



CITES 2007

Analysis of Proposals to Amend Appendices I and II

To be discussed at the 14th Conference of the Parties to CITES, The Hague, the Netherlands, 3 – 15 June 2007, prepared by the Species Survival Network

Abbreviations used: RC=Resolution Conf. • CoP=Conference of the Parties • SC=Standing Committee • AC=Animals Committee • PC=Plants Committee
References cited available upon request

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 1</p> <p>Slow Lorises <i>Nycticebus</i> spp.</p> <p>Cambodia</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with Article II, paragraph 1, of the Convention, and with criteria A i) and v) as well as C i) and ii) of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP 13), Annex 1, for <i>Nycticebus bengalensis</i>, <i>Nycticebus pygmaeus</i>, and criteria C i) and ii) of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP 13), Annex 1, for <i>Nycticebus coucang</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: tropical and subtropical rainforests with dense canopies in South and Southeast Asia; genus now recognized to cover five species; <i>N. bengalensis</i> (recognised as a valid species in 1997): Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Lao People's Democratic Republic (Lao PDR), Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam; <i>N. coucang</i>: Indonesia (Sumatra), Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand; <i>N. pygmaeus</i>: Viet Nam, Cambodia, Lao PDR, China; <i>N. menagensis</i> (recognized as a species in 2003 and again in 2007): Philippines, Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia (Borneo); and <i>N. javanicus</i> (recognized as a species in 2006): Indonesia (Java) • Population: all <i>Nycticebus</i> species have low reproductive rates; <i>N. coucang</i>: only recently uplisted from Lower Risk (IUCN Red List 2006) to Endangered at an Asian Primate Red List Workshop, 8-12 September 2006, Phnom Penh, Cambodia (IUCN/SSC Primate Specialist Group (PSG) 2006), declining in Indonesia (Sumatran populations most at risk due to rampant trade), Malaysia and Singapore; <i>N. javanicus</i>: Endangered (IUCN/SSC PSG 2006), now rarely found on sale due to collapsed wild populations, locally extinct in many lowland rainforests; <i>N. pygmaeus</i>: Vulnerable (IUCN Red List 2006), reduced to a few hundred specimens in China, rapidly declining in Viet Nam; <i>N. bengalensis</i>: only recently uplisted from Data Deficient (IUCN Red List 2006) to Vulnerable (IUCN/SSC PSG 2006) declining in India, China and Viet Nam, some populations in China extirpated; <i>N. menagensis</i>, Vulnerable (IUCN/SSC PSG 2006), declining in Borneo and in the Philippines with small or extirpated populations in the latter country; <i>N. bengalensis</i> and <i>N. coucang</i> rankings are due to habitat loss and extreme pressures of wildlife trade; the few field studies conducted support these findings; in general slow lorises are difficult to study because they are nocturnal and arboreal • Threats: national and international trade as pets and for traditional medicine and food; habitat destruction and degradation; random reintroductions of captive specimens to forests distant from point of origin • Trade: heavily exploited for local and international trade; almost all specimens in trade have been caught in the wild at a rate that far exceeds the low reproductive rate of the genus; increasing market demand due to economic changes and human population growth in region; individual 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Nycticebus</i> spp. are heavily exploited for international and regional trade (pets, food and traditional medicine) • Wild populations are suffering from habitat destruction and over-exploitation over much of their range • Wild populations of all <i>Nycticebus</i> species are declining and some have been locally extirpated due to capture for the pet trade • Low reproductive rates make the genus particularly vulnerable to over-exploitation (one to two offspring per year with up to an 18 month birth interval, and age of first reproduction 18 months to 2 years) • An Appendix-I listing would not only result in higher fines and stronger international efforts, but also increase both public awareness and national conservation measures, thereby reducing pressure on wild populations • Entire genus must be listed due to difficulty identifying specimens in trade • Transfer of the entire genus will avoid difficulties if new species of <i>Nycticebus</i> recognized in future <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, paragraphs A i) and v), and C i) and ii): observed, inferred or projected decline in the number of individuals and the area and quality of habitat • marked decline in the population size in the wild • high vulnerability due to low reproductive rate • high demand for international trade • difficult to distinguish among species in trade</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>species are protected in many range States but laws are poorly enforced, species are difficult to distinguish in trade, and illegal trade far exceeds recorded legal trade; CITES Trade Database (2007) documents the following imports of <i>Nycticebus</i> spp. by Parties from 1977-2004: 131 <i>N. pygmaeus</i>, 1,678 <i>N. coucang</i> (includes <i>N. bengalensis</i>); within the region, legal trade to Singapore, Lao PDR, Hong Kong SAR, Cambodia and Thailand; exported for sale as pets in Japan, the EU (Germany, Netherlands, Poland), Kuwait, United Arab Emirates and offered on the internet; illegal trade routes: Indonesia, Hong Kong and Myanmar, India, Cambodia to Lao PDR, Viet Nam, or Thailand and from there to China and Taiwan; one of most common primates sold in markets: several thousand <i>N. coucang</i>, <i>N. menagensis</i> and <i>N. javanicus</i> are sold in Indonesian markets annually; hundreds of <i>N. pygmaeus</i> are traded in Viet Nam markets monthly; in 2001 the EU suspended imports of wild <i>N. pygmaeus</i> from Lao PDR and Cambodia</p>	
<p>Prop. 2 Bobcat <i>Lynx rufus</i> United States of America Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Canada, Mexico, USA ● Population: IUCN (2006) states population is decreasing; US population reported as 725,000 to 1,017,000 in 1981; size of current US population unknown but believed 'stable' or increasing; size of Canadian population unknown, but believed 'stable' or 'increasing'; size of Mexican population unknown; population trend unknown; species considered 'present and not rare' in some regions ● Threats: habitat loss and harvesting for national and international trade ● Trade: in 2005, 59,545 specimens were traded internationally; most (53,409) were skins and most of these (43,399) were from range States (CITES Trade Database 2007); 6136 other specimens were traded internationally, including tails (used for garment trim), garments, skin pieces, and leather products; main importers were Canada, Italy, Greece; USA by far the largest exporter, followed by Canada, very limited exports from Mexico 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● International trade in skins, parts, and products of <i>L. rufus</i> has grown by more than 500% in the past ten years: up from 13,105 specimens in 1995 to 69,545 in 2006; the number of skins in trade has grown by more than 460% from 11,515 to 53,409 (CITES Trade Database 2007); continued CITES regulation of this growing trade is needed to ensure that trade is not detrimental ● Despite being the most heavily traded cat species, populations of <i>L. rufus</i> are not regularly monitored; the last population estimate for USA is twenty-five years old and no population estimates are available for Canada or Mexico; methodologies used to estimate populations are inaccurate; the majority of USA states lack population estimates on which to base stated trends which calls into question the scientific credibility of management and raises concerns over the impact of increasing trade on the population; the scientific basis for making non-detriment findings is unclear ● <i>Lynx rufus</i> specimens are similar in appearance to skins, parts and products of other small spotted cats, including the IUCN-designated Critically Endangered Iberian lynx (<i>Lynx pardinus</i>), the Near Threatened Eurasian lynx (<i>Lynx lynx</i>), the Canada lynx (<i>Lynx canadensis</i>) (threatened under the US Endangered Species Act) and the Mexican bobcat (<i>Lynx rufus escuinapae</i>) (endangered under the US Endangered Species Act), all of which are listed on appendices I or II of CITES; ongoing illegal trade has been documented in these species and will be exacerbated by delisting of <i>Lynx rufus</i>. ● The proposal acknowledges that pieces of bobcat skin cannot be distinguished from specimens of other <i>Lynx</i> species, even with laboratory analysis; this similarity of appearance would

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>create significant enforcement problems for other <i>Lynx</i> species if <i>Lynx rufus</i> were delisted from CITES; for this reason, Parties have repeatedly rejected several previous proposals to delist this species, most recently at CoP13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal argues that 78% of trade is skins, which are almost always auctioned as complete skins, so they can be readily distinguished from other <i>Lynx</i> species by the ears and tail; however, this ignores the significant trade in parts and manufactured products which are not whole skins (8141 in 2006 alone) and which cannot be distinguished from other <i>Lynx</i> species even by forensic analysis • Proposal states that there is a low volume of illegal trade in <i>Lynx</i> specimens; at the same time, proposal describes illegal international trade of 3568 <i>Lynx</i> spp. items from 1980 to 2004, including from the Critically Endangered <i>L. pardinus</i>, and the Near Threatened <i>L. lynx</i>; if <i>L. rufus</i> was to be delisted, illegal trade would likely increase and laundering of other <i>Lynx</i> species into trade would be facilitated • The proposal is premature: at CoP13 the AC was tasked to report to CoP14 its findings on a review of Felidae and particularly <i>Lynx</i> spp.; however, only a preliminary and incomplete report summarizing information from approximately 47% of the range States was presented at AC22; while the proposal states that range State responses show that trade in <i>L. lynx</i> and <i>L. pardinus</i> is well controlled, one range State identified illegal trade as a problem and seven stated that the species is adversely impacted by trade or is likely to become so without continued listing in the Appendices <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2 a), paragraph B, and Annex 2 b), paragraph A: internationally traded • regulation is required to ensure that the harvest from the wild is not reducing the wild population to a level at which its survival might be threatened by continued harvesting or other influences • the form in which it is traded resembles specimens of a species included in Appendices I and II such that enforcement officers are unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>
<p>Prop. 3</p> <p>Leopard <i>Panthera pardus</i></p> <p>Uganda</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Africa and Asia; in sub-Saharan Africa there are 31 range States • Population: all populations are on Appendix I; <i>P. pardus</i>, Least Concern, decreasing trend (IUCN 2006); 1988 population estimate 714,000 based on modelling (generally considered an overestimate, Nowell and Jackson 1996)) • Threats: habitat loss and degradation; persecution as pests 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal does not conform to species proposal format in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 6 and does not contain information necessary to evaluate whether criteria for downlisting are satisfied • Most recent population estimate is nearly 20 years old and is generally considered to be an overestimate (Nowell and

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>II, population of Uganda, with an annotation: "1) for the exclusive purpose of sport hunting for trophies and skins for personal use, to be exported as personal effects; and 2) with an annual export quota of 50 leopards for the whole country"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trade: 11 range States have export quotas for hunting trophies and skins for personal use, established by RC 10.14 (Rev. CoP13), amounting to a maximum of 2560 exports per annum; 3262 specimens internationally traded in 2005: 1197 trophies (1144 from range States with approved CITES quota), 1690 'derivatives', others included 'specimens', teeth, skins, skulls, leather products; main importing Parties are USA, France, Spain; growing illegal trade in leopard specimens (578 in 2000, 1211 in 2005), particularly 'derivatives' from China and Hong Kong (CITES Trade Database 2007) 	<p>Jackson 1996); the population is considered to be declining (IUCN 2006); there is no scientifically-based information on population size or trend in Uganda</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All leopard populations are listed on Appendix I; many subspecies or important regional populations are classified as Critically Endangered or Endangered (IUCN 2006) ● In accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP12), split-listing of a species should be avoided in view of the enforcement problems it creates ● RC 10.14 (Rev. CoP13) establishes leopard export quotas for hunting trophies and skins for personal use and states that any new quota (i.e. for a State not previously having one) requires the consent of the CoP, in accordance with RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13); this proposal was not prepared in accordance with RC 9.21 ● RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13) states proposals to establish a quota should contain "supporting information including details of the scientific basis for the proposed quota"; this proposal does not provide details of the scientific basis for the proposed quota <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 1 paragraph C i) and ii): internationally traded • decreasing trend occurred in past and is ongoing due to habitat loss and degradation • Uganda population size unknown • no apparent population monitoring in Uganda</p>
<p>Prop. 4</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>Botswana and Namibia</p> <p>Maintenance of the populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe in Appendix II in terms of Article II, paragraph 2 (b), with the replacement of all existing annotations with the following annotation: "1) The establishment of annual export quotas for trade in raw ivory is determined in accordance with Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12); 2) Trade in raw ivory is restricted to trading partners that have been certified by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States) ● Population: Botswana 160,000 (Prop. 5 states that Botswana's elephant population is 154,658), Namibia 16,000, South Africa 18,000, Zimbabwe 90,000 (data from proposal); latest continental population estimate: 402,067 to 660,211 (IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group 2002); poaching severely reduced elephant populations in past and continues to affect populations in all African sub-regions; current continental population less than 50% of 1979 estimated population level ● Threats: poaching, illegal trade, habitat destruction, human-elephant conflict, civil unrest ● Trade: all but four populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with a "one-off experimental" export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999; South Africa elephant population transferred to Appendix II in 2000; a one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 tonnes of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa was approved at CoP12, but is subject to certain conditions and has yet to be approved by the SC; annotations for populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa: trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, trade in live animals for <i>in-situ</i> conservation programs, trade in 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Effectively proposes unlimited commercial trade in raw ivory for Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe, under conditions of RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), to Parties certified by the CITES Secretariat as importing countries; as written, it is unclear whether the proposed annotation would continue to allow commercial trade in live animals and all parts and derivatives (carved ivory, leather, etc.) from these populations, as RC 11.21 provides that "specimens that are not specifically included in the annotation shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I"; also proposes listing the four populations in Appendix II in terms of Article II, paragraph 2(b), for look-alike reasons which would change the basis for the listing so that the populations would not be considered potentially threatened by trade ● No trade in raw or worked ivory, commercial or non-commercial, should be allowed while illegal levels of trade and poaching remain serious threats to elephants across many parts of Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>), and while internal ivory markets in many countries remain unregulated

