



CITES 2007

Analysis of Working Documents Submitted by Parties

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

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Doc. 1 Rules of Procedure Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 30 states that the Rules of Procedure (RoP) adopted at CoP13 remain in effect until they are amended at a subsequent CoP • Rule 14 on Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in paragraph 2, that the CoP elects a Chair and two Vice-Chairs to preside over plenary sessions and that candidates are nominated by the SC after consulting with the “Host Government” ▪ in paragraph 4, that if the CoP Chair is absent or is unable to discharge his/her duties, the CoP Bureau shall nominate one of the Vice-Chairs to serve as Presiding Officer • Rule 15 on the Bureau states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in paragraph 1, that the CoP Bureau is composed of the CoP Chair and Vice-Chairs, Chairs of Committees I and II and of the Credentials Committee, the Chair and members of the SC, and the Secretariat ▪ in paragraph 3, that if the CoP Chair is absent or unable to discharge his/her duties then the CoP Bureau nominates one of the Vice-Chairs to deputize for him/her • Rule 28 on Submission of Informative Documents and Exhibitions states: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in paragraph 1, that CoP informative 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes to amend Rule 14 on Chairs and Vice-Chairs as follows (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ paragraph 2: “<i>The Conference of the Parties shall elect a <u>Chairman, an Alternate Chairman</u> and two Vice-Chairmen of the Conference to preside over plenary sessions of the meeting ... Candidates for these offices shall be nominated by the Standing Committee after appropriate consultations with, inter alia, if applicable, the <u>host country Host Government.</u>”</i> ▪ paragraph 4: “<i>If the Chairman of the Conference is absent or is unable to discharge his/her duties, <u>the Alternate Chairman shall deputize for him/her as Presiding Officer. If the Chairman and Alternate Chairman are both unavailable, the Bureau shall nominate one of the Vice-Chairmen of the Conference to <u>serve deputize for him/her as Presiding Officer.</u></u></i>” • Proposes to amend Rule 15 on the Bureau as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ paragraph 1: “<i>The <u>Chairman, the Alternate Chairman and the Vice-Chairmen of the Conference, the Chairmen of Committees I and II and of the Credentials Committee, the Chairman and the other members of the Standing Committee and the Secretariat shall constitute the Bureau of the Conference ...</u>”</i> 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART/ OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rule 14: Support • Rule 15, paragraph 1: Oppose. The proposed amendment would add another person to the Bureau (the “Alternate Chairman”) who would be a second representative of the host country. SSN recommends that the CoP approve language that allows the Alternative Chair to be an observer, without voting rights, at the Bureau unless the Chair is unavailable in which case the Alternative Chair would serve in place of the Chair. SSN suggests the following language to replace the proposed amendment to Rule 15, paragraph 1: “<i>The <u>Chairman, or the Alternate Chairman in the absence of the Chairman, and the Vice-Chairmen of the Conference, the Chairmen of Committees I and II and of the Credentials Committee, the Chairman and the other members of the Standing Committee and the Secretariat shall constitute the Bureau of the Conference ...</u>”</i> • Rule 15, paragraph 3: Support • Rule 28, paragraphs 1 and 2: Support • Rule 28, paragraph 3: Oppose. This amendment formalizes current CITES practice. However, SSN encourages the CoP to allow relevant documents produced by observers to be included in the list of official meeting documents for meetings of the CoP as “Inf.” documents, if requested by the observer (Note: this would be in addition to Rule 28, paragraph 2, which allows observers to distribute documents without

