing Committee to undertake a regular review of actions taken by consumer States to improve legislation and enforcement measures and to report the results at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties.</li> <li>Decision 12.39 directed the Secretariat to assess whether ten Parties with active internal ivory markets (Cameroon, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Japan, Nigeria, Thailand, Uganda and the United States of America) have established the comprehensive internal legislative, regulatory and enforcement measures specified in RC 10.10 (Rev.) regarding control of internal ivory trade: the Secretariat provided the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee with its assessment, which identified problems in all countries and indicated considerable work remains</li> <li>The 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee considered a Work Plan that proposed to halt domestic sales of ivory in African countries (except Zimbabwe), introduction of legislation where necessary, work with law enforcement and border control agencies, public awareness campaigns and <i>in situ</i> verification missions, and decided this will form the basis of discussions at the African elephant range States dialog meeting prior to CoP13</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes to amend RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) including by recommending that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Parties in Africa and other Parties not designated as ivory importing countries: a) halt all domestic sales of raw and worked ivory; b) where necessary, introduce legislation making domestic sale of ivory illegal; c) issue instructions to all law enforcement and border control agencies to enforce existing or new legislation rigorously; and d) engage in public awareness campaigns publicizing existing or new bans on ivory sales</li> <li>Parties designated as ivory importing countries: restrict ivory imports to registered government-owned stocks of raw ivory marked in accordance with this Resolution (excluding seized ivory and ivory of unknown origin) in countries whose elephant populations are listed in Appendix II and from which exports have been approved by the CoP, and hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, and should have monitoring procedures that allow them to trace worked ivory back to the tusk or piece of raw ivory and the country from which it originated</li> <li>Parties with elephant populations on Appendix II: introduce computerized procedures for registering and recording government-owned stocks of raw ivory and enable all worked ivory on sale in designated importing countries to be traced back to the tusk or piece of raw ivory and the country from which it originated</li> <li>Parties that have been designated as ivory importing countries and those involved in illegal ivory trade: take measures to prevent illegal export, transit and import of ivory; ensure that wildlife law enforcement agencies provide information on incidents of illegal ivory trade to Interpol, the CITES Secretariat and other relevant authorities, and are responsive and act on information provided to them about illegal trade; develop mechanisms for cooperation and coordination between law enforcement agencies at the national and international level; and provide the necessary political and financial support to their wildlife law enforcement agencies</li> <li>Parties whose elephant populations are listed on Appendix II set zero quotas for exports of raw and worked ivory, except raw ivory exported as hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, for a period of twenty years following the conditional sale of registered ivory stocks agreed at CoP12</li> </ul> </li> <li>Provides a draft decision that directs the Secretariat to identify Parties in addition to those identified in Decision 12.39, that may not have established the comprehensive internal legislative, regulatory and enforcement measures specified in RC 10.10 (Rev.) regarding control of internal ivory trade; for these Parties, as well as Parties wishing to be designated as 'ivory importing countries', the Secretariat would undertake 'on-site missions' to determine compliance with RC 10.10 (Rev.), giving priority to those parties that wish to export registered stocks of government-owned ivory</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prohibition of domestic ivory trade would contribute to the reduction of illegal trade and illegal killing of elephants</li> <li>Computerized procedures are urgently needed in order to assist in distinguishing legal from illegal ivory</li> <li>The term 'designated ivory importing countries' should be clearly defined; any Party designated as an ivory importing country should be subject to a verification mission each time it seeks permission to import ivory through a CITES-approved process</li> <li>This document reflects a global concern with regard to unregulated or poorly controlled ivory markets; research carried out in the USA, the EU, and the UK in recent years indicates that this is not an African or Asian problem alone, but a widespread problem in consumer markets</li> <li>A lengthy ivory trade moratorium would simplify the tightening up of controls on internal ivory markets; in addition, the suggestion that Parties should undertake consumer education programmes should be supported: since CoP10, the message to consumers and traders has been confusing and this situation is likely to continue if proposals to trade ivory are continually submitted</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>and 'ivory importing countries' with apparently high levels of illegal trade and active internal ivory markets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a draft decision that directs the Standing Committee to consider the results of the 'on-site missions' and only designate a Party as an 'ivory importing country', or only allow the sale of registered government-owned stocks of ivory from Botswana, Namibia or South Africa, if their legislative, regulatory and enforcement measures enable them to comply with RC 10.10 (Rev.)</li> <li>• Provides a draft decision that calls on ivory importing countries, donors and organizations to provide financial and technical support to strengthen the implementation of RC 10.10 (Rev.)</li> </ul>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 29.5</p> <p>Conditions for the export of registered stocks of ivory in the annotation to the Appendix II listing of populations of <i>Loxodonta africana</i> in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa</p> <p>Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most populations of the African elephant, <i>Loxodonta africana</i>, are on Appendix I; those of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa, and Zimbabwe are on Appendix II</li> <li>• At CoP12, the Parties agreed that Botswana, Namibia and South Africa may export certain quantities of stockpiled ivory in a one-off sale, subject to certain conditions; elaboration on some of those conditions was directed to the Standing Committee at CoP12</li> <li>• Decision 12.33 directed the Standing Committee by its 49<sup>th</sup> meeting to define, in consultation with the MIKE (Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants) Central Coordinating Unit and the IUCN, "the geographical scope and the nature of the data that constitute the baseline information from MIKE that must be provided before any exports can be approved"; the Standing Committee agreed to require the following information from a subset of the African and Asian MIKE sites: 1) at least one population survey; 2) levels of killing derived from a minimum of: 12-months data from African sites and six-months data from Asian sites; 3) a descriptive report of the patterns of influencing factors; 4) an assessment of the effort made in providing the illegal killing information; and 5) a preliminary baseline analysis of the above information</li> <li>• Decision 12.34 directed the Standing Committee to, "determine how it would conclude that a detrimental impact on other elephant populations had occurred as a result of approved trade in ivory"; the Standing Committee agreed: a) the reporting and monitoring procedures already in place in MIKE and ETIS will provide the Secretariat and Standing Committee with information on rates and levels of illegal hunting and trade in elephant specimens; b) the Secretariat will work with the Parties that report an increase in illegal hunting of elephants or illegal trade in elephant specimens to establish the veracity of such reports and the linkage, if any, to the commercial trade in raw ivory; c) the Secretariat will report to the Chairman of the Standing Committee and to the Parties concerned and will formulate recommendations, taking a precautionary approach acting in the best interests of conservation; d) if the Standing Committee concludes that there has been an increase in either illegal hunting of elephants or illegal trade in elephant specimens owing to the commercial trade, it will recommend that international trade in all specimens referred to in the annotation in the Appendices regarding the <i>Loxodonta africana</i> populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa be halted.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regarding Decision 12.33, provides a draft Decision, directed to the Secretariat, that amends the Standing Committee text regarding baseline information required [underlined text is different from that agreed by the Standing Committee, other agreed text remains the same]: 1) <u>at least one population survey not older than three years from sites where reliable population estimates existed before introduction of the MIKE program and two population surveys from sites where no such data exist</u>; 2) <u>trends in illegal killing derived from a minimum of two years data</u>; 3) <u>statistical analysis of the patterns of influencing factors and their relationship to trends in illegal killing</u></li> <li>• Regarding Decision 12.34, provides a draft Decision, directed to the Secretariat [underlined text is different from that agreed by the Standing Committee, other agreed text remains the same]: b) <u>as soon as possible after the 13<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and following the determination by the Standing Committee that the conditions have been met for the trade in registered raw ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa, the Secretariat will issue Notifications to the Parties requesting information on any increase in illegal hunting of elephants or illegal trade in elephant specimens since the 12th Conference of the Parties, and on possible non-compliance with the conditions of the trade in registered raw ivory by the exporting or importing countries. Parties will be given 60 days to respond to the second Notification</u>; c) <u>the Standing Committee will appoint independent experts to work with all Parties concerned to establish the veracity of such reports. The independent experts will consider whether any increase in illegal killing or illegal trade could be correlated with the decisions made by the Conference of the Parties and the Standing Committee to allow commercial trade in raw ivory and formulate recommendations to the Standing Committee, taking a precautionary approach acting in the best interests of conservation</u>; d) if the Standing Committee concludes that there has been an increase in either illegal hunting of elephants or illegal trade in elephant specimens which may be correlated with the commercial trade, <u>or non-compliance by an importing or exporting country with any of the conditions for trade</u>, it will recommend that international trade in all specimens referred to in the annotation in the Appendices regarding the <i>Loxodonta africana</i> populations of Botswana, Namibia, and South Africa be halted. Furthermore, the Standing Committee will request the</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <p>Regarding Decision 12.33</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Two sets of data are needed to establish a baseline</li> <li>• As it has been acknowledged that it is impossible to establish a causal link between CITES decisions and illegal killing or trade, SSN supports the suggestion that a statistical analysis of the patterns of influencing factors, which would be more objective than a descriptive report, should be