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Committee, to have sufficient national legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that the imported ivory will not be re-exported and will be managed in accordance with the requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) concerning manufacturing and trade; and 3) The proceeds of the trade in raw ivory are to be used exclusively for elephant conservation and community development programmes"</p>	<p>hides, trade in leather goods for non-commercial purposes for Botswana and for commercial or non-commercial purposes for South Africa and Namibia, trade in hair for commercial or non-commercial purposes for Namibia, trade in ekipas for Namibia for non-commercial purposes; Zimbabwe annotations: export of hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, export of hides and export of leather goods and ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes; illegal trade: more than 40 tonnes of ivory have been reported seized since CoP13, including a number of very large individual shipments up to 6,000kg; many thousand elephants have been poached to supply ivory for the international market</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Seizures of ivory since CoP13 have reached alarming proportions and prices for ivory have increased significantly in several importing countries; several very large seizures of ivory indicate organized criminal activities; spikes in seizure rates following previous CITES CoPs demonstrate that meeting outcomes are communicated quickly, and often inaccurately, to market participants, leading to increases in poaching and illegal trade in populations other than those considered in the proposals; those carrying out such activities will undoubtedly be watching CITES decisions closely in order to take full advantage of any relaxation of the ivory trade ban ● At CoP12, Botswana, South Africa and Namibia requested annual sales of ivory but these proposals were rejected by the Parties; no requests for annual sales should be considered by Parties until a considerable length of time (e.g. 20 years, per Prop. 6) has passed in order to observe the effects of the one-off sale of 60 tonnes of ivory, conditionally approved at CoP12 but not yet carried out ● Although Botswana, Namibia and South Africa may experience levels of poaching lower than other range States, Parties should take into account effects of legalized ivory trade on other elephant populations, particularly those small, fragmented populations in West and Central Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>) ● Enforcement controls in many range States are inadequate to protect elephant populations from increased poaching threats ● At CoP13 in 2004, Namibia proposed to trade in raw and worked ivory; Parties only approved non-commercial trade in ivory ekipas, which Namibia agreed would be strictly controlled; as of 2006, Namibia had failed to implement the agreed control system for ekipas, risking laundering of illegal ivory into the legal trade (Reeve and Pope 2006) ● Allowing international trade in raw ivory from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe would send a message to consumers that it is legal to purchase ivory and would likely cause further increases in poaching and illegal trade ● Proposal indicates that the four countries have adequate national measures in place for protection of elephants; however, there is evidence to the contrary; at SC54, the Secretariat was directed to conduct a mission to Zimbabwe to assess ivory trade controls and enforcement since ivory from Zimbabwe's stockpiles had entered into illegal trade; the Secretariat found a "degree of complacency" in implementation of controls and made suggestions for improvements (CoP14 Doc. 53.1); Namibia has failed to control trade in ekipas; and

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>none of the four countries can control illegal ivory trade across their borders or trade in worked ivory</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Numerous reports of poaching and illegal ivory trade in Zimbabwe call into question the population size claimed and the ability of Zimbabwe to control trade (see Prop. 6) • Proposal implies that by allowing highly regulated commercial trade from these four countries to importing Parties certified by the CITES Secretariat, a 'closed trade cycle' would exist; however, controls in exporting and importing countries are not sufficient to ensure tracking of the flow of ivory and to prevent illegal ivory from being laundered into the system; illegal trade will be encouraged by such a relaxation of the ban; legal and illegal trade cannot be viewed in isolation from each other • Re-opening ivory trade when there has been a significant increase in illegal ivory trade in recent years would undermine ETIS and MIKE, which were originally established as safeguards to monitor trends in illegal trade and elephant poaching
<p>Prop. 5</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>Botswana</p> <p>Amendment of the annotation to the population of Botswana: "For the exclusive purpose of allowing in the case of the population of Botswana: 1) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; 2) trade in hides for commercial purposes; 3) trade in leather goods for commercial purposes; 4) trade in live animals for commercial purposes to appropriate and acceptable destinations (and as determined by the national legislation of the country of import); 5) trade annually in registered stocks of raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces of not more than 8 tonnes) of Botswana origin owned by the Government of Botswana for commercial purposes only with trading partners that have been certified by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing Committee, to have sufficient national</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States) • Population: Botswana: 154,658 and increasing by approximately 5% each year (according to this proposal); latest continental population estimate: 402,067 to 660,211 (IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group 2002); poaching severely reduced elephant populations in past and continues to affect populations in all African sub-regions; current continental population less than 50% of 1979 estimated population level • Threats: poaching, illegal trade, habitat destruction, human-elephant conflict, civil unrest • Trade: all but four populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with a "one-off experimental" export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999; South Africa elephant population transferred to Appendix II in 2000; a one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 tonnes of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa was approved at CoP12, but is subject to certain conditions and has yet to be approved by the SC; annotation for population of Botswana allows trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, trade in live animals for <i>in-situ</i> conservation programs, trade in hides, and trade in leather goods for non-commercial purposes; illegal trade: more than 40 tonnes of ivory have been reported seized since CoP13, including a number of very large individual shipments up to 6,000kg; many thousand elephants have been poached to supply ivory for the international market 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No trade in ivory, commercial or non-commercial, should be allowed while levels of illegal trade and poaching remain serious threats to elephants across many parts of Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>), and while internal ivory markets in many countries remain unregulated • Seizures of ivory since CoP13 have reached alarming proportions; several very large seizures of ivory indicate organized criminal activities; spikes in seizure rates following previous CITES CoPs demonstrate that meeting outcomes are communicated quickly, and often inaccurately, to market participants, leading to increases in poaching and illegal trade in populations other than those considered in the proposals; those carrying out such activities will undoubtedly be watching CITES decisions closely in order to take full advantage of any relaxation of the ivory trade ban • At CoP12 in 2002, Botswana requested annual sales of not more than 4,000kg ivory (half the amount in this proposal) but this was rejected by the Parties; no requests for annual sales should be considered by Parties until a considerable length of time (e.g. 20 years, per Prop. 6) has passed to observe the effects of the one-off sale of 60 tonnes of ivory, conditionally approved at CoP12 but not yet carried out • Although Botswana experiences levels of poaching relatively lower than other range States, Parties should take into account effects of legalized ivory trade on other elephant populations, particularly those small, fragmented populations in West and

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that the imported ivory will not be re-exported and will be managed in accordance with the requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) concerning manufacturing and trade; and 6) trade in registered stocks of raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces of not more than 40 tonnes) of Botswana origin owned by the Government for commercial purposes on a one-off sale immediately after the adoption of the proposal. Botswana will trade only with trading partners that have been certified by the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing Committee, to have sufficient national legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that the imported ivory will not be re-exported and will be managed in accordance with the requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) concerning manufacturing and trade”</p>		<p>Central Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enforcement controls in many range States are inadequate to protect elephant populations from increased poaching threats; Botswana is unable to control illegal ivory trade across its borders (see Prop. 6) • Proposal implies that some of the money raised from the 1999 ivory auction has not yet been spent; this requires clarification especially since the undertaking to expend the funds on community projects and elephant conservation was agreed at CoP10 (Dec 10.2, paragraph b)) as a condition for the sale of stockpiles • Proposal does not indicate annual average quantity of ivory recovered from natural mortality • Allowing international trade in raw ivory from Botswana would send a message to consumers that it is legal to purchase ivory and would likely cause further increases in poaching and illegal trade • Proposal would broaden acceptable destinations for live elephants to other than <i>in situ</i> conservation programs; the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group (2003) “does not endorse the removal of African elephants from the wild for any captive use”; prominent elephant biologists have recommended “an immediate moratorium on the capture and training of young elephants, and prohibit all removals of this nature in future” (Moss et al. 2005); RC 11.20 notes that the term ‘appropriate and acceptable destinations’ has yet to be fully defined by CITES Parties • Trade in ivory will not provide countries with a solution to human-elephant conflict; other non-consumptive methods of mitigation need to be applied
<p>Prop. 6</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>Kenya and Mali</p> <p>A. Amendment of the annotation regarding the populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa to: a) include the following provision: "No trade in raw or worked ivory shall be permitted for a period of 20 years except for: 1) raw ivory exported as hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States) • Population: latest continental population estimate: 402,067 to 660,211 (IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group 2002); poaching severely reduced elephant populations in past and continues to affect populations in all African sub-regions; current continental population less than 50% of 1979 estimated population level • Threats: poaching, illegal trade, habitat destruction, human-elephant conflict and civil unrest • Trade: all but four populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with a "one-off experimental" export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999; South Africa elephant population transferred to Appendix II in 2000; a one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 tonnes of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa was approved at CoP12, but is subject to certain conditions and 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ghana and Togo, range States for the species, strongly support this proposal and would have been co-sponsors if circumstances had allowed • An ivory trade moratorium would: provide Parties with the necessary time to tighten up enforcement on illegal international trade and illegal ivory in domestic markets; enable Parties to monitor the effect that a complete moratorium would have on illegal trade (given that since the ivory ban a certain amount of trade has been allowed by the Parties, including one-off sales and trade for non-commercial purposes); and enhance efforts to increase international awareness about restrictions on international ivory trade • More than 40 tonnes of ivory have been reported seized

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>and 2) ivory exported pursuant to the conditional sale of registered government-owned ivory stocks agreed at the 12th meeting of the Conference of the Parties"; and b) remove the following provision: "6) trade in individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewellery for non-commercial purposes for Namibia".</p> <p>B. Amendment of the annotation regarding the population of Zimbabwe to: "For the exclusive purpose of allowing: 1) export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations; 2) export of hides; and 3) export of leather goods for non-commercial purposes. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly. No trade in raw or worked ivory shall be permitted for a period of 20 years. To ensure that where a) destinations for live animals are to be appropriate and acceptable and/or b) the purpose of the import is to be non-commercial, export permits and re-export certificates may be issued only after the issuing Management Authority has received, from the Management Authority of the State of import, a certification to the effect that: in case a), in analogy to Article III, paragraph 3 (b) of the Convention, the holding facility has been reviewed by the competent Scientific Authority, and the proposed recipient has been found to be suitably equipped to house and care for the animals; and/or in case b), in analogy to Article III, paragraph 3 (c), the Management Authority is satisfied that the specimens will not be used for primarily commercial purposes"</p>	<p>has yet to be approved by the SC; annotations for populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa: trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, trade in live animals for <i>in-situ</i> conservation programs, trade in hides, trade in leather goods for non-commercial purposes for Botswana and commercial or non-commercial purposes for South Africa and Namibia, trade in hair for commercial or non-commercial purposes for Namibia, trade in ekipas for Namibia for non-commercial purposes; Zimbabwe annotations: export of hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, export of hides and export of leather goods and ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes; illegal trade: more than 40 tonnes of ivory have been reported seized since CoP13, including a number of very large individual shipments up to 6,000kg; many thousand elephants have been poached to supply ivory for the international market</p>	<p>between December 2004 and December 2006 (since CoP13), including a number of very large individual shipments up to 6,000kg in weight; many thousands of elephants have been poached to supply ivory for the international market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There continue to be considerable quantities of ivory on sale in domestic markets, with evidence that prices for ivory in those markets are increasing ● No further trade in ivory should be allowed while illegal levels of trade and poaching remain serious threats to elephants across many parts of Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>), and while internal ivory markets in many countries remain unregulated; this proposal therefore makes important amendments to current annotations ● The continued presence of legal ivory on the market, through stockpile sales and exemptions for trade in ivory products from Namibia and Zimbabwe, renders effective enforcement impossible and fuels the laundering of ivory from poached elephants into illegal trade ● There is no evidence that the certification system agreed by Namibia at CoP13 has been implemented; uncontrolled trade in ekipas which has arisen must be addressed by the Parties ● Proposal cites evidence that poaching, ivory trade and sport hunting are all out of control in Zimbabwe; that government stocks of ivory have entered the illegal market, as reported by the Secretariat in CoP14 Doc. 53.1, is of great concern; although the Secretariat has recommended that no additional measures be taken in relation to Zimbabwe, SSN believes that, in addition to approving this proposal, the CoP should direct the SC to assess further the situation in Zimbabwe and consider a suspension of CITES trade and/or advocate a transfer of Zimbabwe's elephant population to Appendix I (as provided in RC 11.21 (Rev. COP13) and 9.24 (Rev. COP13)) ● This annotation will not deny Parties their right under Article XV to submit proposals to amend CITES Appendices I and II to permit trade in ivory but it makes adoption of these proposals less likely due to the 20-year moratorium on ivory trade. It is therefore similar to RC 11.4 (Rev. CoP 12), the effect of which is to discourage trade in cetacean products but which does not prevent Parties from submitting proposals to amend the CITES Appendices in relation to whale stocks. ● According to the African Elephant Status Report (IUCN 2007), population surveys in Zimbabwe in 2006 revealed notable increases in elephant mortality in two of the four major populations since the previous survey in 2001. A "2.5 fold increase in the number of dead elephants" was observed in

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>the Sebungwe area, for which illegal killing was at least partly responsible; in Northwest Matabeleland, a partial survey revealed "a considerable increase in the carcass ratio (i.e. the proportion of dead to dead plus live elephants), from 3.2% in 2001 to 5.6% in 2006"; tusks were missing in 90% of dead elephants found</p>
<p>Prop. 7</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>Tanzania</p> <p>Transfer of the population of Tanzania from Appendix I to Appendix II with an annotation that reads as follows: "For the exclusive purpose of allowing: 1) trade in registered stocks of raw ivory in whole tusks and pieces; 2) trade in live specimens for non-commercial purposes to appropriate and acceptable destinations; and 3) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes."</p> <p>Proposal rationale states: "A maximum of 100,000 kg of ivory and dispatched in several shipments under the supervision of the CITES Secretariat"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States) ● Population: Tanzania: 141,000 (according to this proposal); however, no references for this figure are cited and no recent population surveys are publicly available; latest Tanzania population estimate from the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group (IUCN/SSC AESG 2002) is 92,453-130,470; latest continental population estimate: 402,067 to 660,211 (IUCN/SSC AESG 2002); poaching severely reduced elephant populations in past and continues to affect populations in all African sub-regions; current continental population less than 50% of 1979 estimated population level ● Threats: poaching, illegal trade, habitat destruction, human-elephant conflict and civil unrest ● Trade: all but four populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with a "one-off experimental" export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999; South Africa elephant population transferred to Appendix II in 2000; a one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 tonnes of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa was approved at CoP12, but is subject to certain conditions and has yet to be approved by the SC; annotations for populations of Botswana, Namibia and South Africa: trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, trade in live animals for <i>in-situ</i> conservation programs, trade in hides, trade in leather goods for non-commercial purposes for Botswana and commercial or non-commercial purposes for South Africa and Namibia, trade in hair for commercial or non-commercial purposes for Namibia, trade in ekipas for Namibia for non-commercial purposes; Zimbabwe annotations: export of hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, export of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, export of hides and export of leather goods and ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes; illegal trade: more than 40 tonnes of ivory have been reported seized since CoP13, including a number of very large individual shipments up to 6,000kg; many thousand elephants have been poached to supply ivory for the international market 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No trade in ivory, commercial or non-commercial, should be allowed while illegal levels of trade and poaching remain serious threats to elephants across many parts of Africa and Asia, and while internal ivory markets in many countries remain unregulated ● Seizures of ivory since CoP13 have reached alarming proportions; several very large seizures of ivory indicate organized criminal activities; recently, Tanzania has been named as the point of origin for a number of large illegal shipments of ivory: 3,060kg seized in Taiwan in July 2006; 2,158kg seized in Taiwan in July 2006; 503kg seized in Hong Kong in May 2005; and 800 kg seized in Vietnam in December 2004 (see Prop. 6, Annex 2A); the Lusaka Agreement Task Force (LATF) reported eight seizures of ivory believed to have originated in Tanzania between January and September 2006 alone ● Anti-poaching forces for Tanzania's National Parks are overstretched; effective anti-poaching forces for other protected areas (i.e. Game Reserves) are lacking, thus exposing large areas to poachers; eye witnesses reported "heavy poaching" in Tanzanian Game Reserves, particularly the Selous, Kisigo and Rungwa Game Reserves (Environmental Investigation Agency 2002) ● One report has indicated increased elephant poaching incidents, coupled with isolated seizures, involving elephant tusks mostly targeted towards markets outside the country (Tanzania Report to 'IECTG' Meeting, Mlilwane Swaziland 25th-26th November 2005) ● Allowing international trade in raw ivory from Tanzania would send a message to consumers that it is legal to purchase ivory and would likely cause further increases in poaching and illegal trade; spikes in seizure rates following previous CITES CoPs demonstrate that meeting outcomes are communicated quickly, and often inaccurately, to market participants, leading to increases in poaching and illegal trade in populations other than those considered in the proposals; those engaged in criminal activities will undoubtedly be watching CITES decisions closely in order to take full advantage of any