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>documents (labeled “<i>Inf.</i>”) can be submitted by any Representative of a Party, any observer representing a State that is not a Party, any intergovernmental organization, and any observer representing any organization</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ in paragraph 2, that such documents shall clearly identify the delegation or observer presenting them ▪ in paragraph 3, that documents from States and organizations referred to in paragraph 1 may, on request, be distributed by the Secretariat and provided in sufficient numbers for distribution <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC54 agreed that the Secretariat should submit proposals to amend the RoP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ paragraph 3: “<i>If the Chairman of the Conference is absent or is unable to discharge his/her duties, the Alternate Chairman shall deputize for him/her. If the Chairman and Alternate Chairman are both unavailable, the Bureau shall nominate one of the Vice-Chairmen to preside deputize for him/her.</i>” ● Proposes to amend Rule 28 on Submission of Informative Documents and Exhibitions as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ paragraph 1, to include “<i>c) the Secretariat.</i>” ▪ paragraph 2, “<i>No approval is required for the distribution of such documents. However, they shall clearly identify who is the delegation or observer presenting them.</i>” ▪ paragraph 3, to include “<i>Documents submitted by Parties and by the Secretariat relating to specific items on the agenda of the meeting shall be numbered by the Secretariat and included in its list of official documents.</i>” 	<p>approval)</p>
<p>Doc. 7.3</p> <p>Costed Programme of Work for the Secretariat for the Triennium 2009-2011</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CITES Article XI, paragraph 3 states that at each CoP the Parties shall review the implementation of the present Convention and adopt financial provisions ● RC 13.1 provides the budget for 2006-2008 ● CoP14 will consider a budget for 2009-2011 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Provides a draft Resolution that includes a draft budget for 2009-2011 ● The total budget requested for 2009-2011 is US\$ 32,144,725; this is a substantial increase (2.2 times larger) over the budget for 2006-2008 which was US\$ 14,606,429 (RC 13.1) ● The draft budget contains funds necessary to implement existing Resolutions and Decisions ● The draft budget follows the format of the draft Strategic Vision (Doc. 11) and thus includes costs for many new activities proposed in the Vision including (costs are for 2009-2011 unless otherwise indicated) [from Annex 1 unless indicated]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objective 1.2: electronic permitting and reporting (also see Doc. 40), US\$ 131,155 ▪ Objective 1.3: promote the use of multilateral processes in CITES, US\$ 202,447 ▪ Objective 1.4: proposed study of unlisted species subject to commercial exploitation to 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN believes that it is highly unlikely that Party contributions to the CITES Trust Fund will increase beyond the budget approved at CoP13; therefore, the draft budget is unrealistic and must be reduced by more than half; many items will need to be cut or be subject to external funding ● SSN urges Parties to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ participate in CoP14 discussions of the Budget Committee; the Decisions of the CoP, including those most important to each Party, cannot be properly implemented without an adequate budget ▪ utilize the draft budget in Doc. 7.3, Annex 1, as a tool to prioritize essential expenditures; ▪ ensure that essential expenditures receive priority in terms of funding from the CITES Trust Fund ▪ ensure that expenditures for implementation and enforcement of the Convention are top priorities for funding ▪ eliminate items from the draft Budget that are