required</li> </ul> <p>Regarding Decision 12.34</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suggested draft decision provides necessary guidance on how information on illegal killing and trade can be collected from Parties and would ensure that the available information is interpreted by independent experts</li> <li>• In order to give meaning to the safety mechanisms established at CoP12, a mechanism needs to be established in case of non-compliance in importing or exporting countries</li> <li>• A 60-day reporting period, during which Parties can submit information relating to increases in illegal killing or trade, will assist in implementing this Decision so that trade can be 'halted' in the event of non-compliance or detrimental impacts</li> <li>• A number of Parties have expressed concerns over the lack of clarity in the conditions attached to the CoP12 ivory trade proposals; at both the 49th and 50th meetings of the Standing Committee Kenya presented a comprehensive set of suggestions as to how the language in these conditions could be clarified and interpreted; this document is a third attempt achieve the necessary clarity</li> <li>• This document reflects a global concern with regard to unregulated or poorly controlled ivory markets; research carried out in the USA, the EU, and the UK in recent years indicates that this is not an African or Asian problem alone, but a widespread problem in consumer markets</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>Furthermore, the Standing Committee will request the Depository Government to propose, at the following meeting of the Conference of the Parties, that all Appendix II populations of this species be transferred to Appendix I; and e) the Secretariat should, to ensure transparency and assist decision-making, make available on its website information relating to paragraph b) above</p>	<p>Depository Government to propose, at the following meeting of the Conference of the Parties, that all Appendix II populations of this species be transferred to Appendix I; e) the Secretariat should, to ensure transparency and assist decision-making, make available on its website information relating to <u>paragraph c)</u> above</p>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 30</p> <p>Conservation of and trade in rhinoceros</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 9.14 (Rev.) strongly urges all range States of rhinoceros species to submit a report to the Secretariat six months prior to each CoP detailing population status, illegal hunting, illegal trade, law enforcement activities and monitoring programs, development and implementation of national legislation and national conservation action plans, and status of marking, registration and control of rhino horn stocks</li> <li>• RC 9.14 (Rev.) directs the Secretariat to develop a standard format for these reports, to evaluate the reports, and to submit a written summary of these for consideration at each CoP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secretariat states that no reports from range States were received; Secretariat has sent a reminder to range States and will report verbally on the outcome at CoP13</li> <li>• Secretariat notes that it expressed doubt about the value of RC 9.14 (Rev.) at CoP12 and recommended that it be repealed; Secretariat reiterates the recommendation to repeal the Resolution or, at least, to delete the paragraph starting with STRONGLY URGES and the second one starting with DIRECTS that follows it</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 9.14 (Rev.) should not be repealed because it is important for rhinoceros conservation; efforts should be made to improve compliance with the Resolution rather than to repeal it</li> <li>• Rhinoceros conservation should continue to receive special attention through this species-specific resolution; it is one of the clearest examples of illegal trade driving a species to the brink of extinction</li> <li>• If RC 9.14 (Rev.) is amended as suggested by the Secretariat, there would appear to be no reporting to CoPs on range States efforts regarding conservation of and trade in rhinoceros</li> <li>• Urging Parties to gather and analyze data on populations and trade may help to keep the profile of the species high on national agendas</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 31</p> <p>Conservation of and trade in Tibetan antelope</p> <p>CITES Secretariat, on its own behalf and that of the Standing Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC11.2 (Rev. CoP12), regarding conservation of and control of trade in Tibetan antelope, directs the Secretariat to report to the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee on implementation of the Resolution; the Standing Committee is directed to review the report and report to CoP13</li> <li>• Decision 12.40 directs the Secretariat, subject to available funding, to “undertake an enforcement-needs assessment mission to China to provide technical assistance regarding anti-poaching issues and combating the smuggling of wool, and organize a workshop in China to provide training for enforcement personnel involved in anti-poaching and anti-smuggling of Tibetan antelope wool in 2003”</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reports that the Secretariat undertook the work under Decision 12.40 and reported the results to the Standing Committee</li> <li>• Reports that the Secretariat submitted its report about the work undertaken under Decision 12.40 to China, Bhutan, India, Nepal and Pakistan; China responded in detail; Secretariat will report verbally at CoP13 on other responses received</li> <li>• Secretariat reports that new legislation in the State of Jammu and Kashmir in India to address the processing and trade in wool of the Tibetan antelope appears not to be enforced; Secretariat recommends that RC 11.2 (Rev. CoP12) be amended to include the following text at the end of paragraph (a) under URGES, “and, in particular, that the State of Jammu and Kashmir in India halts the processing of such wool and the manufacture of shatoosh products”</li> <li>• Secretariat recommends the deletion of paragraphs (b) and (c) under DIRECTS in RC 11.2 (Rev. CoP12), which refer to reports due to past meetings of the Standing Committee and CoP13, since they have now been complied with</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN supports continued efforts to address this issue</li> <li>• Rather than eliminate paragraphs (b) and (c) under DIRECTS in RC 11.2 (Rev. CoP12), these should be revised to require reports on implementation of the Resolution to future meetings of the Standing Committee and CoPs</li> <li>• India's opinion should be sought on the text proposed to be added to the end of paragraph (a) under URGES</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 32</p> <p>Conservation of <i>Saiga tatarica</i></p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Saiga tatarica</i> was included in Appendix II at CoP9 (1994); the species is Critically Endangered (IUCN 2003)</li> <li>• The population numbered over 1 million in the early 1990s, but declined to 178,000 by 2000; the primary causes of the decline are excessive legal and illegal hunting, illegal trade in horns and other products, and habitat destruction and degradation, including migration barriers</li> <li>• The species was considered in the Significant Trade Review process, resulting in a recommendation from the 45<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee (2001) to suspend trade from Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation; these two Parties had already voluntarily suspended trade</li> <li>• A meeting of the five range States in May 2002 resulted in a draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and a draft Action Plan</li> <li>• The 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee discussed progress and recommended: the conservation crisis of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a draft Decision that urges range States to sign the MOU and implement that Action plan; report their actions to the Secretariat and Standing Committee; share incentives derived from legal use; and solve implementation problems in cooperation with the Secretariat, other competent Management Authorities, and non-governmental organizations.</li> <li>• The draft Decision directs the Secretariat to address the CITES-relevant aspects of the MOU and Action Plan and assist in the assessment of their implementation; provide assistance to range States; intensify cooperation with the Convention on Migratory Species on this matter; and report back to the Standing Committee and CoP14</li> <li>• The draft Decision requests the Standing Committee to discuss the issue at its meetings between CoP13 and CoP14, and to recommend appropriate action</li> <li>• The draft Decision requests importing Parties with high</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Urgent measures are needed to halt the dramatic decline of this species in recent years</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>progress and recommended: the conservation crisis of the species is a matter of urgency that should be brought to the Standing Committee for action and follow-up; consumer countries, demand, market and illegal trade should be addressed by the Secretariat and the Standing Committee; range States should be encouraged to sign the MOU; and the Animals Committee chair and the Secretariat should evaluate recommendations in the Action Plan that concern CITES and send them to the Standing Committee as a matter of priority for action as appropriate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee was provided a verbal report but took no action</li> </ul>	<p>volumes of traditional medicine trade to provide in their biennial reports special information on steps they are taking to control trade in parts and products of the species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft Decision urges donor Parties, aid agencies, and non-governmental organizations to assist the range States with funding, enforcement and anti-poaching assistance, training and capacity building, equipment, education and public awareness, population monitoring, and gathering and exchange of scientific, technical and legal information and expertise</li> </ul>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 36</p> <p>Conservation and trade in <i>Dissostichus</i> species</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 12.57 states that Parties should report to the Secretariat, by the end of June 2003, their use of the <i>Dissostichus</i> [toothfish] Catch Document used by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), and their verification requirements for such Catch Documents</li> <li>• Decision 12.58 states that the Secretariat shall compile the information on the use of and verification requirements for <i>Dissostichus</i> Catch Documents provided by Parties and send this information to CITES Parties and CCAMLR yearly, and report on this at CoP13</li> <li>• Decision 12.58 states that the Secretariat shall invite CCAMLR to consider, at its 22<sup>nd</sup> Commission meeting, how further cooperation between CITES and CCAMLR could be progressed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• States that reports required under Decision 12.57 were received from Australia, Brazil, Canada, New Zealand, Peru, the Russian Federation, Spain, Sweden, the United States of America, and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union</li> <li>• Contains an Annex with a compilation of these reports, as required under Decision 12.58</li> <li>• Regarding Decision 12.58, reports that: the CITES Secretary-General wrote to the Executive Secretary of CCAMLR, providing the text of the decisions, as well as that of RC 12.4 on Cooperation between CITES and CCAMLR, indicating interest in working with CCAMLR on their implementation and inviting the CCAMLR Executive Secretary to consider how CCAMLR could progress on such cooperation at their 22<sup>nd</sup> Commission meeting; the CITES Deputy-Secretary General attended the 22<sup>nd</sup> Commission meeting, where the Commission agreed to continue exchanging information with the CITES Secretariat on steps taken by CITES in implementing CCAMLR's Catch Documentation Scheme by CITES Parties; CCAMLR implementation of the Scheme and other measures aimed at IUU fishing in the Convention Area; and communication of any other measures of relevance to the two organizations in the