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>relaxation of the ivory trade ban</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No requests for annual sales should be considered by Parties until a considerable length of time has passed in order to observe the effect of the one-off sale of 60 tonnes of ivory, conditionally approved at CoP12 but not yet carried out • The proposal does not specify over what time period the 100,000kg of ivory proposed for sale would be exported if the proposal is approved • Parties should take into account effects of legalized ivory trade on other elephant populations, particularly those small, fragmented populations in West and Central Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>); enforcement controls in many range States are inadequate to protect elephant populations from increased poaching threats • Live animals should not be included in annotations; the IUCN/SSC African Elephant Specialist Group (2003) “does not endorse the removal of African elephants from the wild for any captive use”; prominent elephant biologists have recommended “an immediate moratorium on the capture and training of young elephants, and prohibit all removals of this nature in future” (Moss et al. 2005); furthermore, although Article I, paragraph (b), of the Convention, provides the possibility to specify certain parts and derivatives of Appendix-II and Appendix-III plant species (and Appendix-III animal species) as included in the Appendices, and thus to exclude certain others, it does not provide the possibility to include certain whole animals or plants and exclude others; on the contrary, it is clear from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) that “any animal or plant, whether alive or dead” is considered as a ‘specimen’ and therefore subject to the provisions of the Convention (SC54 Doc. 18); RC 11.20 notes that the term ‘appropriate and acceptable destinations’ has yet to be fully defined by CITES Parties
<p>Prop. 8</p> <p>Vicuña <i>Vicugna vicugna</i></p> <p>Bolivia</p> <p>Amendment of annotation: “Population of Bolivia (listed in Appendix II): For the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in wool sheared from live vicuñas, and in cloth and items made</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador • Population: all populations are on Appendix I except certain populations of Argentina and Chile, and all populations of Bolivia and Peru, which are on Appendix II; global wild population 306,680 and increasing; Bolivia population: 62,869 and increasing; historically over-exploited for trade (global population declined from 400,000 to 10,000 between 1950s and 1967) • Threats: poaching for wool and meat; perceived competition with livestock • Trade: certain populations of vicuña in Argentina and Chile and all populations of Bolivia and Peru are on Appendix II with an annotation that allows for trade in wool sheared from live animals and/or cloth, manufactured 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At CoP12 (2002) Bolivia proposed to transfer its population from Appendix I to II, annotated to allow trade in products made from wool sheared from vicuña from all its populations; however, Parties approved trade in wool for only the three largest populations (Mauri-Desaguadero, 2006 population size 15,405; Ulla Ulla, 10,350; and Lípez-Chichas, 16,078); since 2002, two populations, including Lipez-Chichas, have declined in number • Proposal would allow trade in wool from all nine Bolivian vicuña populations, not just the three largest populations as in the current annotation (current annotation allows trade in products

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>thereof, including luxury handicrafts and knitted articles. The reverse side of the cloth must bear the logotype adopted by the range States of the species, which are signatories to the <i>Convenio para la Conservación y Manejo de la Vicuña</i>, and the words 'VICUÑA-BOLIVIA'. Other products must bear a label including the logotype and the designation 'VICUÑA-BOLIVIA-ARTESANÍA'. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly"</p>	<p>products and handicrafts; the annotation for Bolivia reads: "For the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in: a) wool and products derived therefrom sheared from live animals of the populations of the Conservation Units of Mauri-Desaguadero, Ulla Ulla and López-Chichas; and b) products made from wool sheared from live animals of the rest of the population of Bolivia. The reverse side of the cloth must bear the logotype adopted by the range States of the species, which are signatories to the <i>Convenio para la Conservación y Manejo de la Vicuña</i>, and the words 'VICUÑA-BOLIVIA'. Other products must bear a label including the logotype and the designation 'VICUÑA-BOLIVIA-ARTESANÍA'. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly"; main trade is in wool, cloth and garments; in 2005: Bolivia exported 500kg of wool, Argentina 200kg, Peru 2279kg, Chile 127kg; Italy exported 1366m of cloth, Belgium 416 m, Peru 91m; Peru exported 718 garments and Italy 650; in 2005, the main importers of wool were Italy, Great Britain, Japan and USA.; of cloth: Japan, Switzerland, China; of garments: Japan, Peru, Germany; some illegal trade in wool, cloth and garments exists (CITES Trade Database 2007)</p>	<p>from all nine Bolivian populations but wool from only three)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some of the six populations from which wool trade would be allowed if this proposal was accepted are very small (fewer than 800 animals) (Table 2 of proposal); SSN is concerned about the impact of additional trade in wool on these populations There are consistent indications of illegal poaching and trade in Bolivia (IUCN 2002); in one area gangs killed 12% of the population; proposal for trade in wool from all nine populations in Bolivia should be rejected until poaching and illegal trade are controlled
<p>Prop. 9</p> <p>Barbary Red Deer <i>Cervus elaphus barbarus</i></p> <p>Algeria</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix III to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution: Algeria, Tunisia; Morocco (extinct) Population: Lower Risk/Near Threatened (IUCN 2006); listed on CITES Appendix III by Tunisia; on Appendix I of the Convention on Migratory Species; wild population size is 50-60 in Algeria where specimens are dispersed between the El Kala National Park (la Wilaya de El Tarf) and the Guelma/Souk Ahras area (from proposal); total population in Tunisia is now estimated to be about 800 individuals (Hajji et al. in print); current range much reduced from historic range; low reproductive rate (one and very rarely two offspring per year) (Bonenfant, 2004) Threats: habitat loss and habitat degradation (forests are affected by fires, urbanization, excessive grazing); poaching (possibly for trade in meat, antler velvet and trophy antlers); hunting Trade: markets for meat (venison), antler velvet and trophy antlers are well established for <i>C. elaphus</i>; antler velvet is used for traditional medicine and is exported mainly to China, Taiwan, Hong Kong and Korea, the main export markets of this product; the existing markets for <i>C. elaphus</i> could include smuggled parts and products of <i>Cervus elaphus barbarus</i> 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the historical range covered large parts of Algeria, Tunisia and Morocco, now only a very small wild population remains, which is restricted to a small area on the Tunisian-Algerian border (Hajji et al. in print). Recent population estimates for Tunisia resulted in only 800 specimens, whereas former estimates reported 2,000 specimens; reintroduction programs in protected areas are threatened by poaching (Hajji et al. in print) Extinct in one range State (Morocco) Well-developed international markets for <i>C. elaphus</i> meat, antlers for trophies and antler velvet; may be driving illegal trade Ongoing observed decline in the area and quality of habitat Low reproductive rate Efforts by the proponent, one of two remaining range States, to protect the species should be supported; Appendix I listing might result in improved enforcement by increasing fines and raising public awareness <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, A i), ii), v): very small wild population • international trade in meat, trophy antler and antler velvet • degradation and loss of habitat • low reproductive rate</p>
<p>Prop. 10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution: Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, Western Sahara Population: Endangered (IUCN 2006); listed on CITES Appendix III by 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species is classified as Endangered by the IUCN since 1986;

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Cuvier's Gazelle <i>Gazella cuvieri</i></p> <p>Algeria</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix III to Appendix I</p>	<p>Tunisia; on Appendix I of the Convention on Migratory Species; in 1991, experts estimated that 560 specimens were present in Algeria (De Smet 1991) while a 2005/2006 survey found only 500 specimens, a 10.7% decline; total population estimates for the populations of Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco combined amounts to 1450-2450 individuals: 600 to 1500 in Morocco, 300 to 400 in Tunisia and 560 in Algeria (Algerian figure is based on the 1991 survey) (CMS 2006); nationally reported as endangered in Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia (CMS 2006); species is in Class A of the 1968 African Convention on the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources which provides that "the hunting, killing, capture or collection of specimens shall be permitted only on the authorization in each case of the highest competent authority and only if required in the national interest or for scientific purposes", Tunisia and Morocco have ratified this convention while Algeria has signed it but not ratified it; low reproductive rate: one offspring per litter, but twins are frequent; middle-aged females can produce two litters in one year if sufficient food and water are available (Olmedo <i>et al.</i> 1985)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: poaching possibly motivated by trade; forest fires; illegal hunting; habitat degradation and diminution due to expansion of pastureland for livestock and deforestation for agriculture or charcoal (CMS 2006); predation by dogs (CMS 2006); species is found in same areas as <i>Gazella dorcas</i> and <i>Gazella leptoceros</i> which could mean that it faces identical threats (illegal hunting, habitat loss, international trade, hunting for trade in meat, horns and trophies); <i>Gazella cuvieri</i> seems less tolerant of disturbance than <i>Gazella dorcas</i> (CMS 2006) • Trade: between 2004 and 2005: 24 live specimens were traded between United Arab Emirates (country of import) and Canada (country of export): 14 were traded for breeding in captivity or artificial propagation (purpose code B) and 10 for reintroduction or introduction into the wild (purpose code N) (CITES Trade Database 2007); data on illegal trade not available; meat locally traded in Morocco 	<p>populations have not recovered during recent decades</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decreasing wild populations • Very small wild populations that are only surviving in highland areas • Traded internationally • Despite strong legal protection, species remains threatened by poaching and illegal hunting • Ongoing loss and degradation of habitat • Low reproductive rate (one or two offspring per year) <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, A i), ii), v) and C i) and ii)): very small wild populations • endangered • decreasing wild populations • traded internationally • threatened by smuggling and illegal hunting despite legal protection • degradation and loss of habitat • low reproductive rate</p>
<p>Prop. 11</p> <p>Dorcas Gazelle <i>Gazella dorcas</i></p> <p>Algeria</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix III to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Algeria , Burkina Faso , Chad , Djibouti , Egypt , Eritrea , Ethiopia , Israel , Jordan , Libyan Arab Jamahiriya , Mali , Mauritania , Morocco , Niger , Nigeria (extinct) , Senegal (extinct), Somalia , Sudan, Togo, Tunisia , Western Sahara , Yemen • Population: Vulnerable and decreasing wild population (IUCN 2006); listed on CITES Appendix III by Tunisia; listed on Appendix I of the Convention on Migratory Species (only Northwest African populations); general distribution has remained the same but the number of specimens reduced substantially, probably to half of original abundance (Dragesco-Joffe 1993); a 2005/2006 a survey estimated that 619 wild specimens remained in Algeria; Morocco: 500-800; Egypt: 1,000-2,000; Mali: 2,000-2,500; Ethiopia: little more than 500 specimens in the Afar region (Ali and Zeleke 2003); low reproductive rate: a single fawn per year although twins have been reported in Algeria (CMS 2006); numbers have decreased dramatically due to over-hunting and annihilation of wildlife by military-style hunting expeditions originating from 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classified as Vulnerable (IUCN 2006); • Species is endangered or probably endangered in five range States (Morocco, Libya, Mauritania, Mali and Burkina Faso) (CMS 2006) • Wild population is in serious decline throughout its range and populations have become locally extinct • Only small wild populations remain • Species has become extinct in Nigeria and Senegal • Heavily traded internationally, mainly exported as live to be hunted for trophy specimens in importing countries • Hunting is a major threat for the species and studies show that it is partially motivated by trade • Proponent is in the process of conducting surveys and studies

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>the Gulf States resulting in a major threat for the species; such expeditions have caused the decline of formerly large populations in Egypt's western deserts which now number no more than 1000-2000 specimens (CITES Species Database); formerly common in its entire range, <i>G. dorcas</i> has entirely disappeared from many regions and been gravely reduced in numbers where it subsists (CMS 2006); species is reported as endangered in Morocco, Libya and Mauritania; probably endangered in Mali, Burkina Faso; probably vulnerable or endangered in Chad and Niger; vulnerable in Tunisia and Egypt; probably near threatened or vulnerable in Sudan, and probably vulnerable in Algeria (CMS 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: poaching, illegal hunting, military-style hunting expeditions, hunting for trade in meat, trophies, and animal parts used in traditional medicine (Cuzin 2003), habitat loss due to the use of land for cattle, and international trade • Trade: between 2000 and 2005, the sum of all reported transactions involved 1806 Dorcas gazelles (1675 live specimens, 95 trophies, 10 bodies, 4 skulls, 6 bones, 2 skeletons, 3 skins, 1 horn and 10 specimens) (CITES Trade Database); most Dorcas gazelles involved in this trade are reported as coming from the wild (only 533 are reported as coming from ranching or captivity); large-scale transactions are common practice for some CITES Parties (i.e. Sudan reported a total of 1313 exports and re-exports of live specimens from 2000 to 2005; trade data for Sudan show that from 2000 to 2004, yearly transactions of live specimens involved an average of 250 up to 352 animals per year, whereas in 2005, only 62 animals were exported which could show a significant decrease in the population) (CITES Trade Database); Sudan is the main exporter of the species; Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Qatar are main importers of the species (CITES Trade Database); a 2007 internet search showed that mounted horns of Dorcas gazelle can be found for sale on eBay; data on illegal trade not available but several specimens are reported as confiscated in the CITES Trade Database 	<p>which so far have demonstrated substantial population declines throughout the species' range</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat loss ongoing due to the use of land for cattle • Low reproductive rate (one offspring per year) <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, A i), ii), v) and C i) and ii): wild population declining • Vulnerable • small wild populations • heavily traded internationally • hunting is major threat for the species and hunting is partly motivated by trade • loss of habitat • low reproductive rate</p>
<p>Prop. 12</p> <p>Slender-Horned Gazelle <i>Gazella leptoceros</i></p> <p>Algeria</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix III to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Algeria, Chad, Egypt, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Niger, Sudan (possibly extinct), Tunisia • Population: Endangered and decreasing (IUCN 2006); listed on CITES Appendix III in Tunisia; on Appendix I of the Convention on Migratory Species; nationally reported as probably endangered in Chad, Niger, Libya, Algeria and Tunisia (CMS 2006); nationally reported as endangered in Egypt (CMS 2006); nationally reported as possibly extinct in Sudan (CMS 2002); wild populations declined substantially from historic numbers; total population has been estimated to less than 2,500 mature individuals (Mallon and Kingswood, IUCN 2001); population size of <i>G. leptoceros</i> is very difficult to estimate but experts affirm that "it seems clear, however, that it was much more abundant in the Algeria-Tunisia Great Ergs at the end of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century than it has been in recent years" (CMS 2006); observations suggest it is possible the Tunisian 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Since 1990 classified as Endangered and wild population is still decreasing • Once the most common of all gazelles living in the Sahara desert; since the early 1970s in serious decline due to hunting, trade and habitat loss • Small wild populations highly fragmented in isolated pockets throughout the Sahara Desert • Still traded internationally. Its horns were formerly sold as ornaments in North African markets and shops • Habitat degradation and diminution • Low reproductive rate