context of improving their cooperation</li> <li>• Concludes that CCAMLR members have not yet addressed the nature of and mechanism for formal cooperation with CITES so it is not possible to provide much assistance to CCAMLR beyond exchange of information</li> <li>• Notes that the Convention tools cannot be used in relation to toothfish because <i>Dissostrichus</i> species are not listed in the CITES Appendices</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN considers the exchange of information between CCAMLR and CITES to be important; such activities should continue as proposed by Australia in CoP12 Doc. 12.3</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 37.2</p> <p>Implementation of Decision 12.60 (sea cucumbers)</p> <p>Ecuador</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 12.61 directed the Secretariat, in part, to convene a technical workshop to consider and review biological and trade information that would assist in establishing conservation priorities and actions to secure the conservation status of sea cucumbers in the families Holothuridae and Stichopodidae, and to contract the preparation of a document for discussion at the technical workshop</li> <li>• The technical workshop called for in Decision 12.61 was convened in Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia) March 1-3, 2004; the discussion document and other relevant reports could not be circulated prior to the workshop</li> <li>• The CITES technical workshop was preceded by another forum on sea cucumber conservation, convened by FAO in Dalian (China) October 14-18, 2003; a summary of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Decision would replace Decisions 12.60 and 12.61</li> <li>• Directs the Animals Committee to review proceedings from the CITES technical workshop as well as the forum on Advances in Sea Cucumber Aquaculture and Management (ASCAM) convened by FAO; and to prepare, for consideration at CoP14, a discussion paper on the biological and trade status of sea cucumbers in the families Holothuridae and Stichopodidae to provide scientific guidance on the actions needed to secure their conservation status</li> <li>• Directs the Secretariat to assist in obtaining funds to support preparation of the Animals Committee discussion paper</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES Parties should be able to make full use of the findings of the two technical workshops</li> <li>• SSN recommends that the document be strengthened; as CoP14 will not take place until 2007 and actions for sea cucumber conservation may need to be initiated before that date, SSN would prefer that the Animals Committee report to the Standing Committee before CoP14, preferably by the 53<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee, with any recommendations for actions that could be taken in the interim</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>Dalian discussions stated, <i>inter alia</i>, that “international intervention (e.g. IUCN/CITES) may be needed to assist in the conservation and management of sea cucumbers.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision 12.60 directed the Animals Committee to review the outcomes of the technical workshop convened by the Secretariat and other available information concerning the biology, catch and bycatch of and trade in sea cucumbers in the families Holothuridae and Stichopodidae and develop appropriate recommendations, and to prepare a discussion paper for CoP13</li> <li>• At the 20<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee (29 March – 2 April 2004; Johannesburg, South Africa), most attendees were unable to review the summary of the workshop before the meeting; a small working group was unable to draft more than a simple outline of the discussion paper called for in Decision12.60; the Decision has therefore not been fulfilled</li> </ul>		
<p>CoP13 Doc. 41</p> <p>Introduction from the sea: interpretation and implementation of Article I, Article III, paragraph 5, and Article IV, paragraphs 6 and 7</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article I, paragraph (e) of the Convention defines “introduction from the sea” to mean “transportation into a State of specimens of any species which were taken in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State.”</li> <li>• The Management Authority of the “State of introduction” must issue an introduction from the sea certificate for specimens of Appendix I and Appendix II specimens that have been introduced from the sea</li> <li>• The Convention provides no further advice on how to implement these provisions</li> </ul>	<p>Amends RC 12.3 (Permits and certificates) as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A certificate of introduction may be issued by the State into which the specimen is first landed or, for specimens of Appendix II species, the flag State of the vessel that caught the specimens, if the Management Authority of the State of fish landing has agreed with the Management Authority of the flag State that the flag State may issue the certificate</li> <li>• A Management Authority grants a certificate in advance of landing, in accordance with Article IV, paragraphs 6(a) and 6(b), and, upon landing, the number and/or weight of the specimens actually harvested is entered on the certificate and validated</li> <li>• An introduction from the sea certificate should contain, where appropriate, any international management control measure to monitor total take (such as total allowable catch or quota) in place for each species at the time of issuance</li> <li>• The new draft resolution defines “in the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State” to mean “not within the territorial sea or the internal waters of a State or in the archipelagic waters of an archipelagic State, or Exclusive Economic Zone of a State.”</li> <li>• The new draft resolution recommends that, when determining that the introduction will not be detrimental to the survival of the species involved, Parties’ “take into account” quotas, total allowable catch and other management controls adopted by any relevant international organization</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT IN PART</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN supports the provision that allows the State into which the specimen is first landed to issue a certificate of introduction from the sea</li> <li>• However, SSN does not support the proposal to authorize flag States of vessels that catch the specimens to issue introduction of the sea certificates; severe and widely recognized problems associated with flags of convenience would create substantial loopholes in the Convention if such a provision were adopted</li> <li>• SSN supports the provision that the Management Authority must issue the certificate of introduction from the sea <i>before</i> the specimen is landed. This provision is similar to an export in which the species may be taken, but not exported, before an export permit is granted</li> <li>• SSN supports the provision that the introduction from the sea certificate “should contain”, where appropriate, the control measures of an international management organization for that species. However, this provision could be improved by providing that the certificate “must contain” a statement of compliance with international control measures</li> <li>• SSN supports the definition of “introduction from the sea” in the draft resolution. However, the proposed definition does not exhaust all possible situations. For example, the appendices could include living marine resources on the continental shelf. Because some countries have continental shelves that extend beyond the line demarcating the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ), the reference in the proposal to “not in the [EEZ]” is inadequate. In addition, many countries have designated fisheries conservation zones or exclusive fisheries zones that are “under the jurisdiction” of the State that designated them (sovereignty over some of these areas may be disputed by two or more governments, however.). As such, the definition would be more complete if the following text (underlined) was added to the definition: “not within the territorial sea or the internal waters of a State or in the archipelagic waters of an archipelagic State, or Exclusive Economic Zone or on the continental shelf of a State, or in a marine area for <u>which a State has lawfully asserted its sovereign rights (such as a validly declared exclusive fishery zone or fishery conservation zone)</u>”</li> <li>• SSN supports the call in the draft resolution to “take into account” the management controls of relevant international organizations. This recommendation provides a mechanism to ask non-Parties of a relevant fisheries management organization to comply with it</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 42</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article III, paragraph 3(c) requires that, regarding import of a specimen of an Appendix I species, the Management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Notes that RC 5.10, paragraph 4, can be interpreted to mean that only the nature of the final use of the specimen</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This would close a significant loophole that enables commercial</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Commercial trade in Appendix-I species</p> <p>Israel</p>	<p>Authority of the State of import be satisfied that the specimen is not to be used for primarily commercial purposes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article III, paragraph 5(c) requires with respect to Appendix I specimens introduced from the sea that the Management Authority of the State of introduction be satisfied that the specimen is not to be used for primarily commercial purposes</li> <li>RC 5.10, regarding the definition of 'primarily commercial purposes' states, in paragraph 4, "Article III, paragraphs 3(c) and 5(c), of the Convention concern the intended use of the specimen of an Appendix I species in the country of importation, not the nature of the transaction between the owner of the specimen in the country of export and the recipient in the country of import. It can be assumed that a commercial transaction underlies many of the transfers of specimens of Appendix I species from the country of export to the country of import. This does not automatically mean, however, that the specimen is to be used for 'primarily commercial purposes'"</li> </ul>	<p>needs to be taken into account when determining whether trade is for primarily commercial purposes, but that the nature of the underlying transaction need not be considered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has created a loophole for commercial trade in specimens of Appendix I species and clarification is needed</li> <li>Proposes to replace RC 5.10, paragraph 4, with (proposed new text underlined, deleted text struck out): 'Article III, paragraphs 3(c) and 5(c), of the Convention concern the intended use of the specimen of an Appendix I species in the country of importation. <del>not</del> The nature of the transaction between the owner of the specimen in the country of export and the recipient in the country of import <u>must also be taken into account as part of the determination of the intended use of the specimen, to ensure that a commercial transaction does not underlie the transfer of specimens of Appendix I species from the country of export to the country of import. Only Appendix I specimens originating from registered operations, as defined in Resolution Conf. 12.10, may be traded for commercial purposes.