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>population may number a few hundred individuals, but more data are needed to verify this preliminary assessment (CMS 2006); low reproductive rate: one litter of one or two fawns per year (Geoffroy and Cuvie 2004, CMS 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: international trade; motorized hunts, partly motivated by trade in horns and meat (horns sold as ornaments in North African markets, can also be used for traditional masks); habitat degradation and diminution (CMS 2006); species is found in same areas as <i>G. dorcas</i> and <i>G. cuvieri</i> which could mean that it faces identical threats (illegal hunting, habitat loss, international trade, hunting for trade in meat, horns and trophies); experts report that although paler and slightly larger, this species can be mistaken for <i>G. dorcas</i> (Newby 1984) • Trade: 36 live specimens were traded between 2000 and 2005; all were reported to be captive-bred (CITES Trade Database 2007); information on illegal trade is not available 	<p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, A i), ii), v) and C i) and ii): wild population declining • Endangered • small wild populations • traded internationally • hunting is major threat for the species and hunting is partly motivated by trade • habitat degradation • low reproductive rate</p>
<p>Prop. 13</p> <p>Black Caiman <i>Melanosuchus niger</i></p> <p>Brazil</p> <p>Transfer of the Brazilian population from Appendix I to Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: terrestrial and freshwaters of Amazon River Basin; Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guiana, Guyana, Peru, Suriname • Population: all populations on Appendix I, except that of Ecuador which is on Appendix II with a zero export quota until an annual export quota has been approved by the CITES Secretariat and the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group; Lower Risk / Conservation Dependent (IUCN 2006; Conservation Dependent means “taxa which are the focus of a continuing taxon-specific or habitat-specific conservation program targeted towards the taxon in question, the cessation of which would result in the taxon qualifying for one of the threatened categories above within a period of five years”); historically over-exploited and populations depleted; listed as an endangered species in Brazil in 1982; now occupies historic range and is considered ‘locally abundant’ in Brazil (according to proposal); estimated Brazil population size: 16 million and increasing in one studied area (this proposal) • Threats: habitat modification; illegal trade for national and international trade • Trade: no legal international trade; no illegal international trade of skins from Brazil has been recorded since the 1980s (according to proposal); however, proposal states there is a ‘vigorous market’ in dried and salted meat in the Amazon region, including unrecorded trade between Parties, in apparent violation of CITES; in 1995, an estimated 65 tonnes of black caiman meat was illegally taken from the Brazillian Mamirauá reserve and sold in Brazil and Colombia (according to proposal); Da Silveira and Thorbjarnarson (1999) estimate that 5,230 black caimans were hunted annually in this reserve; in 2005, 67.8 tonnes of meat (5115 individuals) was illegally taken from another reserve (this proposal) 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal requests transfer from Appendix I to II in accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 4, paragraph A. 2. b) which states: “the species is likely to be in demand for trade, but its management is such that the Conference of the Parties is satisfied with: i) implementation by the range States of the requirements of the Convention, in particular Article IV; and ii) appropriate enforcement controls and compliance with the requirements of the Convention”; however, this proposal demonstrates that Brazil is unable to control illegal harvest and illegal international trade in black caiman meat (illegal under Brazil law and CITES) • Proposal states that illegal trade in black caiman meat will be eliminated by allowing legal production; however, given that Brazil cannot control current illegal harvest and illegal international trade, it is more likely that legal trade would be in addition to illegal trade, or that legal trade will provide a cover for illegal trade • Proposal states that it is “much easier to control international trade than the clandestine local market”; to the contrary, it is much more difficult to control lucrative international markets which will drive up prices and increase illegal trade • Proposal states that take would only be allowed in ‘sustainable use reserves’ and initial take will be restricted to Mamirauá reserve, with a quota of 695; however, current illegal hunting in this same reserve exceeds this proposed legal harvest by more than seven times • Proposal states that the Ministry of Agriculture and the State Sanitary Authority have “strict measures to control meat exports”; however, the proposal acknowledges lack of control

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>over illegal meat export</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal states that there is “strict observance of national and international laws and regulations are monitored”; however, the proposal acknowledges illegal harvest and illegal, undocumented international trade • Currently, CITES does not permit any international trade in the species; permitting trade in black caiman from Brazil may result in enforcement problems in other range States <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 1, paragraph C) i): illegal international and domestic trade • a marked decline in the population size in the wild having occurred in the past but with a potential to resume • precautionary measures for transferring species from Appendix I to II in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 4 are not met due to poor enforcement and implementation of CITES and domestic law</p>
<p>Prop. 14</p> <p>Guatemalan Beaded Lizard <i>Heloderma horridum charlesbogerti</i></p> <p>Guatemala</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with Article II (2(a)) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) [Annex 1, paragraph A i) ii) and v); paragraph B i), ii), iii) and iv); and paragraph C ii)]</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: dry forest areas of the Rio Motagua Valley and adjacent foothills in Guatemala • Population: <i>H. horridum</i> is classified as Vulnerable (IUCN 2006); subspecies listed as Threatened on Guatemala’s Red List; <i>Heloderma</i> spp. listed on CITES Appendix II; only 70-250 individuals remain in the wild; studies indicate that the species may be declining because it is difficult to find in recent years while interviews with local communities indicate that the species was commonly encountered as recently as the 1980s • Threats: habitat loss (historic distribution was nearly 200,000 ha but current distribution is limited to dispersed patches of forest that cover an estimated 24,000 ha); illegal trade in specimens for local and international trade; extermination by local communities who fear this venomous animal • Trade: in great demand in the international market due to its rarity and value (up to US\$2,000 per specimen); an estimated 35 specimens were illegally taken from the wild during the 1990s for sale in international trade; protected from trade by Guatemalan law, only legal specimens outside Guatemala are maintained in zoos 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the most endangered reptiles in the world; “populations are reduced and in sad shape compared to the situation a few years ago” (Beck 2005) • Proponent is the sole range State and should be supported in its effort to protect this rare species • Inclusion in Appendix I will increase penalties for illegal trade in potential consumer nations • Adult specimens of this subspecies can be differentiated from other subspecies by the presence of five pairs of well-defined yellow rings separated by black bands on the tail • Recent genetic studies have shown that <i>H. h. charlesbogerti</i> constitutes a genetically differentiated taxon from the other subspecies and may be promoted to the species level <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, paragraphs A i), ii), v), B i), ii), iii) and iv), and C ii): very small wild population • very restricted distribution • observed decline in the wild population • habitat loss • internationally traded • threatened by illegal trade</p>
<p>Prop. 15</p> <p>Porbeagle <i>Lamna nasus</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the Member States of the European Community</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: between latitude 30-60°S in a circumglobal band in the Southern Ocean, and 30-70°N in the North Atlantic Ocean (57 range States) • Population: vulnerable due to its late maturity, low reproductive rate (litter of 4 pups every 1 – 2 years), longevity, and long gestation (8 – 9 months); Northwest Atlantic population is estimated at 188,000-191,000 sharks (21-24% of historic numbers), with 9,000-13,000 female spawners, representing 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsustainable fisheries have been driven by the high value of the meat in national and international markets • International trade is wholly unregulated and no regional fishery organizations manage high seas stocks • There are no international control measures or monitoring

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Inclusion in Appendix II, with the following annotation: "The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Lamna nasus</i> in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues, such as the possible designation of an additional Management Authority."</p>	<p>12-15% of virgin abundance; this population is Endangered (IUCN 2006) and is considered to be so low that its role in the ecosystem is disrupted (Fisheries and Oceans Canada 2006); both the Northeast Atlantic and Mediterranean populations are Critically Endangered (IUCN 2006); in the Northeast Atlantic, target fishery catches have declined by 90% from baseline levels and there are no indications of stock recovery (ICES 2005); in the Mediterranean Sea, this species has almost completely disappeared, with only 15 individuals caught during bycatch research in 1998-1999; Southern Ocean stocks are Near Threatened (IUCN 2006), with a 50-80% decline in 10 years in the Southwest Pacific, and an 80-90% decline in the southwest Atlantic inferred from pelagic longline catch per unit effort (CPUE) data</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Threats: over-exploitation in target and bycatch fisheries; both large juveniles (well before maturity) and mature fish are targeted ● Trade: trade is not documented to species level, so scale of worldwide trade is difficult to assess; however, the demand for porbeagle meat and by-products is sufficiently high to justify existence of an international market; porbeagle meat is one of the most highly valued of all shark species, and is traded fresh, frozen and dried-salted; fins are frequently traded in the global fin market, hides are processed for leather and liver oil, and other parts are used for fishmeal fertiliser; on the international market Canada exports to the USA and the EU, Japan exports to the EU, and the EU exports to the USA; porbeagle is also traded internally within the EU; there is a large unreported bycatch in the southern hemisphere 	<p>systems, so data on international trade, or on the scale and value of global consumption of the species, are nonexistent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Despite listings on Annex 1 (Highly Migratory Species) of the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, Annex III (Species whose exploitation is regulated) of the Barcelona Convention Protocol, and Appendix III of the Bern Convention (the Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats), no international management actions have been implemented ● Only USA, Canada and New Zealand have management plans in place ● Listing in Appendix II will require that management plans are established in the remaining range States and would promote regional cooperation for the conservation of the species <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • poor management • high global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 16</p> <p>Spiny Dogfish <i>Squalus acanthias</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the Member States of the European Community</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II, with the following annotation: "The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Squalus acanthias</i> in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues, such as the possible designation of an additional Management Authority."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: species is highly migratory and is found in northern and southern temperate and boreal waters, including the Northwest and Northeast Atlantic, Northwest and Northeast Pacific, South Atlantic and Southeast Pacific (64 range States) ● Population: vulnerable due to its late maturity, low reproductive rate (litter of 2-11 pups every 2 years), longevity, and long gestation (18-24 months); populations are distinct and are in widespread decline worldwide; Northeast Atlantic population, globally the most important, is Critically Endangered (IUCN 2006); Mediterranean Sea, Northwest Atlantic and Western North Pacific populations are Endangered (IUCN 2006); Black Sea and South American populations are Vulnerable (IUCN 2006); Northeast Atlantic population was estimated at 100,000 to 500,000 mature individuals in 2000, representing a 95% decline from baseline levels (and an 80% decline since 1980), with a 75% reduction in mature females in the last 10 years; Northwest Atlantic female spawning biomass has also declined by 75% leading to seven years of recruitment failure, while landings in the Northwest Pacific have declined by more than 99% in the last 50 years; the species has vanished from the western Mediterranean in the last 30 years; its aggregating habits and segregation by age and sex make it particularly vulnerable to fisheries ● Threats: over-exploitation by targeted fisheries and by-catch; unregulated 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Shark Working Group, established by the CITES Animals Committee, agreed in 2004 that this species meets the requirements for Appendix II listing ● The proponent (as well as other EU Member States) is a range State for this species and has listed it as Vulnerable on its Red List, while IUCN has its populations listed from Vulnerable to Critically Endangered ● There are no international instruments for the conservation of this species; it is not listed on any international wildlife or fisheries agreement and has no legal status ● Implementation of FAO's International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks) is voluntary worldwide; there is no EU shark management plan; Northwest Pacific population has no management while the Northwest Atlantic and Northeast Pacific populations are only minimally protected ● Listing on Appendix II will ensure the international trade fisheries are sustainably managed and accurately recorded, thereby supporting the FAO's IPOA-Sharks

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>trade into Europe; inadequate management of populations; habitat loss</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trade: trade in meat is the most important product for target fisheries; it is traded fresh, chilled and frozen, primarily from the USA and Canada to Europe, and internally within the EU; the global export of meat to the EU has decreased from 11,926 tonnes in 1995 to 4,879 tonnes in 2005 because of declining catches; fins and tails are traded from the USA to China; cartilage and livers (or liver oil) are traded commonly from the USA to France, Italy, Switzerland and Taiwan for medicinal products; no shark management plans are in place for non-pelagic sharks such as this species; there are no look-alike problems with this species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Even with the introduction of quota restrictions in the Northwest Atlantic, there have been no signs of recovery of mature females or improvements in recruitment <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • poor management and high global demand • habitat degradation and loss</p>
<p>Prop. 17</p> <p>Sawfishes Pristidae spp.</p> <p>Kenya and United States of America</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix I in accordance with Article II (1) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, paragraphs A. i) and v); B. i), iii) and iv); and C.ii)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: seven species; occupy a near-shore marine and estuarine habitat; distribution is very fragmented and varies with the species; <i>Anoxypristis cuspidata</i>: Indo-West Pacific Ocean ranging from east Africa to Australia and China (20 range States); <i>Pristis clavata</i>: northern nearshore waters of Australia (1 range State); <i>Pristis microdon</i>: from Sri Lanka to Australia including islands in the archipelago (49 range States); <i>Pristis pectinata</i>: Western Atlantic Ocean, Gulf of Mexico and Brazil, may be found in west African countries, South Africa, east Africa to southeast Asia and Australia, extinct in the Mediterranean (60 range States); <i>Pristis perotteti</i>: western Atlantic ocean from the United States to Brazil and in the Eastern Pacific Ocean from Mexico to Ecuador (9 range States); <i>Pristis pristis</i>: Eastern Atlantic Ocean from Portugal to Angola (38 range States); <i>Pristis zijsron</i>: Indian Pacific Ocean from east Africa to Australia including some areas of southeast Asia and in Indonesian archipelago, declared extinct in New South Wales, Australia, in 2007 (18 range States) ● Population: all species are Critically Endangered (IUCN 2006); sawfishes are vulnerable due to their very low reproductive rate (7 offspring every 2 years) and long gestation (5 months); the global populations of all species have experienced historic declines greater than 90% mostly due to fishing pressure (direct captures and bycatch); declines are demonstrated by a significant reduction in captures or complete disappearance from the original range; proposal provides decline data for all species of sawfishes; distribution severely fragmented, many populations extirpated from large parts of former range, remaining populations severely depleted ● Threats: fishing (formerly targeted but now mostly bycatch, fishes caught as bycatch are usually retained for trade); entanglement; various forms of international trade; habitat loss and habitat destruction ● Trade: all international trade is legal except in very few States; trade in parts and derivatives of sawfishes is significant (an estimated 1,000-1,500 small to medium sized rostra are sold per year); sawfish fins are regarded as high quality in the shark fin trade (sawfishes have large fins with high fine needle content); there is an international market for sawfish meat in northern Brazil and international trade occurs in rostral teeth used as cockfighting spurs; trade in live sawfishes for public and private aquariums is also important and command high prices (an aquarium recently acquired a specimen for 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All sawfish species are Critically Endangered and their exploitation is driven by various forms of international trade (trade in living specimens for aquariums, trade in parts and derivatives) ● Sawfishes are not regulated by regional fisheries management organizations or the FAO and are not protected by any international treaty or regime ● Because sawfishes are only protected by a few countries and no international organizations, almost all trade is considered legal; impact and quantity of illegal, unreported trade on the species are unknown <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 1, paragraphs A i), v), B i), ii), iv), and C ii): internationally traded • Critically Endangered • small wild populations • over-exploited for international trade • populations declining • restricted area of distribution • distribution fragmented • not protected by any international measures • low reproductive rate</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>\$10,000); snouts are used by spirit mediums for ceremonial practices in Taiwan, China; demand for trade is known to drive sawfish fishery and explains why bycaught animals fail to be released</p>	
<p>Prop. 18</p> <p>European Eel <i>Anguilla anguilla</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the Member States of the European Community</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II (2(a)) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: from the Atlantic coast of North Africa, in all of Europe, including the Baltic Sea and in the Mediterranean waters of Europe, northern Africa and Asia; also in the Canary Islands, Madeira, the Azores and Iceland; highly migratory; believed to spawn in the eastern part of the Sargasso Sea (although spawning has never been directly observed) so the distribution of eels on their spawning migration extends all the way from northern Europe across the Atlantic Ocean and down to the Sargasso Sea, north by north-east of the West Indies; it has been generally accepted that the European eel comprises a single panmictic stock (populations mix together when breeding); 45 range States ● Population: conspicuous downward trends are evident from all stock assessments in the last two and a half decades; if the current trend continues, the stock might reach the brink of extinction within a single generation (<10 years); the latest IUCN Red List assessment for this species is that of Sweden (2005) which lists the European eel as Critically Endangered ● Threats: the principal threat to this species is over-exploitation by fisheries targeting the various life stages; large-scale collection of post-larval stage or 'glass eel' for aquaculture production; in addition, blocking of rivers by dams, pollution of waters and sediments and habitat alteration have adverse effect on recruitment and survival; introduced parasites may impair migration of adults; hydropower and drainage pumps together with fisheries are major causes of eel mortality (of the lethal threats for downstream migrating eels); parallel declines in European and American eels, both of which spawn in the Sargasso Sea, has been taken as evidence that changes in ocean currents resulting from climate change may have interfered with larval transport leading to reduced recruitment in both stocks ● Trade: though the species is traded in all its life stages, exports consist mainly of glass eels (postlarval stage); from 1995 to 2005, the average number of European glass eels exported annually from the EU was estimated at about 500 million fish; studies estimate that 50% of glass eels arriving to the European continent and surrounding waters go to aquaculture (43% to Asia and 7% to EU countries—mainly Italy), 18% are used for direct consumption (almost all by Spain), 10% are used for "trap & transport" (moving fish) within EU countries, 8% are traded for re-stocking between countries, and only 14% escape as natural immigration 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The species falls into FAO's lowest productivity category of the most vulnerable species; the rate of decline is so rapid and steep that the species actually qualifies for CITES Appendix I listing under the footnote to RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) on commercially exploited aquatic species because the eel population has declined to 20% or even less of the historic baseline ● CITES listing would enable regulation of the significant trade and encourage greater cooperation among range States to manage this migratory species ● It is possible to separate <i>A. anguilla</i> in all developmental stages from similar species using genetic tests; further, it does not overlap with any other eel species in the fishery areas of its distribution ● Artificial restocking of populations is not possible as all aquaculture and restocking is still based on capture of wild young eels; the youngest eel stages are overexploited as the basis of eel aquaculture world wide <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a): declining wild population • threatened by over-fishing for international trade</p>
<p>Prop. 19</p> <p>Banggai Cardinalfish <i>Pterapogon kauderni</i></p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Indonesia; restricted to 27 islands in the Banggai Archipelago ● Population: small total population of 2.4 million individuals with a small natural range of approximately 5,500 km²; population numbers and trend are declining in exploited populations with surveys indicating significant (>90%) declines in two populations fished from 2001 to 2004, including the extinction of a population of Limbo Island; exploited populations show significantly 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Collection for the aquarium trade has significantly and adversely impacted most known populations contributing to, if not causing, the extinction of one population ● Species is highly susceptible to over-collection: extremely limited range, unique biological and ecological characteristics,

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, Paragraph 2(a) of the Convention and Criterion B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13)</p>	<p>lower population densities compared to populations in protected or unfished sites; seven exploited sites surveyed in 2004 had an average population density of 0.07 fish/m² whereas fish density for a population found in a bay off limits to fishing was nearly ten times higher (0.63 fish/m²); pre-fishing population densities for Sarina Kenecil Island were 0.11 fish/m² but declined to 0.03 fish/m² two years after initiation of a fishery; unique reproductive characteristics including low fecundity (60% fertility rate, small clutch size), advanced degree of parental care, direct development, long oral incubation period, make this species highly vulnerable to over-exploitation; species also experiences high mortality upon release from brood pouch; unique reproductive characteristics are also thought to play a role in the high degree of population subdivision where genetic diversity varies significantly over small distances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: heavy and unregulated collection for international trade; species is highly susceptible to over-exploitation because of restricted range in shallow waters; currently receives no international or national protection; habitat loss due to destructive fishing practices (cyanide and dynamite use); siltation and pollution runoff from land clearing; poor agricultural practices • Trade: an estimated 600,000-700,000 individuals were collected each year by local fishers prior to 2001 for sale in international aquaria markets; current harvest rates are believed to exceed 700,000-900,000 per year; total collection pressure is believed to be even greater due to high mortality during collection, holding, and transport; exported to USA, Europe and Asia 	<p>and isolated populations that prevent the species from naturally recolonizing sites from which it has been extirpated and from rapidly recovering from localized population declines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species is particularly vulnerable due to a high degree of population genetic subdivision • Species is in high demand in the aquarium trade; retail prices of wild caught fish are less than captive bred fish; captive breeding facilities in Indonesia are undercut by trade in less expensive wild-caught fish • Without international conservation measures, scientists have predicted that current levels of exploitation may drive this species to extinction within the next decade; habitat loss caused by anthropogenic impacts is also adversely impacting the species <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraph B: internationally trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations • wild populations already decimated • limited range • low population size • high demand • low fecundity • high juvenile mortality • specialized habitat requirements • habitat loss and degradation • high genetic subdivision and isolation</p>
<p>Prop. 20</p> <p>Caribbean Spiny Lobster <i>Panulirus argus</i></p> <p>Smoothtail Spiny Lobster <i>Panulirus laeviscauda</i></p> <p>Brazil</p> <p>Inclusion of Brazilian populations in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: for both species, tropical, sub-tropical and temperate waters along the Eastern Atlantic and Western Pacific coasts of North, Central and South America, from the USA to Brazil and out to the Bermudas, including Gulf of Mexico and the Caribbean Sea; <i>P. argus</i> exists at a greater ocean depth than <i>P. laeviscauda</i>; approximately 23 range States (proposal affects Brazil population only) • Population: for both species combined, unknown; however, catch per unit effort has declined by about 90% and average biomass production has decreased by 30% since 1978 • Threats: over-fishing for international trade (including violation of minimum catch size), habitat destruction and degradation (including damage by illegal lobster fishing gear) • Trade: for both species combined, about 7000 tonnes on average exported annually from Brazil for human consumption, fresh and frozen; main markets are USA, Japan, France; illegal trade exists (in specimens smaller than minimum legal size) 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overfishing for the international market is the main threat • Prices have increased in recent years from US\$13/kg to US\$25/kg and more (this proposal), possibly indicating reduced availability • Appendix II would help Brazil to ensure that exports are not detrimental to the survival of Brazil populations of these species, and help to ensure that minimum catch size regulations are not violated • Proposal is supported by Brazil's Management Board of Sustainable Lobsters Usage (CGSL) which advises the government on management and exploitation of spiny lobsters; CGSL consists of government and civil society representatives including fishermen and fishing companies <p>■ Meet criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2 a), paragraph B): internationally traded • regulation is required to ensure that the harvest from the wild is not reducing the wild population to a level at which its survival might be threatened by continued harvesting or other influences</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 21</p> <p>Red and Pink Corals <i>Corallium</i> spp.</p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II (2(a)) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2a, Criterion B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: 26 species found throughout the world in tropical, subtropical and temperate oceans; only known populations of <i>Corallium</i> large enough to support commercial harvest are found north of 19° N latitude, including seven species collected in the Western Pacific and one collected in the Mediterranean ● Population: global harvest statistics from 1950 to 2001 indicate a rapid decline in abundance of Mediterranean and Pacific species corresponding with the discovery, inception of commercial fishing, increase in landings, overexploitation, and, ultimately, exhaustion of the resource; most western Pacific populations of <i>Corallium</i> have been depleted within 4–5 years of their discovery; throughout the Mediterranean, <i>C. rubrum</i> populations have shown a dramatic decrease in their size, age structure and reproductive output over the last 20 years, with the only remaining commercially valuable beds are now found along the African coasts from Morocco to Tunisia, in the Bonifacio Strait off western Sardinia and along the Spanish coasts ● Threats: primary threat to <i>Corallium</i> is over-harvesting for the international trade in precious corals; secondary human impacts include pollution, sedimentation, tourism and recreational diving (Mediterranean), and incidental take and habitat degradation associated with longline fishing and bottom trawling (Western Pacific) ● Trade: millions of items and thousands of kilograms per year are traded internationally as jewelry and in other forms; international demand drives serial depletions of <i>Corallium</i> as new stocks are discovered and rapidly exhausted 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Corallium</i> has been collected for over 5,000 years and the use is characterized by depletion ● <i>Corallium</i> is the most valuable genus of precious coral and is highly valued for jewelry and art objects; superior beads fetch prices of up to US\$50 per gram and necklaces cost up to US\$25,000 ● There are no international trade control or management measures for the genus <i>Corallium</i> ● CITES listing would enable regulation of the significant trade in these species, reduce illegal trade and encourage greater cooperation among range States to manage this species <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraph B): declining wild populations • over-exploited for international trade • slow growth rates and late reproductive maturity</p>
<p>Prop. 22</p> <p>Arizona Agave <i>Agave arizonica</i></p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: USA; restricted to mountainous regions of Central Arizona in four Arizona counties (Gila, Maricopa, Pinal, Yavapai) ● Population: exists as randomly scattered individual plants with no definable populations; an estimated 64 plants in the wild; trend of the wild populations is unknown; Endangered (IUCN 2006), ‘critically imperilled’ (Natural Heritage Program), and is protected under the Arizona Native Plant Law; species was recently removed from the U.S. Endangered Species Act due to evidence that it is a hybrid; taxon is now considered to be a first generation (F1) hybrid between <i>Agave tourneyana</i> ssp. <i>bella</i> and <i>A. chrysantha</i> though it also may represent an evolutionarily transitional entity; neither of the parental species are included in the CITES appendices ● Threats: intrinsic biological factors including low reproductive capacity, small number of individual plants, low density of plants, lack of overlap of flowering period with parental species with which this taxon is capable of reproducing; extrinsic factors include cattle grazing, foraging by wildlife, snout-weevil beetle depredation, and collection; the small number of plants along with the remoteness of their habitat is assumed to provide some protection from collection; since species may be an evolutionarily transitional entity, wild-collection of the few known plants could be devastating; there appears to be no current demand for this species as an ornamental 	<p>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Species is now considered an F1 hybrid and the parental species are not listed in the CITES Appendices ● As a precaution, SSN recommends that the species be transferred to Appendix II in accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 4 (A) which states “No species listed in Appendix I shall be removed from the Appendices unless it has been first transferred to Appendix II, with monitoring of any impact of trade on the species for at least two intervals between meetings of the Conference of the Parties”