</u> It can be assumed that a commercial transaction underlies many of the transfers of specimens of Appendix I species from the country of export to the country of import. This does not automatically mean, however, that the specimen is to be used for 'primarily commercial purposes'</li> </ul>	<p>trade in captive-bred specimens of Appendix I species from breeding facilities that are not registered in accordance with RC 12.10</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This would also address enforcement problems created by trade in CITES-listed species over the internet, where commercial transactions may take place well before shipment</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 43</p> <p>Management of annual export quotas</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 12.17 directs the Standing Committee to establish an inter-sessional Export Quota Working Group to develop guidelines for Parties to establish, implement and report national export quotas for CITES-listed taxa; the decision included Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Working Group and required that the Standing Committee consult extensively with the Animals and Plants Committees in fulfilling the TOR; the Working Group was to present its findings to the meeting of the Standing Committee prior to CoP13, and the Standing Committee was to present its findings on how to improve the management of national export quotas to CoP13</li> <li>Decision 12.18 directs the Secretariat to seek funding for a meeting of the Working Group</li> <li>Decision 12.72 directs the Standing Committee to consider the issue of how to improve the management of annual export quotas and to report to CoP13</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports that, at its 49<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Standing Committee established the Working Group, which was unable to make progress between meetings</li> <li>Reports that, at its 50<sup>th</sup> meeting, the Standing Committee agreed to a procedure by which the Working Group would prepare a discussion document for CoP13, to be distributed through a Notification to the Parties by no later than July 2004; during CoP13, the Working Group will meet outside of formal sessions, together with interested observer Parties, and preferably with simultaneous interpretation, in order to discuss the issue in full and identify problems in the management of export quotas and potential solutions</li> <li>Reports that the Standing Committee agreed to propose adoption of a decision at CoP13 that would extend the TOR of the Working Group until CoP14 and require the Working Group to submit the result of its deliberations to the Animals and Plants Committees for comment by May 2005; based on the comments received from the Committees, the Working Groups should prepare a working document and draft resolution for consideration at the 2006 meeting of the Standing Committee, and for consideration at CoP14</li> <li>Standing Committee recommends that Decisions 12.17 and 12.18 be deleted and Decision 12.72 be amended to refer to CoP14</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Export Quota Working Group meetings at CoP13 should be open to participation from interested NGO observers</li> <li>Given the importance of this issue, Export Quota Working Group meetings at CoP13 should occur only if simultaneous translation is available</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 44</p> <p>Use of CITES certificates with ATA or TIR carnets</p> <p>CITES Secretariat at the request of the Standing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article VII, paragraph 1, states, "the provisions of Articles III, IV and V shall not apply to the transit or transshipment of specimens through or in the territory of a Party while the specimens remain in customs control"; no CITES documents are required for such specimens</li> <li>RC 9.7 defines "transit or transshipment of specimens" as "specimens that remain in Customs control and are in the process of shipment to a named consignee when any interruption in the movement arises only from the arrangements necessitated by this form of traffic"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reports the conclusions and recommendations of the informal working group of the Standing Committee, including draft revisions of RC 9.7 and RC 12.3 to address the temporary cross-border movement of samples destined for fairs, exhibitions, shows and other such events</li> <li>The draft revision of RC 9.7: incorporates in the preamble text that refers to ATA carnets (the working group decided that TIR carnets were not relevant); includes in the definition of "transit or transshipment of specimens" the "cross-border movement of sample collections of specimens that comply</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the proposed revisions to RC 9.7 and RC 12.3 are adopted at CoP13, SSN urges the Parties to include text establishing an evaluative mechanism to ensure that this new system is addressing the perceived problem and not contributing to illegal trade</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 10.5 states that “shipments covered by the exemption specified in Article VII of the Convention and traveling on an ATA or TIR carnet still require appropriate CITES documentation”; ATA (<i>The Admission Temporaire – Temporary Admission</i>) carnet is an international customs document that may be used for the temporary duty free importation of commercial samples for trade fairs or exhibitions; TIR (<i>Transports Internationaux Routiers</i>) carnet is an international customs document that allows passage of foreign merchandise through a customs territory</li> <li>RC 12.3 addresses the issuance of permits and certificates</li> <li>Some Parties have stated that the issuance of CITES permits and certificates for temporary international movement of samples and collections destined for fairs, exhibitions, shows and other such events imposes a management burden on CITES authorities</li> <li>This matter was discussed at CoP12, which adopted Decision 12.77, directing the Standing Committee to examine the procedures and conditions for a CITES certificate becoming an annex to an ATA or TIR carnet; subsequently, the Secretariat reported to the Standing Committee that the World Customs Organization and the World Chambers Federation did not support the suggestion in Decision 12.77; an informal working group was formed and reported its conclusions and recommendations to the Standing Committee, including a draft revision of RC 9.7 that repeals RC 10.5 and a draft amendment of RC 12.3 to include text regarding documents for sample collections covered by ATA carnets; the drafts are supported by the Standing Committee, which directed the Secretariat to prepare a document for CoP13</li> </ul>	<p>with the provisions of section XV of Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) and are accompanied by an ATA carnet”; includes reference to “valid documentation that clearly shows the ultimate destination of the shipment, which, in the case of a sample collection, must be the country of issuance”; includes text that “URGES all Management Authorities to communicate to the Customs and other competent CITES enforcement officials to ensure that all CITES shipments travelling on ATA or TIR carnets comply with the applicable provisions of CITES”; and repeals RC 10.5 (the provisions of which have been addressed by the draft revision of RC 9.7)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The draft revision of RC 12.3: defines “sample collection” as “collections of legally acquired dead specimens, parts or derivatives of species included in Appendix II or III and of Appendix I species bred in captivity or artificially propagated, which are treated as Appendix II specimens, which are not entitled to be sold or otherwise transferred, and that will cross borders for presentation purposes before returning to the country from which the movement was first authorized”; states that such sample collections be considered to be “in transit” and entitled to the special provisions stipulated in Article VII, paragraph 1 provided that six permit conditions, specified in the draft revision, are met; states that such permits are not transferable and can only be duplicated (if lost, stolen, or accidentally destroyed) by the issuing Management Authority; states that stolen, destroyed or lost specimens shall be reported to the issuing Management Authority and that of the country in which it occurred; and states that Parties that do not recognize ATA carnets should follow the usual CITES procedures for export, re-export, and import of sample collections</li> </ul>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 45</p> <p>Electronic permitting systems for CITES specimens</p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 12.3 sets out the format for CITES permits and certificates including minimum information required within such documents, preferred numbering systems and security methods, and the source codes to be used</li> <li>RC 11.17 encourages Parties to use computers to assist in preparing CITES reports, and to consult each other on the development of computer programs for licensing and reporting trade</li> <li>Decision 12.76 directs the Secretariat to evaluate the possibility of using the CITES website to check the validity of permits and certificates; initial consultations suggest that further analysis is needed</li> <li>Notification 2003/084 asked the Parties for information on use of computers to issue permits and report trade; results were reported to the 50<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee (SC50 Inf. 15)</li> <li>Decision 12.87 directed the Standing Committee to review CITES reporting requirements</li> <li>At its 50<sup>th</sup> meeting the Standing Committee adopted a recommendation to instruct the Secretariat to develop and test simple software and Internet related modules for permit issuance and trade reporting, subject to funding</li> </ul>	<p>Proponent recommends that, subject to the provision of funding, the Secretariat should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advise the Parties on the work done by UNEP-WCMC in the development of simple internet-based software tools and provide recommendations based on experience and testing by Parties</li> <li>Evaluate the experience of other permit based agreements and conventions in using electronic permitting systems</li> <li>Provide guidance to the Parties on practicality of using computerized systems to meet their obligations under CITES</li> <li>Prepare recommendations on a strategy for developing standards, guidelines and capacity building options for the use of electronic permitting systems in the future</li> </ul> <p>Based on the information provided by the Secretariat, the CITES Standing Committee shall: adopt guidelines for the electronic processing and handling of CITES permits and trade reports; and set up a working group to pilot the development of a paper free permitting system.</p>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Electronic permitting systems would permit much faster and more efficient handling of CITES documents and would make it easier to consolidate data in preparing reports</li> <li>Secretariat and Standing Committee should explore funding options to assist Parties in acquiring the necessary hardware, software and internet capabilities, and to train CITES officers in their use</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 46</p> <p>Retrospective issuance of</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articles III, IV and V of the Convention provide that trade requires the prior issuance and presentation of relevant CITES documents</li> <li>RC 12.3, Section XIII, recommends that Parties not issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amends RC 12.3, Section XIII, paragraph I (i) to read (new text underlined): “that the irregularities that have occurred are not attributable to the (re) exporter or the importer <u>or, in the case of specimens imported or (re) exported for primarily</u></li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN generally supports increasing flexibility in issuance of retrospective permits in cases involving trivial irregularities in the trade of specimens exported for primarily non-commercial purposes,</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>permits</p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)</p>	<p>or accept permits or certificates issued retrospectively and not provide exceptions to this for trade in Appendix I specimens.