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trade: there is no evidence of international trade in this species except for the trade of 48 live, artificially propagated specimens in 1987 when the species was first listed on Appendix I; no evidence of illegal trade has been documented; has been cultivated in captivity from seed and tissue culture so artificially propagated specimens could be produced if a demand for the species develops 	
<p>Prop. 23</p> <p>Dehesa Bear-grass <i>Nolina interrata</i></p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II, including all parts and derivatives, in accordance with Article II(1) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 4 and, in particular, Annex 4 paragraph A 2(a)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: United States (San Diego County, California), Mexico (Baja California north of Ensenada) ● Population: Mexico: three populations each estimated to include fewer than 25 plants; USA: nine occurrences containing an estimated 9,000 plants are known within a 15.6-km² area in San Diego County, California.; however a recent survey indicates only approximately 5,500 plants exist (California Department of Fish and Game); range-wide conservation ranking for the species is critically imperilled (G1) (NatureServe 2001); endangered in the state of California, Mexico protects the species under NOM-059-SEMARNAT-2001; no population trend data has been disclosed by Mexico, USA status is considered stable but declining with most recent inspection of sites conducted in 1990 ● Threats: fire suppression represents a significant threat as species is fire-dependent; other threats include clearing for residential development, grazing by rodents, off-road vehicle use, road construction (Mexico), and over-collection on at least one site ● Trade: no documented international trade in the species except for 16 artificially propagated specimens traded between CITES member countries in 2002 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There is very little recorded international trade, all trade is in artificially propagated specimens, there is no evidence of production on a commercial scale, and there is no indication of market demand; however, any increase in international trade in the species resulting from a transfer to Appendix II could adversely impact the very small remaining wild populations; SSN therefore encourages range states to monitor the situation closely
<p>Prop. 24</p> <p>Leaf-bearing Cacti <i>Pereskia</i> spp. and <i>Quiabentia</i> spp.</p> <p>Argentina</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: <i>Pereskia</i> (16 species): Central America and the eastern side of the Andes to northern Argentina, and eastward to the West Indies, Venezuela, Guyana, eastern Brazil, and northern Uruguay; doubtfully native in Florida; <i>Quiabentia</i> (2 species): Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay; <i>Pereskia</i> and <i>Quiabentia</i> inhabit seasonally dry, deciduous tropical forests; <i>Pereskia</i> also inhabits semideciduous forests ● Population: no data on population size or trends; <i>Quiabentia zehntneri</i> is of Least Concern (IUCN 1997); <i>Pereskia quisqueyana</i> is Endangered (IUCN 2006); <i>Pereskia aureiflora</i> is Vulnerable (IUCN 2006) ● Threats: habitat is under pressure due to conversion into farmland and urbanization; total range is considerably reduced ● Trade: used as stock for grafting of seedlings of rare cacti species; <i>Pereskia</i>: from 1975 to 2005, exports of 29 live and four dried specimens of wild origin are reported, and export of 195 potentially wild live specimens plus one kilogram of live specimens; from 1990 to 2005, more than 700 artificially propagated specimens entered international trade; main exporters are Thailand and China, main importers are USA and Italy; <i>Quiabentia</i>: from 1990 to 2006, more than 300 artificially propagated specimens entered international trade; main exporter is Peru, main importer is USA 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Pereskia</i> spp. and <i>Quiabentia verticillata</i> are currently in the Periodic Review in the PC; PC16 encouraged Argentina and Switzerland to “submit draft reviews of <i>Pereskia</i> spp. and <i>Quiabentia verticillata</i> for consideration by the Plants Committee” (PC16 Sum. 3 (06/07/2006)); this proposal is premature and should not be approved pending completion of the reviews and discussion by the PC ● Proponent states that the species can be differentiated from other species; this appears true for <i>Pereskia</i> spp; however, there is similarity of appearance (at least in leafless state) of most <i>Quiabentia</i> spp. to other CITES-listed cacti; the deletion of these species from Appendix II is likely to further complicate CITES implementation for the many Cactaceae species retained in the Appendices (TRAFFIC 2002) ● This species was included in Appendix II as part of the listing of the Cactaceae family in 1975 in order to enhance enforcement and ensure that trade does not unknowingly shift to similar species; SSN believes that removal of certain species from

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>Appendix II will unnecessarily complicate enforcement and implementation and serve no conservation benefit</p> <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a) paragraph A: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • if trade is not controlled one or more of the taxa may meet at least one of the criteria for listing on Appendix I in the near future</p>
<p>Prop. 25</p> <p>Leaf-bearing Cacti <i>Pereskiaopsis</i> spp.</p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: <i>Pereskiaopsis</i> spp. are cacti endemic to Mexico with the exception of <i>Pereskiaopsis kellermanii</i> which has a distribution that extends into Jalapa and Santa Rosa in Guatemala; distributed in tropical seasonal forests and thorny forests on the Pacific slope, from Baja California to the Isthmus of Tehuantepec ● Population: four species, no data on population size or trends ● Threats: habitat has been considerably reduced and is under pressure due to conversion into farmland and ranchland ● Trade: often used as stock for grafting of seedlings of rare cacti species; from 2000-2005, the following quantities entered international trade: 97 artificially propagated specimens of <i>Pereskiaopsis diguetii</i>, three artificially propagated specimens of <i>P. rotundifolia</i>, and 17 artificially propagated specimens identified as of <i>Pereskiaopsis</i> spp.; in 2000, there was an export of one specimen of illegal origin from Poland to the Czech Republic under the name of <i>Pereskiaopsis spathulata</i>, synonymous with <i>Pereskiaopsis diguetii</i> 	<p>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal supported by the Plants Committee ● Proponent states that the species can be differentiated from other similar plants that do not belong to the Cactaceae family; however, there is similarity of appearance (at least in leafless state) of most <i>Pereskiaopsis</i> spp. to other CITES-listed cacti; the deletion of these species from Appendix II is likely to further complicate CITES implementation for the many Cactaceae species retained in the appendices (TRAFFIC 2002); similarity of appearance has proven a significant problem in CITES enforcement with respect to the Cactaceae generally; unless Mexico can demonstrate how enforcement officers who encounter specimens of CITES-listed species could readily distinguish between them and <i>Pereskiaopsis</i> spp., then the species should remain on Appendix II, under RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2b, paragraph A, for look-alike reasons ● This species was included in Appendix II as part of the listing of the Cactaceae family in 1975 in order to enhance enforcement and ensure that trade does not unknowingly shift to similar species; SSN believes that removal of certain species from Appendix II will unnecessarily complicate enforcement and implementation and provide no conservation benefit
<p>Prop. 26</p> <p>Cactaceae spp. (#4) and Orchidaceae spp. (#8) in Appendix II, and all taxa annotated with annotation #1</p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p>Merging and amendment of annotations #1, #4 and #8 to read: "Designates all parts and derivatives, except: a) seeds, spores and pollen (including pollinia), except seeds of Mexican Cactaceae spp. originating in Mexico; b) seedling or tissue cultures</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CITES Article I (b)(iii) states that "specimen" means, "in the case of a plant: for species included in Appendix I, any readily recognizable part or derivative thereof; and for species included in Appendices II and III, any readily recognizable part or derivative thereof specified in Appendices II and III in relation to the species" ● Annotation #1 designates all parts and derivatives, except: a) seeds, spores and pollen (including pollinia); b) seedling or tissue cultures obtained in vitro, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; and c) cut flowers of artificially propagated plants ● Annotation #4 designates all parts and derivatives, except: a) seeds, except those from Mexican cacti originating in Mexico, and pollen; b) seedling or tissue cultures obtained in vitro, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; c) cut flowers of artificially propagated plants; d) fruits and parts and derivatives thereof of naturalized or artificially propagated plants; and e) separate stem joints (pads) and parts and derivatives thereof of naturalized 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The effect of combining Annotations #1, #4, and #8 as proposed is apparently neutral ● However, SSN <u>opposes expanding</u> the current annotation to allow additional exemptions of certain parts or derivatives from CITES control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>cut leaves of artificially propagated plants:</u> PC15 considered and rejected this exemption, stating that such leaves may be difficult to distinguish from the leaves of wild plants, excessive harvesting of foliage may be detrimental to plants, interpreting the levels of trade in leaves of CITES-listed species and its non-detrimental nature may be problematic; and that it remained unclear what the status of fragmented, broken or shredded leaves would be (PC15 Summary Report) • <u>fruits of <i>Hylocereus</i> spp. and <i>Selenicereus</i> spp. (Cactaceae):</u>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; c) cut flowers and cut leaves (excluding phylloclades and other stem parts, and pseudobulbs) of artificially propagated plants; d) fruits and parts and derivatives thereof of naturalized or artificially propagated plants of the genera <i>Vanilla</i> (Orchidaceae), <i>Opuntia</i> subgenus <i>Opuntia</i>, <i>Hylocereus</i> and <i>Selenicereus</i> (Cactaceae); e) separate stem joints (pads), stem sections and flowers and parts and derivatives thereof of naturalized or artificially propagated plants of the genera <i>Opuntia</i> subgenus <i>Opuntia</i>, and <i>Selenicereus</i> (Cactaceae); f) finished products that are packaged and ready for retail trade (excluding whole or grafted specimens, seeds, bulbs and other propagules) of <i>Aloe</i> spp., <i>Aquilaria malaccensis</i>, Cactaceae spp., <i>Cibotium barometz</i>, <i>Cistanche deserticola</i>, <i>Cyclamen</i> spp., <i>Dionaea muscipula</i>, <i>Euphorbia</i> spp., <i>Galanthus</i> spp., Orchidaceae spp. and <i>Prunus africana</i>; and g) non-living herbarium specimens for non-commercial purposes"</p>	<p>or artificially propagated plants of the genus <i>Opuntia</i> subgenus <i>Opuntia</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annotation #8 designates all parts and derivatives, except: a) seeds and pollen (including pollinia); b) seedling or tissue cultures obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; c) cut flowers of artificially propagated plants; and d) fruits and parts and derivatives thereof of artificially propagated plants of the genus <i>Vanilla</i> • While some of the recommended amendments would not change the effect of the annotations, other proposed changes would expand the current annotations to exempt the following parts and derivatives from CITES control: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cut leaves of artificially propagated plants (<i>de facto</i> not applicable to Cactaceae spp. and other taxa, such as, for instance, <i>Avonia</i> spp., <i>Cistanche deserticola</i> and succulent <i>Euphorbia</i> spp.) • fruits of <i>Hylocereus</i> spp. and <i>Selenicereus</i> spp. (Cactaceae), in trade as 'pitaya' or 'dragon fruits' produced in Southeast Asia, Central and South America, Oceania, North America (United States) and possibly other regions • dried biomass and extract of <i>Selenicereus grandiflorus</i> and possibly other species of <i>Selenicereus</i> (Cactaceae) for medicinal purposes, produced in North Africa, North America (United States) and possibly in other regions • finished products of taxa of medicinal plants annotated with #1, such as <i>Aloe</i> spp. (applies for instance to <i>A. ferox</i>, but not to <i>A. vera</i>) • non-living herbarium specimens for non-commercial purposes (of commercially tradable taxa) 	<p>Appendix II Cactaceae have Annotation #4 meaning that (except for Mexican cacti) trade in cactus fruits derived from naturalized or artificially propagated plants is exempted from CITES controls; these fruits are commercially grown and widely traded without CITES permits; it is therefore redundant to have a specific exemption for these fruits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>dried biomass and extract of <i>Selenicereus grandiflorus</i> and possibly other species of <i>Selenicereus</i> (Cactaceae) for medicinal purposes</u>: may be acceptable for <i>S. grandiflorus</i> (dragon fruit) because there are no known wild populations and dried products probably originate from farms; however, exempting such specimens of other <i>Selenicereus</i> spp. may lead to collection and illegal trade in wild specimens, causing harm to wild populations • <u>finished products of taxa of medicinal plants annotated with #1</u>: PC15 considered and rejected a proposal to amend Annotation #1 with an exemption for "finished pharmaceutical products" (PC15 Summary Report) • <u>non-living herbarium specimens for non-commercial purposes</u>: RC 11.15 (on non-commercial loan, donation or exchange of museum or herbarium specimens) was already revised at CoP12 to take into account concerns raised by Parties about the lack of application of this resolution
<p>Prop. 27</p> <p>Switzerland, as Depository Government, at the request of the Plants Committee</p> <p>Amendment of the annotations to these taxa to read as follows: – For <i>Adonis vernalis</i>, <i>Guaiaacum</i> spp., <i>Nardostachys grandiflora</i>, <i>Picrorhiza kurrooa</i>, <i>Podophyllum hexandrum</i>, <i>Rauvolfia serpentina</i>, <i>Taxus chinensis</i>, <i>T. fuana</i>, <i>T. cuspidata</i>, <i>T. sumatrana</i> and <i>T. wallichiana</i>: "Designates all parts and derivatives except: a) seeds and pollen; and b) finished products packaged and ready for retail trade."</p>	<p>Proposed changes include amendments to annotations for the following plant species, and which would have the following effect :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u><i>Taxus chinensis</i>, <i>T. fuana</i>, <i>T. cuspidata</i>, <i>T. sumatrana</i>, and <i>T. wallichiana</i></u>: would strengthen the existing annotation by excluding only those products "packaged and ready for retail trade" in order to close an existing loophole that provides a possible means to circumvent CITES controls • <u><i>Adonis vernalis</i></u>: would expand the existing annotation to cover trade in resin, extract and oil • <u><i>Guaiaacum</i> spp.</u>: would expand the existing annotation to include resin and oil which are traded for medicinal purposes and the liqueur industry • <u><i>Hydrastis canadensis</i></u>: would expand the existing annotation to include powder which is the primary form in which the species is traded, in addition to rhizomes and roots (currently, companies are powdering roots to avoid CITES controls) • <u><i>Nardostachys grandiflora</i></u>: would expand the existing annotation to include oil and powder, which are traded in large quantities • <u><i>Panax ginseng</i>, <i>P. quinquefolius</i></u>: would not substantively change the 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amendments will expand CITES trade controls to parts and products of select medicinal plant species that are known to be in trade but were previously exempted; also clarifies annotations for those that were ambiguous or poorly defined • Requires that all new annotations should be accompanied by a glossary in which the terms used in the annotations are clearly defined • Proposed changes were agreed to by PC16 • SSN encourages the PC to consider a future amendment to the annotation to <i>Picrorhiza kurrooa</i> in order to require CITES controls for extract and oil, the quantities in trade of which are unknown

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>– For <i>Hydrastis canadensis</i>: "Designates underground parts (i.e. roots, rhizomes): whole, parts and powdered." – For <i>Panax ginseng</i> and <i>P. quinquefolius</i>: "Designates whole and sliced roots and parts of roots." – For <i>Pterocarpus santalinus</i>: "Designates logs, wood-chips, powder and extracts." – For Orchidaceae spp. in Appendix II and all Appendix-II taxa (<i>Agave victoriae-reginae</i>, <i>Aloe</i> spp., <i>Anacampteros</i> spp., <i>Aquilaria</i> spp., <i>Avonia</i> spp., <i>Beccariophoenix</i>, <i>Bowenia</i> spp., <i>Caryocar costaricense</i>, <i>Cibotium barometz</i>, <i>Cistanche deserticola</i>, <i>Cyathea</i> spp., <i>Cycadaceae</i> spp., <i>Cyclamen</i> spp., <i>Dicksonia</i> spp., <i>Didiereaceae</i> spp., <i>Dionaea muscipula</i>, <i>Dioscorea deltoidea</i>, <i>Euphorbia</i> spp., <i>Fouquieria columnaris</i>, <i>Galanthus</i> spp., <i>Gonystylus</i> spp., <i>Gyrinops</i> spp., <i>Hedychium philippinense</i>, <i>Lewisia serrata</i>, <i>Neodypsis decaryi</i>, <i>Nepenthes</i> spp., <i>Oreomunnea pterocarpa</i>, <i>Orothamnus zeyheri</i>, <i>Pachypodium</i> spp., <i>Platymiscium pleiostachyum</i>, <i>Protea odorata</i>, <i>Prunus africana</i>, <i>Sarracenia</i> spp., <i>Shortia galacifolia</i>, <i>Sternbergia</i> spp., <i>Swietenia humilis</i>, <i>Tillandsia harrisii</i>, <i>T. kammii</i>, <i>T. kautskyi</i>, <i>T. mauryana</i>, <i>T. sprengeliana</i>, <i>T. sucrei</i>, <i>T. xerographica</i>, <i>Welwitschia mirabilis</i>, <i>Zamiaceae</i> spp.) and Appendix-III taxa (<i>Gnetum montanum</i>, <i>Magnolia liliifera</i> var. <i>obovata</i>, <i>Meconopsis regia</i>, <i>Podocarpus neriifolius</i>, <i>Tetracentron sinense</i>) annotated with #1: "Designates all parts and derivatives, except: a) seeds, spores and pollen (including pollinia); b) seedling or tissue cultures obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; c) cut flowers of artificially propagated plants; and d) fruits and parts and derivatives</p>	<p>existing annotation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <i>Picrorhiza kurrooa</i>: would expand the existing annotation to include rhizomes ● <i>Podophyllum hexandrum</i>: would strengthen the existing annotation by excluding only those products "packaged and ready for retail trade" ● <i>Pterocarpus santalinus</i>: would expand the existing annotation to include powder and extract ● <i>Rauvolfia serpentina</i>: would expand the existing annotation to include extracts, which are widely traded ● <i>Orchidaceae</i> spp.: no change; exemption of vanilla beans maintained 	

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
thereof of artificially propagated plants of the genus <i>Vanilla</i> "		
<p>Prop. 28</p> <p>Oconee Bells <i>Shortia galacifolia</i></p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: USA (endemic to escarpment gorges of the Appalachian Mountains in Georgia, North Carolina and South Carolina); two varieties (<i>brevistyla</i> and <i>galacifolia</i>) separated by 100 km of mountainous terrain • Population: population sizes are unknown; vast majority of populations are <i>S. galacifolia</i> var. <i>galacifolia</i>; there are seven extant populations of <i>S. galacifolia</i> var. <i>brevistyla</i> in one county in North Carolina; range wide conservation ranking for <i>S. galacifolia</i> and <i>S. galacifolia</i> var. <i>galacifolia</i> is imperilled while ranking for <i>S. galacifolia</i> var. <i>brevistyla</i> is critically imperilled (NatureServe 2003); <i>S. galacifolia</i> var. <i>brevistyla</i> is listed as endangered in North Carolina; <i>S. galacifolia</i> var. <i>galacifolia</i> is listed as endangered in Georgia and North Carolina and rare in South Carolina; <i>S. galacifolia</i> is listed as endangered in Georgia and vulnerable in North Carolina and South Carolina (Walter and Gillet 1998); population trend is not known; yet, according to proponent, populations are believed to be 'stable' and species 'abundant' at most of the remaining sites • Threats: timber harvest, road construction, soil erosion, invasive species, land clearing, and rooting by feral pigs; limited seed dispersal capacity and specific conditions for seed germination impairs species ability to colonize new areas; limited distribution and gene pool makes species susceptible to stochastic events • Trade: species is in demand by plant enthusiasts as an attractive garden plant; however, no evidence of collection of wild plants; no international trade in this species reported in the CITES Trade Database since species included on Appendix II in 1983 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand for this species among plant enthusiasts raises concerns about the impacts to wild populations if international trade is not regulated by CITES • Proponent has offered no data on population sizes or trends to support the claim that populations are stable and species is abundant • Geographic range of the species is extraordinarily limited • The species is susceptible to a variety of threats the severity of which have not been documented for each population raising concerns about the integrity of existing populations and future viability; colonization of new habitat or recolonization of disturbed habitat is unlikely due to biological limitations of seed dispersal and germination <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraph B): regulation of trade is required to ensure that the wild population is not reduced to a level at which its survival might be threatened by continued harvesting or other influences • unknown population numbers • specific seed germination requirements and limited seed dispersal capacity limit recovery ability • threats from invasive species, soil erosion, depredation, habitat loss, and stochastic events</p>
<p>Prop. 29</p> <p>Spurges <i>Euphorbia</i> spp. included in Appendix II</p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p>Amendment of the annotation to <i>Euphorbia</i> spp. included in Appendix II to read as follows: "Succulent, non pencil-stemmed, non-coralliform, non-candelabriform species only, with shapes and dimensions as indicated, except the species included in Appendix I: a) pencil-stemmed succulent <i>Euphorbia</i> spp.: whole plants with spineless, erect stems of up to 1 cm diameter and a length of more than 25 cm, unbranched or predominantly branching from near the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current annotation: "Succulent species only except the species included in Appendix I. Artificially propagated specimens of cultivars of <i>Euphorbia trigona</i>, artificially propagated specimens of crested, fan-shaped or color mutants of <i>Euphorbia lactea</i>, when grafted on artificially propagated root stock of <i>Euphorbia neriifolia</i>, and artificially propagated specimens of cultivars of <i>Euphorbia</i> 'Milii' when they are traded in shipments of 100 or more plants and readily recognizable as artificially propagated specimens, are not subject to the provisions of the Convention" • Current annotation is exceptional in that these plants are the object of a split-listing on the basis of morphological rather than taxonomic characteristics; the CITES Secretariat has called into question a similar annotation for <i>Taxus</i> spp. because "although Article I, paragraph (b), of the Convention, provides the possibility to specify certain parts and derivatives of Appendix-II and Appendix-III plant species (and Appendix-III animal species) as included in the Appendices, and thus to exclude certain others, it does not provide the possibility to include certain whole animals or plants and exclude others. On the contrary, it is clear from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) that "any animal or plant, whether alive or dead" is considered as a 'specimen' and therefore subject to the provisions of the Convention;" SC54 agreed with the 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed amendment to the annotation, and indeed the current annotation, are contrary to the language of the Convention; although Article I, paragraph (b), of the Convention, provides the possibility to specify certain parts and derivatives of Appendix-II and Appendix-III plant species (and Appendix-III animal species) as included in the Appendices, and thus to exclude certain others, it does not provide the possibility to include certain whole animals or plants and exclude others; on the contrary, it is clear from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) that "any animal or plant, whether alive or dead" is considered as a 'specimen' and therefore subject to the provisions of the Convention (SC54 Doc. 18) • There are nearly 2000 <i>Euphorbia</i> species; the proposal does not provide sufficient species-specific information on the relationship between the species' shape and size and the non-detrimental nature of trade; further information would be necessary for a proper evaluation of this proposal

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>base, leafless or with small leaves; b) coralliform succulent <i>Euphorbia</i> spp.: whole plants with spineless, multiply branched, occasionally sharply pointed stems with a diameter of up to 3 cm and more than 50 cm length, leafless or with inconspicuous or ephemeral leaves; and c) candelabriform succulent <i>Euphorbia</i> spp.: whole plants with angled or winged stems and paired spines, confined to the edges, at least 3 cm diameter and more than 50 cm length, unbranched or branching"</p>	<p>Secretariat and to a revision of the <i>Taxus</i> spp. annotation (see Prop. 37)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal would extend the exemptions provided under the current annotation to additional <i>Euphorbia</i> species based on their <u>shape and size</u> and not on their species • Suggests that the proposal be discussed in a working group of interested range States at CoP14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is difficult to see how customs and border officials will be able to apply the complicated definitions in the proposed annotation • No consultation with range States was conducted • Proper venue for discussion of this proposal would be the Plants Committee, not the CoP
<p>Prop. 30</p> <p>Brazilwood / Pernambuco <i>Caesalpinia echinata</i></p> <p>Brazil</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II, including all parts and derivatives, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2(a), Paragraph A and B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: remaining stands exist in a few areas in the coastal forests—<i>Mata Atlantica</i>—of Brazil, where deforestation rates have been rapid; only 7.3% of the original forest cover remains • Population: Endangered (IUCN 2006); its present area is reduced and highly fragmented with remaining populations located primarily in difficult to reach areas • Threats: deforestation and the illegal logging for the production of violin bows and other uses; protected from commercial utilization but logging continues • Trade: naturally rare species has been over-exploited for international trade since the late 16th Century; significant commerce continues for the manufacture of bows for violins, violas and cellos; bow-makers around the world consider this wood irreplaceable for the making of bows; no reliable figures on the quantity exported for this purpose but one estimate puts world demand at 200m³, actual figure is likely to be considerably greater when taking account of the large amount of waste in processing; estimated that 70-80% of the wood is lost in converting logs into bow blanks and a further 70-80% is then lost in processing bow blanks into bows; about 1,500kg of wood is cut to provide 100-200kg of suitable wood for bows due to imperfections in the wood; largest consumers of brazilwood are the United States and Europe (Germany and France); Brazil allows the trade in reclaimed wood from structures such as fences, sheds, and houses 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing will assist Brazil, the only range State, in tackling illegal trade • The species is in high demand: bows made from Brazilwood can command prices of up to US\$5,000 or more • National tree of Brazil; Brazil was named for the species <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • threatened by over-collection for trade • populations declining • fragmented distribution • levels of within-population genetic diversity are low • slow growing</p>
<p>Prop. 31</p> <p>Black Rosewood / Nicaraguan Rosewood / Red Foxwood / Rosewood / Yellow Rosewood <i>Dalbergia retusa</i> <i>Dalbergia granadillo</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the European Community Member States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: <i>Dalbergia retusa</i> principally occurs in dry tropical forests from Mexico to Panama and in north-western Colombia; <i>D. granadillo</i> occurs in El Salvador and Mexico. • Population: <i>Dalbergia</i> was described by the United States National Academy of Sciences as scarce in 1979 with all accessible stands having long since been logged out; <i>D. retusa</i> is classified as Vulnerable (IUCN 2006); some areas where <i>D. retusa</i> was once widespread now contain populations that are nearly completely exhausted; considered to be threatened in Costa Rica with a high risk of becoming endangered due to significant decline in its populations and habitat; though once plentiful in 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extensive and unsustainable harvest has significantly reduced the range and abundance of <i>D. retusa</i>, leading to local commercial extinction • Removal of mature trees, combined with the species slow growth rate, impair the ability to regenerate • Habitat loss as a result of conversion for agricultural use, cattle grazing, and burning further threatens the species • International trade both of sawn timber and finished products is

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Inclusion of <i>Dalbergia retusa</i> in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2(a), Paragraph B</p> <p>Inclusion of <i>Dalbergia granadillo</i> in Appendix II for look-alike reason in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b) of the Convention and Resolution conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2(b), Paragraph A</p>	<p>Panama it is now endangered; reported difficulties in sourcing the wood indicate that <i>D. retusa</i> may be commercially extinct in some areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Threats: commercial over-exploitation and habitat loss; extensively felled for beautiful, dense, and durable wood used for carvings; removal of reproducing individuals results in corresponding reduction in population size and density, impairing the ability of <i>D. retusa</i> to regenerate; habitat is also under threat from conversion to agricultural use, cattle ranching, and burning; overall deforestation rates in range states between 1990 and 2000 vary from 7,000 hectares in El Salvador to 631,000 hectares in Mexico ● Trade: both <i>D. retusa</i> and <i>D. granadillo</i> are often traded under the name 'cocobolo'; international trade is mainly in sawn wood and manufactured items; only small quantities of timber reach the world market, resulting in high prices; evidence from eBay (USA) documents that trade in small, high quality wood items and small quantities of sawn timber exists; cocobolo is now so rare that it is mainly harvested from private farms though destructive harvest from the wild continues 	<p>occurring and continues to pose a threat to both species in the wild</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The wood of <i>D. granadillo</i> is indistinguishable from <i>D. retusa</i> necessitating the CITES listing of both species ● An Appendix II listing will require the regulation of international trade which is currently unregulated; in addition, international protection will likely increase conservation efforts including assessments of the status of the species in the wild, promulgation of national legislation to protect the species and its habitat, and the establishment of population monitoring strategies <p>■ <i>D. retusa</i> meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraph B): internationally traded • inability to easily regenerate • wild populations are declining • slow-growing • habitat degradation and loss</p> <p>■ <i>D. granadillo</i> meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24(Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 b), paragraph A): species resembles a species proposed for inclusion in Appendix II such that enforcement officers who encounter specimens of the species are unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>
<p>Prop. 32</p> <p>Honduras Rosewood <i>Dalbergia stevensonii</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the Member States of the European Community</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II 2(a) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2 a, paragraph B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: in broadleaf evergreen swamp forests of southern Belize, Guatemala and Mexico ● Population: confined to small areas due to habitat specificity and considered to be rare; although found in large patches within its small range in southern Belize, all populations are believed to be declining ● Threats: deforestation, slash-and-burn agriculture, illegal logging, genetic erosion, habitat loss, cattle ranching; international trade has promoted logging ● Trade: there are no plantations of this species; as a result, all timber is sourced from wild populations; its restricted distribution limits the amount of trade and availability is declining; used for making musical instruments where wastage is as high as 80%; no comprehensive reports of the levels of local or international trade are available; however, historic records document exports from Belize to the USA, UK and France in the 1920s and 1930s; in 2004, 254.65m² were exported from Guatemala to Japan, El Salvador, USA, Germany, Belize and The Netherlands 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This species is not protected under any international legal instruments and no international measures are in place to control movement of specimens across international borders ● It is predicted that by 2010 only 2% of the forests will remain in the Petén, Guatemala where <i>D. stevensonii</i> is found; the species' habitat in Chiapas, Mexico, is experiencing one of the highest rates of deforestation in the world; there is some cross border illegal logging in Belize ● Forest protection in Belize and Mexico is poorly managed due to insufficient funding for the enforcement of environmental regulations ● Listing in Appendix II will assist these countries to protect the species by regulating its trade and preventing its unsustainable and destructive harvest <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraph B): internationally traded • all wild populations are declining • high demand and limited availability • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 33</p> <p>Cedar <i>Cedrela spp.</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the Member States of the European Community</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II <i>Cedrela odorata</i> in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2(a), Paragraph B and the remaining species in the genus <i>Cedrela</i> in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b) of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2(b), Paragraph A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: found throughout lowland Central America and South America to northern Argentina and most Caribbean Islands within a latitudinal range of 26°N and 28°S • Population: <i>C. odorata</i>: Vulnerable, now widely threatened at the provenance level (IUCN 2006); <i>C. fissilis</i> and <i>C. lilloi</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2006); <i>C. fissilis</i> has become threatened in Colombia, Ecuador, and Amazonian Peru, rare in Bolivia (IUCN 2006); once common, populations of <i>C. odorata</i> have been reduced due to harvest and habitat reduction; populations are further threatened by selective logging which has resulted in substantial genetic degradation and insufficient stock of seed trees for natural regeneration • Threats: commercial demand for the genus, <i>C. odorata</i> in particular, in domestic and international markets; <i>C. odorata</i> has been harvested for at least 250 years and remains popular for its aromatic and attractive grain, reddish-brown color and its resistance to insects and rot; wood is used for building and cabinet work, furniture, and musical instruments; other threats include illegal logging, deforestation and the associated loss of habitat • Trade: considered to be the next most valuable species in the New World after mahogany, <i>C. odorata</i> has played a major role in the timber trade; Brazil reported exporting 97,000 m³ in 1994; in 2005, Mexico imported 31,924 m³ of sawn wood, and the United States imported 17,048 m³; illegal trade is difficult to quantify but estimated to be extensive; <i>C. fissilis</i>: Brazil exported 11,064 m³ in 1995, over one-third of Brazil's <i>Cedrela spp.</i> exports that year • Protection: the species has been listed on Appendix III by Peru and Colombia since 2001; its annotation includes logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Cedrela odorata</i> is one of the most important timber species and has been traded internationally for centuries; commercial demand for international trade is a recognized threat to the species • <i>C. fissilis</i> and <i>C. lilloi</i> are also seriously threatened by ongoing extraction • Brazil, a range State, strongly supports this proposal and would have joined as a co-proponent if time had allowed • There is evidence of significant illegal logging in protected areas throughout its range • The listing of <i>Cedrela spp.</i> could complement the 2002 listing of mahogany (<i>Swietenia macrophylla</i>) on Appendix II as the two species are often harvested together, their wood is difficult to distinguish, and mahogany shipments have been mislabeled as cedar in the past • The listing of all species within the genus is required to avoid enforcement problems due to similarity of appearance; experts at the Royal Botanic Garden Kew found it problematic to distinguish between the different species within the genus <i>Cedrela</i> <p>■ <i>C. odorata</i> meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13), Annex 2 a), paragraph B): high commercial value of <i>C. odorata</i> and <i>C. fissilis</i> drives harvest and international trade • extensive illegal harvest and trade • genetic erosion of the species due to significant over-exploitation</p> <p>■ Remaining <i>Cedrela spp.</i> meet criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) Annex 2 b), paragraph A: all species must be listed for look-alike reasons</p>
<p>Prop. 34</p> <p>Orchids Orchidaceae spp. included in Appendix II</p> <p>Switzerland</p> <p>Amendment of the annotation to Orchidaceae spp. included in Appendix II to read as follows: "Artificially propagated hybrids of the following genera are not subject to the provisions of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current annotation states: "Artificially propagated specimens of hybrids of the genera <i>Cymbidium</i>, <i>Dendrobium</i>, <i>Phalaenopsis</i> and <i>Vanda</i> are not subject to the provisions of the Convention when: 1) the specimens are traded in shipments consisting of individual containers (i.e. cartons, boxes or crates) each containing 20 or more plants of the same hybrid; 2) the plants within each container can be readily recognized as artificially propagated specimens by exhibiting a high degree of uniformity and healthiness; and 3) the shipments are accompanied by documentation, such as an invoice, which clearly states the number of plants of each hybrid. Artificially propagated specimens of the following hybrids: <i>Cymbidium</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus and intergeneric hybrids; <i>Dendrobium</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus known in horticulture as "nobile-types" and 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parties have stated that the current annotation is complex and difficult to apply and that they prefer simplified text (PC16 Doc. 17.2, Annex 2); simplified text was agreed by PC16 and is presented in Prop. 35 • However, the addition of <i>Miltonia</i>, <i>Odontoglossum</i>, and <i>Oncidium</i>, as proposed in this proposal, was not agreed by the PC • PC16 decided it was premature to extend the current annotation to <i>Miltonia</i>, <i>Odontoglossum</i>, and <i>Oncidium</i> and that the PC Chair would present a Decision to CoP14 directing the PC to develop recommendations and identification materials