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, RC 12.3, Section XIII, paragraph I states that exceptions for trade in Appendix II or III specimens can be made provided (i) “that the irregularities are not attributable to the exporter (or re-exporter) or importer” and (ii) “that the export (or re-export) and import of the specimens are otherwise in compliance with the Convention and the relevant legislation of the countries of export (or re-export) and import”</li> <li>• Furthermore, RC 12.3, Section XIII, paragraph (d) states that “whenever exceptions are made: I) the permit or certificate clearly indicate that it is issued retrospectively; and ii) the reasons for the relaxation, which should come under the purview of paragraph c), subparagraphs I) and ii) above, are specified on the permit or certificate and a copy sent to the Secretariat”</li> </ul>	<p><u>non-commercial purposes, the management authority, in consultation with the relevant enforcement authority, is satisfied that there is evidence that a genuine error had been made, or that there were exceptionally extenuating circumstances, and that there was no attempt to deceive”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends RC 12.3, Section XIII, paragraph (d)(ii) to read: “the reasons for the relaxation, which should come under the purview of paragraph c), subparagraphs I) and ii) above, are specified in the conditions on the permit or certificate and a copy sent to the Secretariat and also list these in the biennial report to the Secretariat”</li> <li>• Amends RC 12.3, Section XIII, by adding a new paragraph: “Parties are further urged to make provision for penalties and restrictions on subsequent sales to be imposed where appropriate to ensure that the power to grant exemptions to the general prohibition on the issue of retrospective permits is not abused”</li> </ul>	<p>providing that this does not complicate enforcement or increase opportunities for abuse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, SSN believes the suggested language is not specific enough about the types of shipments for which retrospective permits ought to be available, and, by requiring only “evidence” that an error has been made, may weaken the standard to too great an extent</li> <li>• SSN therefore recommends that this document be accepted only if the language is considerably tightened to ensure that it applies only to small shipments such as personal and household effects, and to specify the type of information that should be required in order to determine whether a genuine error has been made</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 47</p> <p>Use of the source code "R" for ranched specimens: revision of Resolution Conf. 12.3 on Permits and certificates</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 12.3, section I, paragraph (e) provides source codes used on permits and certificates. “R” is defined as “specimens originating from a ranching operation”</li> <li>• RC 11.16, on the ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, defines ranching as “the rearing in a controlled environment of specimens taken from the wild”</li> <li>• Specimens of many species listed on Appendix II are exported with permits and certificates containing the “R” source code, although these exports do not originate from a ranching operation that complies with RC 11.16</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends RC 12.3, section I, paragraph (e) to read: “R Specimens originating from a ranching operation in accordance with RC 11.16”</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The source code "R" should be limited to specimens originating from a ranching operation in accordance with RC 11.16; this source code was specifically designated for trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching purposes. Restricting use of the source code “R” to specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching purposes should prevent the misuse of this code which has resulted in wild-caught specimens of some Appendix II species being traded as “ranched”</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 48</p> <p>Use of marks and numbers in lieu of bill of lading numbers for CITES export and re-export documents for timber species: revision of Resolution Conf. 12.3 on Permits and certificates</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 12.3, section XI, requires in part that permits or certificates for timber shipments not be accepted for import into a country other than the one for which they were issued, except under conditions including presentation of the bill of lading</li> <li>• At the Second Meeting of the Mahogany Working Group (MWG2), held 6-8 October 2003, in Belem, Brazil, the USA expressed concerns about the absence of certain information on CITES export documents for <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> (bigleaf mahogany), including the absence of bill of lading numbers on CITES export documents and the presentation of what appear to be retrospectively issued CITES export permits</li> <li>• Export bills of lading are often not available at the time shipments receive inspection and CITES document endorsement; numbers are not available until after the exporting vessel has departed the port, resulting in CITES export documents being issued either without bill of lading numbers, or being issued and/or endorsed retrospectively</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed amendment adds new paragraph stating that: “when the bill of lading or air waybill for a shipment is not available at the time of export or re-export endorsement: i) the marks and numbers found on the bundles, pallets, or individual pieces of logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, or plywood be included on the permit or certificate under the description of specimens; and ii) the permit or certificate include, in place of the bill of lading or air waybill number, a declaration from the endorsing official that the marks and numbers were confirmed at the time of export in lieu of the bill of lading/air waybill number”</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requiring the documentation of such identifying features could improve the tracking of timber shipments and make it easier to identify illegal shipments</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 49</p> <p>Production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 12.3, section I, paragraph (e) provides source codes used on permits and certificates</li> <li>• Both the Animals and Plants Committees have discussed the various production systems of CITES-listed species and how each system might fit under the source codes in RC 12.3. However, no conclusions have been reached</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a draft decision that directs the Animals and Plants Committees to establish a joint inter-sessional working group on harvest production systems for specimens of CITES-listed species. The working group would define key elements of the different production systems, determine which production systems are in use, determine which existing source codes should be used for each production system, and determine whether any new source codes are</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft decision should be amended to include participation of non-governmental organizations</li> <li>• The terms of reference for the working group should make clear that new source codes should not be created for production systems that are not covered in provisions of the Convention or in Resolutions. For example, source code ‘R’ should only apply to specimens of species on Appendix I, in accordance with RC 11.16. Source code ‘R’ should</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
United States of America		needed. The working group would report on its efforts at each Animals and Plants Committee meeting between CoP13 and CoP14, incorporating comments received, and report the result to CoP14	not apply to 'ranching' specimens of species on other Appendices because there is no provision in the Convention or resolution that provides criteria for 'ranching' of such specimens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The terms of reference of the working group should include simplification of the system, including revision of source codes where necessary; no additional codes should be added</li> </ul>
CoP13 Doc. 50  Plant specimens subject to exemptions  Switzerland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Annotations to species listings allow trade in a number of types of plant specimens of species listed on the CITES Appendices without permits (for example, <i>in vitro</i> specimens in sterile containers and artificially propagated <i>Phalaenopsis</i> (orchid) hybrids under certain conditions)</li> <li>Such specimens may be re-exported but at some point may not qualify for the exemption (for example, as soon as the <i>in vitro</i> specimens are taken from containers for further cultivation, the exemption no longer applies); this makes it difficult for a re-exporting Party to issue a permit because there is no previous permit on which it can be based</li> <li>RC 11.11 pertains to regulation of trade in plants generally but does not address this issue</li> <li>RC 12.3 pertains to permits and certificates generally but does not address this issue</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposes to amend RC 11.11 to add three new paragraphs to the preamble: 'AWARE that plant specimens may legally enter international trade under exemptions from the provisions of CITES, provided by an annotation, and that the qualification for such an exemption may cease outside the country of origin; AWARE that such specimens need CITES permits for subsequent international trade; RECOGNIZING that in the absence of an export permit issued in the country of origin, it may be difficult to issue such CITES permits'</li> <li>Proposes to further amend RC 11.11 by adding a new section, "Regarding plant specimens in international trade under exemptions" and stating, "Specimens that cease to qualify for an exemption from the provisions of CITES, under which they were legally exported and imported, are deemed to originate in the country in which they cease to qualify for the exemption"</li> <li>Proposes to amend the definition of 'country of origin' in RC 12.3, Annex 2, instructions and explanations for block 12, "...except in the case of plant specimens that cease to qualify for an exemption from the provisions of CITES. In such instances, the country of origin is deemed to be the country in which the specimens cease to qualify for the exemption"</li> <li>Proposes to further amend RC 12.3, section II, regarding export permits and re-export certificates, "AGREES that in the case of plant specimens that cease to qualify for an exemption from the provisions of CITES, under which they were exported from their country of origin, the country of origin is deemed to be the first country in which the specimens cease to qualify for the exemption; and that Parties may in such instances, and if considered useful, add the following text in block 5 of permits: 'Legally imported under an exemption from the provisions of CITES'"</li> </ul>	<b>SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This issue was discussed at the Plants Committee, where it gained support from many Parties; the Plants Committee encouraged Switzerland to pursue its work on the issue</li> <li>Some Parties expressed concerns about fraud and the need to trace the origin of such specimens; however, other Parties noted there was no value in keeping track of such specimens</li> </ul>