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Convention, if conditions, as indicated in paragraphs a) and b) below, are met: <i>Cymbidium</i>, <i>Dendrobium</i>, <i>Miltonia</i>, <i>Odontoglossum</i>, <i>Oncidium</i>, <i>Phalaenopsis</i> and <i>Vanda</i>: a) Specimens are readily recognizable as artificially propagated and do not show any signs of having been collected in the wild such as mechanical damage or strong dehydration resulting from collection, irregular growth and heterogeneous size and shape within a taxon and shipment, algae or other epiphyllous organisms adhering to leaves, or damage by insects or other pest; and b) i) when shipped in non flowering state, the specimens must be traded in shipments consisting of individual containers (such as cartons, boxes, crates or individual shelves of CC-containers) each containing 20 or more plants of the same hybrid; the plants within each container must exhibit a high degree of uniformity and healthiness; and the shipment must be accompanied by documentation, such as an invoice, which clearly states the number of plants of each hybrid; or ii) when shipped in flowering state, with at least one fully open flower per specimen, no minimum number of specimens per shipment is required but specimens must be professionally processed for commercial retail sale, e.g. labeled with printed labels or packaged with printed packages indicating the name of the hybrid and the country of final processing. This should be clearly visible and allow easy verification. Plants not clearly qualifying for the exemption must be accompanied by appropriate CITES documents"</p>	<p>"<i>phalaenopsis</i>-types"; <i>Phalaenopsis</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus and intergeneric hybrids; <i>Vanda</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus and intergeneric hybrids are not subject to the provisions of the Convention when: 1) they are traded in flowering state, i.e. with at least one open flower per specimen, with reflexed petals; 2) they are professionally processed for commercial retail sale, e.g. labeled with printed labels and packaged with printed packages; 3) they can be readily recognized as artificially propagated specimens by exhibiting a high degree of cleanliness, undamaged inflorescences, intact root systems and a general absence of damage or injury that could be attributable to plants originating in the wild; 4) the plants do not exhibit characteristics of wild origin, such as damage by insects or other animals, fungi or algae adhering to leaves, or mechanical damage to inflorescences, roots, leaves or other parts resulting from collection; and 5) the labels or packages indicate the trade name of the specimen, the country of artificial propagation or, in the case of international trade during the production process, the country where the specimen was labeled and packaged; and the labels or packages show a photograph of the flower, or demonstrate by other means the appropriate use of labels and packages in an easily verifiable way. Plants not clearly qualifying for the exemption must be accompanied by appropriate CITES documents"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal includes simplified language that was agreed to by PC16 but also extends the current exemption to include interspecific and intergeneric hybrids of <i>Miltonia</i>, <i>Odontoglossum</i>, and <i>Oncidium</i>. 	<p>concerning possible further exemptions for artificially propagated hybrids of Orchidaceae spp. included in Appendix II, in particular for the genera <i>Miltonia</i>, <i>Odontoglossum</i> and <i>Oncidium</i>, taking into consideration the capacities of countries to effectively implement and control such exemptions (PC16 Sum. 3 (06/07/2006))</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN continues to be concerned that these broad exemptions for artificially propagated specimens, both flowering and non-flowering, provide the opportunity for laundering wild-caught specimens into international trade
<p>Prop. 35</p> <p>Orchids Orchidaceae spp. included in Appendix II</p> <p>Switzerland, as Depository</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current annotation states: "Artificially propagated specimens of hybrids of the genera <i>Cymbidium</i>, <i>Dendrobium</i>, <i>Phalaenopsis</i> and <i>Vanda</i> are not subject to the provisions of the Convention when: 1) the specimens are traded in shipments consisting of individual containers (i.e. cartons, boxes or crates) each containing 20 or more plants of the same hybrid; 2) the plants 	<p>NO OPINION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parties have stated that the current annotation is complex and difficult to apply and that they prefer simplified text (PC16 Doc. 17.2, Annex 2); the simplified text in the proposal was agreed by PC16

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Government, at the request of the Plants Committee</p> <p>Amendment of the annotation to Orchidaceae spp. included in Appendix II to read as follows: "Artificially propagated hybrids of the following genera are not subject to the provisions of the Convention, if conditions, as indicated under a) and b), are met: <i>Cymbidium</i>, <i>Dendrobium</i>, <i>Phalaenopsis</i> and <i>Vanda</i>: a) Specimens are readily recognizable as artificially propagated and do not show any signs of having been collected in the wild such as mechanical damage or strong dehydration resulting from collection, irregular growth and heterogeneous size and shape within a taxon and shipment, algae or other epiphyllous organisms adhering to leaves, or damage by insects or other pest; and b) i) when shipped in non flowering state, the specimens must be traded in shipments consisting of individual containers (such as cartons, boxes, crates or individual shelves of CC-containers) each containing 20 or more plants of the same hybrid; the plants within each container must exhibit a high degree of uniformity and healthiness; and the shipment must be accompanied by documentation, such as an invoice, which clearly states the number of plants of each hybrid; or ii) when shipped in flowering state, with at least one fully open flower per specimen, no minimum number of specimens per shipment is required but specimens must be professionally processed for commercial retail sale, e.g. labeled with printed labels or packaged with printed packages indicating the name of the hybrid and the country of final processing. This should be clearly visible and allow easy verification. Plants not clearly qualifying for the exemption must be accompanied by</p>	<p>within each container can be readily recognized as artificially propagated specimens by exhibiting a high degree of uniformity and healthiness; and 3) the shipments are accompanied by documentation, such as an invoice, which clearly states the number of plants of each hybrid. Artificially propagated specimens of the following hybrids: <i>Cymbidium</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus and intergeneric hybrids; <i>Dendrobium</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus known in horticulture as "<i>nobile-types</i>" and "<i>phalaenopsis-types</i>"; <i>Phalaenopsis</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus and intergeneric hybrids; <i>Vanda</i>: Interspecific hybrids within the genus and intergeneric hybrids are not subject to the provisions of the Convention when: 1) they are traded in flowering state, i.e. with at least one open flower per specimen, with reflexed petals; 2) they are professionally processed for commercial retail sale, e.g. labeled with printed labels and packaged with printed packages; 3) they can be readily recognized as artificially propagated specimens by exhibiting a high degree of cleanliness, undamaged inflorescences, intact root systems and a general absence of damage or injury that could be attributable to plants originating in the wild; 4) the plants do not exhibit characteristics of wild origin, such as damage by insects or other animals, fungi or algae adhering to leaves, or mechanical damage to inflorescences, roots, leaves or other parts resulting from collection; and 5) the labels or packages indicate the trade name of the specimen, the country of artificial propagation or, in the case of international trade during the production process, the country where the specimen was labeled and packaged; and the labels or packages show a photograph of the flower, or demonstrate by other means the appropriate use of labels and packages in an easily verifiable way. Plants not clearly qualifying for the exemption must be accompanied by appropriate CITES documents"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal includes simplified language that was agreed to by PC16 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN continues to be concerned that these broad exemptions for artificially propagated specimens, both flowering and non-flowering, provide the opportunity for laundering wild-caught specimens into international trade

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>appropriate CITES documents"</p> <p>Prop. 36</p> <p>Japanese Yew <i>Taxus cuspidata</i></p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Amendment of the listing of <i>Taxus cuspidata</i> in Appendix II by: 1) Deleting the phrase "and infraspecific taxa of this species"; and 2) Annotating to read as follows: "Specimens of hybrids and cultivars are not subject to the provisions of the Convention"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would amend the listing of <i>Taxus cuspidata</i> to exempt artificially propagated hybrids and cultivars 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exclusion of hybrid <i>Taxus</i> specimens could create serious identification problems unless simple and readily-applied identification techniques are available • CITES treaty language does not allow exclusion of whole plants from listings; although Article I, paragraph (b), of the Convention, provides the possibility to specify certain parts and derivatives of Appendix-II and Appendix-III plant species (and Appendix-III animal species) as included in the Appendices, and thus to exclude certain others, it does not provide the possibility to include certain whole animals or plants and exclude others, nor the possibility to exclude artificially propagated specimens; on the contrary, it is clear from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) that "any animal or plant, whether alive or dead" is considered as a 'specimen' and therefore subject to the provisions of the Convention
<p>Prop. 37</p> <p>Yews <i>Taxus chinensis</i>, <i>T. cuspidata</i>, <i>T. fuana</i> and <i>T. sumatrana</i></p> <p>Switzerland, as Depository Government, at the request of the Standing Committee</p> <p>A. Deletion of the annotation to <i>Taxus chinensis</i>, <i>Taxus fuana</i> and <i>Taxus sumatrana</i> in Appendix II that reads: "Whole artificially propagated plants in pots or other small containers, each consignment being accompanied by a label or document stating the name of the taxon or taxa and the text 'artificially propagated', are not subject to the provisions of the Convention"; and</p> <p>B. Amendment of the annotation to <i>Taxus cuspidata</i> to read: "Artificially propagated hybrids and cultivars of <i>Taxus cuspidata</i> in pots or other small containers, each consignment being accompanied by a label or document stating the name of the taxon or taxa and the text 'artificially propagated', are not subject to the provisions of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current annotation (#10) to the listings of <i>Taxus chinensis</i>, <i>Taxus fuana</i> and <i>Taxus sumatrana</i>: "Whole artificially propagated plants in pots or other small containers, each consignment being accompanied by a label or document stating the name of the taxon or taxa and the text 'artificially propagated', are not subject to the provisions of the Convention" • Would delete current annotation • Would amend the annotation to <i>Taxus cuspidata</i> to allow the exemption of artificially propagated hybrids; RC 11.11 (Rev. CoP13) allows hybrids to be excluded from CITES controls by a specific annotation 	<p>CONDITIONAL SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN <u>supports</u> deletion of the annotation to the listings of <i>Taxus chinensis</i>, <i>Taxus fuana</i> and <i>Taxus sumatrana</i> as it ensures that all specimens of these species are subject to CITES trade controls in accordance with the Convention • SSN <u>opposes</u> the proposed amendment to the annotation to the listing of <i>Taxus cuspidata</i> because exclusion of hybrid <i>Taxus</i> specimens could create serious identification problems unless simple and readily-applied identification techniques are available • CITES treaty language does not allow exclusion of whole plants from listings; although Article I, paragraph (b), of the Convention, provides the possibility to specify certain parts and derivatives of Appendix-II and Appendix-III plant species (and Appendix-III animal species) as included in the Appendices, and thus to exclude certain others, it does not provide the possibility to include certain whole animals or plants and exclude others, nor the possibility to exclude artificially propagated specimens; on the contrary, it is clear from subparagraph (i) of paragraph (b) that "any animal or plant, whether alive or dead" is considered as a 'specimen' and therefore subject to the provisions of the Convention

SPECIES/PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
Convention"		



SPECIES SURVIVAL NETWORK

2100 L Street NW, Washington, DC 20037 USA Tel: +1 301-548-7769 Fax: +1-202-318-0891
 European Bureau: Graefelfingerstr. 65, 81375 Munich, Germany Tel: +49 89 81299 507 Fax: +49 89 81299 706
 E-mail: info@ssn.org Website: www.ssn.org