CoP13 Doc. 51  Review of Resolutions on plants and plant trade and the definition of 'artificially propagated'  United States of America	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 9.19 (Guidelines for the registration of nurseries exporting artificially propagated specimens of Appendix-I species) directs the Secretariat to review applications for registration, and to keep a Register of commercial nurseries that artificially propagate specimens of Appendix I plant species for export</li> <li>RC 11.11 (Regulation of trade in plants) deals with a number of issues including the definition of 'artificially propagated' and the issues of grafted plants, higher taxon listings, hybrids, and the exemption for flaked seedlings of Appendix-I orchids</li> <li>Decision 12.11, paragraph e), directs the Plants Committee to "review the Resolutions concerning plants and the plant trade to improve their clarity and to facilitate their understanding through guides or other materials"</li> <li>At PC13 (Geneva, August 2003), a working group was established to conduct a review of RCs 9.19 and 11.11; members of the working group conducted the review inter-</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommended changes to RC 9.19 involve wording in French and Spanish versions only; Secretariat asked to make these as noted in PC14 Doc. 7.4, Annexes 1 and 2</li> <li>Draft revision of RC 11.11 includes clarifications to preamble and definition of "artificially propagated"; requires grafted specimens consisting of taxa from different Appendices to be treated as specimens of the taxon included in the more restrictive Appendix; deletes (not "greatly reduce[s]" as stated) section on higher taxon listings; deletes section on rainsticks; requires flaked orchid seedlings to fit definition of "artificially propagated"; modifies section "Regarding trade in salvaged plant specimens" to exclude import of salvaged plant specimens by registered nurseries, which would presumably be commercial; modifies section "Regarding education about plant conservation through CITES" to clarify that artificial propagation is an alternative to collecting from the wild</li> <li>Draft includes bracketed language suggested by Chile</li> </ul>	<b>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN generally supports the recommended changes, but agrees with some working group members that the original language on higher taxon listings, especially that noting that such listings may be "essential for effective control of trade in the many species within those taxa that are threatened or potentially at risk", should be retained</li> <li>SSN supports the requirement that flaked orchid seedlings fit the definition of "artificially propagated"</li> <li>SSN agrees with the USA and the CITES Secretariat that the language proposed by Chile should not be adopted, as it would undermine the Convention by allowing commercial trade in wild-collected specimens of Appendix I species, and (unlike ranching requirements for animal species) would not require scrutiny by the Conference of the Parties</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>sessionally, reported to PC14 (Windhoek, February 2004) and continued work on RC 11.11 afterwards</p>	<p>(but opposed by USA and CITES Secretariat) deeming specimens grown from wild-collected seed to be artificially propagated under certain circumstances if trade in such specimens had positive conservation benefit for wild populations</p>	
<p>CoP13 Doc. 52</p> <p>Definition of plywood of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>: revision of Resolution Conf. 10.13 on Implementation of the Convention for timber species</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Neotropical populations of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> (bigleaf mahogany) were listed in CITES Appendix II at CoP12; listing includes logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, and plywood, but not any other parts or derivatives</li> <li>• RC 10.13 (Implementation of the Convention for timber species) includes specific definitions for logs, sawn wood, and veneer sheets, and provides specific World Customs Organization Harmonized System (HS) commodity codes to describe them; however, the Resolution does not include a specific definition or HS code(s) for plywood</li> <li>• 13th meeting of the Plants Committee (August 2003) endorsed USA proposed interim definition of <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i> plywood as outlined in PC13 Doc. 10.4, as well as USA proposed HS codes and descriptions, and agreed these should be submitted for consideration of the Mahogany Working Group at its 2nd meeting in October 2003</li> <li>• Working Group agreed that CITES adopt the USA proposed definition on an interim basis until it can be adopted formally at CoP13</li> <li>• 14th Meeting of Plants Committee endorsed the draft revision to RC10.13 included in document PC14 Doc. 7.5.2 and agreed that the USA should submit this draft revision for the consideration of the Parties at CoP13</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft revised resolution adds following definition as paragraph c (iv): “Plywood: Consisting of three or more sheets of wood glued and pressed one on the other and generally disposed so that the grains of successive layers are at an angle (HS code 44.12.13<sup>3</sup>, HS code 44.12.14<sup>3</sup>, and HS code 44.12.22<sup>3</sup>)”; footnote 3 provides specific details of the code definitions</li> <li>• Also deletes out-of-date material in preamble as housecleaning measure</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 53</p> <p>Revision of Resolution Conf. 9.10 (Rev.) on Disposal of illegally traded, confiscated and accumulated specimens</p> <p>Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parties have no guidance on disposal of illegally traded, confiscated and accumulated dead specimens of species on Appendices I or III</li> <li>• RC 3.14 recommended, “e) that Parties transfer confiscated accumulated dead specimens of Appendix I species only for bona fide scientific / educational or enforcement / identification purposes, and that Parties save in storage or destroy those excess specimens whose transfer for these purposes is not practicable”; this paragraph was included in RC 9.10, which repealed RC 3.14; however, at CoP10, RC 9.10 was revised and this paragraph apparently inadvertently omitted</li> <li>• RC 9.10 recommends, “regarding the disposal of illegally traded specimens of species in Appendix II: e) as a general rule, confiscated parts and derivatives of Appendix II species be disposed of in the best manner possible to benefit enforcement and administration of the Convention, and that steps be taken to ensure that the person responsible for the offence does not receive financial or other gain from the disposal; f) in the case of live specimens, Parties having not done so endeavor to make legislative provision to require the guilty importer and/or the carrier to meet the costs of confiscation, custody and returning specimens to the country of origin or re-export (as appropriate), where the Scientific Authority of the confiscating State deems it in their interest of the specimens to do so, and the country of origin or re-export so wishes”</li> <li>• There is a lack of awareness that some Parties do not allow the sale of confiscated specimens because of the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revises RC 9.10 (Rev.): Adds new text “regarding the disposal of illegally traded, confiscated and accumulated dead specimens of Appendix I species: e) Parties transfer confiscated accumulated dead specimens of Appendix I species only for bona fide scientific / educational or enforcement / identification purposes, and that Parties save in storage or destroy those excess specimens whose transfer for these purposes is not practicable; f) Parties make legislative provision to require the guilty importer and/or the carrier to meet the costs of confiscation, custody and storage or destruction of the specimens.”</li> <li>• Amends the following text [new text underlined, deleted text crossed out] “regarding the disposal of illegally traded, <del>confiscated and accumulated</del> specimens of species in Appendix II <u>and Appendix III</u>: e) <u>g)</u> as a general rule, confiscated <u>dead specimens, including parts and derivatives of Appendix II and Appendix III</u> species be disposed of ...” “<u>h) should they choose to do so, Parties have the right to decide not to allow the sale of confiscated dead specimens, including parts and derivatives, of Appendix II and III species;</u> f) <u>i) in the case of live specimens, Parties having not done so endeavor to make legislative provision to require the guilty importer and/or the carrier to meet the costs of confiscation, custody and disposal, including returning specimens to the country of origin or re-export (as appropriate) ...</u>”</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The</b> new text regarding specimens of Appendix I species closes a loophole that is believed to have been created accidentally while increasing the disincentive for illegal traffickers and providing support</li> <li>• <b>The</b> revised text emphasizes the right of Parties not to allow the sale of confiscated dead specimens, including parts and derivatives, of Appendix II and III species</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>message this transmits to the public</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 10.7 on the disposal of confiscated live animals notes that the successful recovery of the costs of confiscation and disposal from the guilty party may be a disincentive for illegal trade, but this principle has not been applied to confiscated dead specimens</li> </ul>		
<p>CoP13 Doc. 54</p> <p>Identification Manual</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 11.19 transfers responsibility for the Identification Manual to the Secretariat</li> <li>• The Secretariat is required by RC 11.19 to report on the status of the Identification Manual to the Standing, Animals and Plants Committees</li> <li>• RC 11.19 also urges Parties who have submitted proposals to amend the Appendices to submit appropriate data for inclusion in the Identification Manual</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Document is a summary of Secretariat reports to the three Committees since CoP12</li> <li>• Though an increasing number of Parties have submitted draft data sheets for species they have proposed, and some manual sheets have been prepared by other Parties, a number of species sheets remain outstanding; these are listed in the document</li> <li>• Document provides lists and summaries of data sheets published (especially since CoP12) in the three working languages of the Convention</li> <li>• Conversion of the Manual into electronic form, and preparation of a database based on it, is proceeding well; the database and converted sheets will be posted on the web site in the near future</li> <li>• The Secretariat commends Environment Canada for its series of identification guides</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN urges Parties to provide information for identification manual sheets as indicated in the Secretariat's document</li> <li>• SSN also encourages Parties and the Secretariat to seek the assistance of NGOs in the provision of data and the preparation of identification manual sheets and other identification materials for CITES-listed species</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 55.1</p> <p>Amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.9 on Personal and household effects</p> <p>China</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article VII, paragraph 3, exempts 'personal and household effects' from the provisions of Articles III, IV and V of the Convention</li> <li>• Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), states that this exemption does not apply in the case of specimens of species included in Appendix II when 'the State where removal from the wild occurred requires the prior grant of export permits before any export of such specimens'</li> <li>• RC 12.9, paragraph (b), recommends that Parties not require export or import permits, or re-export certificates, for personal or household effects of dead specimens, or parts and derivatives, of four Appendix II species that appear in a list, except where the quantity exceeds limits specified in the list</li> <li>• RC 12.9 requests the Secretariat to develop a process for consideration of specimens of personal and household effects of Appendix II species which may be exempted from permitting according to Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Revises RC 12.9 by adding text that directs the Secretariat to "receive and publish notifications from Parties that export or import permits, or re-export certificates, for personal or household effects mentioned in paragraph (b) above, are required by the Party issuing the notification"</li> <li>• Adds text that states: "In the absence of such notification from a Party and until such notification is received by the Secretariat, it shall be deemed that the said export or import permits, or re-export certificates are not required by that Party"</li> </ul>	<p><b>CONDITIONALSUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite the list in RC 12.9, paragraph (b), it is difficult for importing Parties to know which Parties do or do not require export or import permits, or re-export certificates, for those specimens of Appendix II species on the list; thus Parties do not know if the specimens should be exempted under Article VII, paragraph 3</li> <li>• The proposal would allow importing Parties to assume all specimens of Appendix II species on the list in RC 12.9, paragraph (b) are exempted under Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), unless exporting Parties have indicated otherwise by so notifying the Secretariat</li> <li>• However, in order to take a more precautionary approach, and to simplify implementation, SSN would prefer a revision to RC 12.9 that includes in paragraph (b) a list of Parties to which the paragraph applies for each species listed therein; all other Parties should be considered to require export or import permits or re-export certificates for the listed species</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 55.2</p> <p>Amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.9 on Personal and household effects</p> <p>Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Article VII, paragraph 3, exempts 'personal and household effects' from the provisions of Articles III, IV and V of the Convention</li> <li>• Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), states that this exemption does not apply in the case of specimens of species included in Appendix II when 'the State where removal from the wild occurred requires the prior grant of export permits before any export of such specimens'</li> <li>• RC 12.9, paragraph (b), recommends that Parties not require export or import permits, or re-export certificates, for personal or household effects of dead specimens, or parts and derivatives, of four Appendix II species that appear in a list, except where the quantity exceeds limits specified in the list</li> <li>• RC 12.9 requests the Secretariat to develop a process for consideration of specimens of personal and household</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amends RC 12.9 to add other taxa to the list in paragraph (b): "dead coral specimens, as defined in RC 11.10, of <i>Helioporidae</i>, <i>Scleractinia</i>, <i>Milleporidae</i>, <i>Stylasterporidae</i> with the exception of <i>Anthipataria</i> spp. (black corals)—up to six pieces per person" and "shells of giant clam (<i>Tridacnidae</i> spp.)—one specimen (i.e. one intact shell or two matching halves) not exceeding 1 kilogram per person. The meat is not included in this exemption."</li> <li>• Deletes the paragraph requesting the Secretariat to develop a process for consideration of specimens of personal and household effects of Appendix II species that may be exempted from permitting according to Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention. Instead, a draft decision directs the Standing Committee, in consultation with the Secretariat, range States, other Parties and relevant organizations, to develop this process.</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No additional species should be added to the list in RC 12.9, paragraph (b) until a process for consideration of specimens of personal and household effects of Appendix II species that may be exempted from permitting according to Article VII, paragraph 3, is developed, adopted and operational</li> <li>• SSN does not support the addition of corals or giant clams to the list in RC 12.9, paragraph (b), at this time, and is concerned that this addition may create substantial enforcement difficulties with respect to those species in which there is a substantial souvenir trade</li> <li>• However, SSN supports the proposal to direct the Standing Committee, rather than the Secretariat, to develop this process</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	effects of Appendix II species which may be exempted from permitting according to Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention		
<p>CoP13 Doc. 55.3</p> <p>Amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.9 on Personal and household effects</p> <p>Australia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article VII, paragraph 3, exempts 'personal and household effects' from the provisions of Articles III, IV and V of the Convention</li> <li>Article VII, paragraph 3 (b), states that this exemption does not apply in the case of specimens of species included in Appendix II when 'the State where removal from the wild occurred requires the prior grant of export permits before any export of such specimens'</li> <li>RC 12.9, paragraph (b), recommends that Parties not require export or import permits, or re-export certificates, for personal or household effects of dead specimens, or parts and derivatives, of four Appendix II species that appear in a list, except where the quantity exceeds limits specified in the list</li> <li>RC 12.9 requests the Secretariat to develop a process for consideration of specimens of personal and household effects of Appendix II species which may be exempted from permitting according to Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amends RC 12.9 to add another taxon to the list in paragraph (b): "seahorses (<i>Hippocampus</i> spp.)—up to 5 specimens per person"</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No additional species should be added to the list in RC 12.9, paragraph (b) until a process for consideration of specimens of personal and household effects of Appendix II species that may be exempted from permitting according to Article VII, paragraph 3, is developed, adopted and operational</li> <li>SSN believes that the regulation of international movement of personal and household effects makes an important contribution to the conservation objectives of the Convention; in some cases, such as trade in tourist souvenirs of specimens of CITES-listed species, such movement can form a substantial part of trade and can threaten the survival of species</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 56.3.2</p> <p>Relationship between commercial <i>ex situ</i> breeding operations and <i>in situ</i> conservation of Appendix I species</p> <p>Mexico</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Article VII, paragraph 4, of the Convention provides that animal species included in Appendix I bred in captivity for commercial purposes, or of a plant species included in Appendix I artificially propagated for commercial purposes, shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix II</li> <li>RC 12.10 provides a procedure to register and monitor operations that breed Appendix I animal species for commercial purposes and encourages Parties to collect information on how breeding operations contribute to improving the conservation of wild populations</li> <li>Decision 11.102 directs the Animals Committee to examine the complex issues related to the origin of founder breeding stock and the relationship between <i>ex situ</i> breeding operations and <i>in situ</i> conservation of the species and to identify possible strategies and other mechanisms by which registered <i>ex situ</i> breeding operations may contribute to enhancing the recovery and/or conservation of the species within the countries of origin</li> <li>Decision 12.11 directs the Plants Committee to analyze the relationship between <i>in situ</i> conservation and <i>ex situ</i> production of plants</li> <li>Both the Animals and Plants Committees have considered the issue but have not reached conclusions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a draft Resolution that urges: a) Parties with <i>ex situ</i> operations that breed Appendix I animal species, or that artificially propagate Appendix I plant species outside the range States, to enter into bilateral or multilateral agreements with range States to support <i>in situ</i> conservation programs for those species; b) <i>ex situ</i> operations that breed or artificially propagate Appendix I species within the range State, to support <i>in situ</i> conservation programs; and c) Parties to consider such support to consist of, <i>inter alia</i>, technical support, contribution of funds, exchange of specimens for reintroduction into the wild, capacity building and training, technology transfer, investment, infrastructure, incentives, and other forms of benefit sharing</li> </ul>	<p><b>UNDER REVIEW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN encourages <i>ex situ</i> operations, or Parties where such operations exist, to provide support for <i>in situ</i> conservation programs</li> <li>SSN encourages Parties to consider further measures to address problems created by <i>ex situ</i> facilities addressed in AC19 Inf. 5 and listed in Cop13 Doc. 56.3.2, but not addressed in the proposed draft resolution, including: <i>ex situ</i> production can be used to launder illegally traded specimens; <i>ex situ</i> production may be incorrectly assumed to have no negative conservation impacts or worse, to contribute to conservation in the wild, without proving this to be the case</li> <li>It is problematic that the resolution does not recommend that operations breeding Appendix I species outside the range States contribute to <i>in situ</i> conservation</li> <li>Paragraph (c) of the draft resolution should be eliminated or amended to clarify that the specific examples of what constitutes "support" for <i>in situ</i> conservation may not apply, or be desirable, in every case; the determination that any particular measure or action supports <i>in situ</i> conservation of a particular species must be made on a case-by-case basis, and should include a science-based assessment of the conservation needs of the species</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 59.1</p> <p>Standard nomenclature for birds</p> <p>Mexico</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RC 12.11 replaced the list of separate standard references for nomenclature of different animal and plant taxa with the <i>Checklist of CITES species</i>, compiled by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, 2001, and its updates accepted by the Nomenclature Committee, which became the sole standard reference for nomenclature under CITES</li> <li>Paragraph a) of RC 12.11 states that "a subspecies be proposed for inclusion in the Appendices only if it is generally recognized as a valid taxon, and easily identifiable in the traded form"</li> <li>At CoP12, the Nomenclature Committee recommended that the taxonomy for the Psittaciformes (parrots) and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that the <i>Handbook</i> is not a peer-reviewed publication and is intended for the general public; argues that it should not be used as a taxonomic reference [NB: The <i>Handbook</i> is directed to ornithologists "both professional and amateur" but "has no pretensions as to being a definitive taxonomic list" (v. 1, 1992)]</li> <li>Recommends that "Given the problems associated with the current reference, such as the recognition of its taxonomic validity, the use of subspecies not recognized as a valid taxon by the majority of experts, and the difficulties in using it, Mexico recommends that: a) The Secretariat send a Notification to the Parties requesting information on their</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT IN PART</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The practical effect of recommendations of the Nomenclature Committee should be evaluated and communicated clearly to the CoP before adoption</li> <li>SSN agrees with the proponent that the classification of the <i>Amazona ochrocephala</i> complex within a single species may create substantial and unnecessary enforcement difficulties; these difficulties should be addressed in any nomenclatural decision on these populations</li> <li>SSN notes that, by adopting the CITES Checklist as the sole standard reference in RC 12.11, Parties made it possible to depart from the taxonomic works used to compile it if circumstances</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>Trochilidae (hummingbirds) be based on that in the <i>Handbook of the Birds of the World</i> ('<i>Handbook</i>'; v.4, 1997; v.5, 1999) rather than on Sibley and Monroe (1990) used for other birds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Amazona ochrocephala auropalliata</i>, <i>A. o. belizensis</i>, <i>A. o. caribaea</i>, <i>A. o. oratrix</i>, <i>A. o. parvipes</i> and <i>A. o. tresmariae</i> are listed on Appendix I, while <i>A. o. ochrocephala</i> is still included in Appendix II, requiring that specimens be identified to subspecies as the <i>Handbook</i> considers all of these to form one species; recognizing <i>A. o. ochrocephala</i> as a separate species would reduce this requirement</li> <li>• Current document was presented to the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Animals Committee by Mexico (AC19 Doc. 20.2); the Secretariat pointed out that now that there was only a single standard reference, Mexico's recommendations were "unwarranted and inappropriate"</li> </ul>	<p>experience and technical comments on the application of the new nomenclature for Psittaciformes and Trochilidae, as well as information on the nomenclature used by their main museums for these taxonomic groups; b) As a complementary proposal to references of a general scope, the adoption of recent and more detailed additional reference material be considered, such as the regional listings (elaborated collegially), and that the Nomenclature Committee, through consultation and discussion with the Parties, assess the pros and cons of using these"</p>	<p>warranted; this issue has been discussed already at Nomenclature Committee meetings with respect to <i>A. ochrocephala</i>, and Parties could adopt nomenclature differing from the <i>Handbook</i> for this complex without abandoning it as source for other parrot names</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• However, SSN opposes the suggested requirement that new references be peer-reviewed because this would eliminate the use of many important references in use by scientists (e.g. Wilson and Reeder for mammals) that are published as separate books rather than as articles in peer-reviewed journals; no recent peer-reviewed classification for parrots exists</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 59.2</p> <p>Recognition of <i>Chamaeleo excubitor</i> as a separate species</p> <p>Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES checklist currently includes <i>Chamaeleo excubitor</i> (also known as <i>Bradypodion excubitor</i>) as a synonym of <i>Chamaeleo fischeri</i> (also known as <i>Bradypodion fischeri</i>). All <i>Chamaeleo</i> species are listed on Appendix II</li> <li>• Recent field guide to East African reptiles (Spawls <i>et al</i> 2002) lists <i>Chamaeleo excubitor</i>, the Mount Kenya Hornless Chameleon, as a separate species</li> <li>• <i>C. excubitor</i> is a Kenyan endemic with a very restricted range within a forest area which is rapidly being logged, and it is likely that population levels are declining</li> <li>• Currently it is impossible to assess the extent of trade in <i>C. excubitor</i> since it would be included in trade figures for <i>C. fischeri</i>; there has been extensive trade in <i>C. fischeri</i> from Tanzania between 1975 and 2002; if specimens of <i>C. excubitor</i> were included in any of these shipments they would have been illegally smuggled from Kenya since Kenya does not allow exports</li> <li>• Confiscations of illegally traded specimens of <i>C. excubitor</i> have been made in Kenya</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft Decision directs The Nomenclature Committee to consider the evidence and determine whether <i>Chamaeleo excubitor</i> (also known as <i>Bradypodion excubitor</i>) is a full species, separate from <i>Chamaeleo fischeri</i> (also known as <i>Bradypodion fischeri</i>)</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN agrees that the Nomenclature Committee should examine this issue since there is a strong case for full species status, although strictly speaking, a Decision of the Conference of the Parties is not required</li> <li>• Even if <i>C. excubitor</i> is not recognized, it could still be subject of a proposal to transfer it to Appendix I (if desired) as the Kenyan population of <i>C. fischeri</i>, which is otherwise endemic to Tanzania, although full species recognition prior to an Appendix I listing proposal would be preferable</li> <li>• Status of <i>C. fischeri</i> in Tanzania may also be of concern; all Tanzanian populations live in restricted areas "under grave threat from logging and agricultural development" (Spawls <i>et al</i> 2002) and the species is in trade in significant numbers (over 8,000 were imported to the USA alone from Tanzania between 1996 and 2001)</li> </ul>
<p>CoP13 Doc. 61</p> <p>Inclusion of species in Appendix III</p> <p>Switzerland and CITES Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RC 9.25 (Rev.) pertains to inclusion of species in Appendix III</li> <li>• RC 1.5 (Rev. CoP12) states, "if a country makes a reservation on any species listed in Appendix I or II, that country should not propose that this species be listed on Appendix III"</li> <li>• Switzerland, at the request of the Standing Committee, submitted a proposal for consideration at CoP13 (Prop. 2), to amend Appendices I and II by including a new paragraph after paragraph 4 in the Interpretation section of the Appendices that states, "the following are not subject to the provisions of the Convention: a) in vitro cultivated DNA that does not contain any part of the original; b) urine and faeces; c) synthetically produced medicines and other pharmaceutical products such as vaccines that do not contain any part of the original genetic material from which they are derived; and fossils"</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposes that if Prop. 2 to amend Appendices I and II submitted by Switzerland for consideration at CoP13 is approved, then RC 9.25 (Rev.) should be revised and replaced with a new Resolution that includes the text from the proposal, so that it also applies to specimens of species listed on Appendix III</li> <li>• The proposed new text: "RECOMMENDS that the following items derived from species included in Appendix III be interpreted as being exempt from CITES control, taking into account the provisions of Article I, paragraphs (b)(ii) and (b)(iii) of the Convention, and agreeing to a derogation from Resolution Conf. 9.6 (Rev.) for this purpose: a) in vitro cultivated DNA that does not contain any part of the original; b) urine and faeces; c) synthetically produced medicines and other pharmaceutical products such as vaccines that do not contain any part of the original genetic material from which they are derived; and fossils"</li> <li>• In addition, it is proposed that references to Resolutions repealed long ago be deleted from the 'REPEALS' paragraph; that references to more recent or recently revised Resolutions (such as RC 1.5 (Rev. CoP12) be added to the preamble; and that a reference to Article I, paragraph (b), of the Convention which defines 'specimen'</li> </ul>	<p><b>UNDER REVIEW</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN supports the general concept of the proposal to amend Appendices I and II submitted by Switzerland, but prefers the wording in a proposal on the same subject submitted by Ireland on behalf of the European Union</li> <li>• If CoP13 approves the wording in the proposal submitted by Ireland on behalf of the European Union, then SSN would not object to including the approved wording in a revision of RC 9.25</li> <li>• Nonetheless, SSN is concerned as to how customs authorities will be able to ensure that only synthetically derived DNA is being traded</li> <li>• The term "fossils" should be scientifically and consistently defined within the context of CITES</li> </ul>

TITLE / PROPONENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF WORKING DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		as including any recognizable part or derivative thereof specified in Appendix III in relation to the species, be added to the preamble	
CoP13 Doc. 62.1 (Rev. 1)  CITES Secretariat, on behalf of the CITES Bushmeat Working Group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CITES Bushmeat Working Group was established after CoP11 in accordance with Decision 11.166; the Working Group was maintained, using external funding, after CoP12 in accordance with Decision 12.19</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contains a draft Resolution that identifies issues that the CITES Bushmeat Working Group believes must be addressed if bushmeat is to be regulated in a sustainable manner and illicit trade combated effectively</li> <li>Contains two draft decisions, one calling for the Working Group to continue its work under a new name, the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group, and another calling for donors to support the efforts of the Working Group</li> <li>Secretariat recommends adoption of an amended version of the draft resolution; however, it does not support the continuation of the efforts of the Working Group on the grounds that these are “not issues related to CITES and that it is the levels of domestic harvesting, trade and consumption that pose the greatest threat”; the Secretariat also states that there is little evidence of illegal international trade in CITES-listed species and that where this does occur “it is primarily with neighboring countries and is, thus a sub-regional issue rather than an international matter”</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT THE FOLLOWING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN supports the draft Resolution and draft decisions</li> <li>SSN supports the continued involvement of CITES in addressing the bushmeat trade, to the extent that CITES-listed species are involved in the trade</li> <li>SSN believes that NGOs have an important role to play in this process and recommends that any workshops convened be open to all interested NGO participants</li> </ul> <p><b>OPPOSE THE FOLLOWING</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN opposes the adoption of the Secretariat’s recommendations regarding the relevance to CITES of the bushmeat trade or the continuation of the Working Group: there is substantial evidence that there is international trade in bushmeat, particularly within Africa but also between continents, that affects CITES-listed species including primate species listed on Appendix I; SSN notes that the applicability of CITES is defined by the Convention text, not by the distance between trading States; trade between two Parties, even if they are neighbors, constitutes international trade subject to the provisions of CITES; manifestly, the Convention has a role to play in addressing such trade</li> </ul>
CoP13 Doc. 62.2  Bushmeat  Ireland (on behalf of the Member States of the European Community)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision 11.166 directed the Secretariat to convene a working group to examine the trade in bushmeat with the aim of identifying solutions that can be willingly implemented by range States; the CITES Bushmeat Working Group was subsequently established</li> <li>The Decision also directed the Secretariat to contact organizations such as the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and others to make a contribution to achieve better and sustainable management of the bushmeat trade under their own mandates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognizes that, while the Bushmeat Working Group has fulfilled its mandate, much of the trade occurs outside the bounds of CITES (domestic markets and non-CITES species) and other international organizations have an important role to play</li> <li>Directs the Secretariat to draw the attention of the CBD to the concerns about the unsustainable trade in bushmeat species and urge CBD Parties to make recommendations that will help to address this issue by developing policies to protect native habitats and promote sustainable utilization of forest resources</li> <li>Directs the Secretariat to invite the FAO to convene an international workshop to develop a coordinated approach to tackling the issues of poverty, habitat degradation, human population growth, and utilization of natural resources associated with the unsustainable trade in bushmeat; invitees should include CBD, ITTO, Convention on Migratory Species, U.N. Conference on Trade and Development, U.N. Development Programme, U.N. Environment Programme (including the Great Apes Survival Project), and the U.N. Population Fund; if the FAO agrees to convene the workshop, the Secretariat will invite CITES Parties and other bodies to fund the workshop</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SSN supports the continued involvement of CITES in addressing the bushmeat trade, to the extent that CITES-listed species are involved in the trade</li> <li>SSN believes that NGOs have an important role to play in this process and recommends that any workshops convened be open to all interested NGO participants</li> </ul>

**Species Survival Network**

Website: [www.specieessurvivalnetwork.org](http://www.specieessurvivalnetwork.org) • Email: [info@specieessurvivalnetwork.org](mailto:info@specieessurvivalnetwork.org)  
2100 L Street NW • Washington • DC 20037 USA • Tel: +1 301-548-7769 • Fax: +1 301-258-3080  
SSN European Bureau • Graefelfinger Str. 65 • D - 81375 Munich • Germany • Tel: +49 89-81299-508 • Fax: +49 89-81299-706