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>see if they should be listed, US\$ 381,319</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Objective 1.6: Parties cooperate in managing shared wildlife populations, US\$880,053 ▪Objective 1.6: operate the MIKE Central Coordinating Unit from within the Secretariat (from April 2011) US\$496,485 ▪Objective 1.8: CITES Virtual College (also see Doc. 16), US\$ 1,583,694 ▪Objective 2.1: fund-raising for non-Trust Fund CITES activities and implementing, managing, monitoring and evaluating these, US\$ 1,019,255 ▪Objective 3.1: livelihoods (also see Doc. 14), US\$ 544,443 ▪Objective 3.2: enhanced press activities (no document), US\$ 529,668 ▪Objective 3.2: CITES logo as indicator of sustainable trade (no document), US\$ 180,833 ▪Objective 3.2: increase general public awareness about CITES (no document), US\$ 109,622 ▪Objective 3.3: enhance alliances with environmental and trade organizations, promotion of Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, US\$ 981,032 ▪Annex 4 and 5: annual cost of living increase of 4.5% for all 25 Secretariat staff ▪Annex 6: add five new professional posts at the CITES Secretariat, at the P-3 level (US\$ 2,361,085 for all five posts, 2009-2011): Anti-smuggling, Fraud and Organized Crime Officer, Fisheries Officer, Timber Officer, Trade Monitoring and Support Officer, and Educational Technology Officer/Network-Database Specialist 	<p>unnecessary or undesirable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN recommends at least the following items be <u>retained</u> in the budget [from Annex 1 unless indicated]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪a new position for an Anti-smuggling, Fraud and Organized Crime Officer ▪funding for Objectives 1.1 (CITES implementation and enforcement), 1.5 (scientific information is the basis of non-detriment findings), 1.7 (CITES enforcement to reduce illegal wildlife trade), and 1.8 (capacity building, except that the Virtual College should be subject to external funding, see below) ● SSN believes the following budget items may be desirable but are not essential and, assuming that they cannot be funded from the Trust Fund, should be subject to <u>external</u> funding (a savings of US\$ 5,678,291): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪New positions for a Fisheries Officer, a Timber Officer, and an Educational Technology Officer/Network-Database Specialist (\$US 472,217 per person, or US\$ 1,416,651 for all three, 2009-2011) ▪Objective 1.1, participation of sponsored delegates at CoP15, US\$ 750,000 ▪Objective 1.4, proposed study of unlisted species subject to commercial exploitation to see if they should be listed (US\$ 381,319) ▪Objective 1.6: Parties cooperate in managing shared wildlife populations (Doc. 11), US\$ 880,053 ▪Objective 1.6: manage and coordinate the MIKE program (US\$ 60,467) ▪Objective 1.6: operate the MIKE Central Coordinating Unit from within the Secretariat beginning April 2011 (US\$ 496,485) ▪Objective 1.8: Virtual College US\$ 1,583,694 ▪Objective 3.2: increase general public awareness about CITES (no document), US\$ 109,622 ● SSN recommends the following budget items be <u>eliminated</u> from the budget (a savings of US\$ 3,056,034): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Trade Monitoring and Support Officer (US\$ 472,217); <p>SSN recommends that Parties eliminate this new proposed position because livelihoods are beyond the</p>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p>mandate of CITES (see SSN's comments on Doc. 14)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Objective 1.3: promote the use of multilateral processes in CITES, US\$ 202,447 (see SSN's comments on Doc. 11}. However, if this item would focus on enhancing CITES compliance mechanisms without prejudice to stricter domestic measures it would merit support ▪Objective 1.4: Secretariat's advice to Parties on proposals to amend Appendices at CoP15, US\$ 145,394; ▪Objective 3.1: livelihoods (Doc. 14), US\$ 544,443 ▪Objective 3.2: enhanced press activities (no document), US\$ 529,668 ▪Objective 3.2: CITES logo as indicator of sustainable trade (no document), US\$ 180,833 ▪Objective 3.3: enhance alliances with environmental and trade organizations (WTO, UNCTAD, FAO, ITTO, OECD) enhance use and acceptance of Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, US\$ 981,032 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Even with the savings of US\$ 8,913,006 outlined above, Parties will need to shave another US\$ 8,625,290 from the proposed budget, locate the funding elsewhere or commit to additional funding to support the work of the Convention
<p>Doc. 8.2</p> <p>Committee Reports: Report of the Chair of the Animals Committee</p> <p>Chair of the Animals Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13), on Establishment of committees, recommends that the AC report to the CoP on the activities it has carried out or supervised between CoPs • RC 13.1, on Financing and budgeting of the Secretariat and of meetings, recommends that all meetings of the AC and PC be held back-to-back and in the same place, and every other meeting should be convened in Geneva unless a candidate host country pays the difference in costs between its proposed venue and Geneva 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a report of the activities of the AC for the period from 15 October 2004 to 4 January 2007 • Provides an overview of the issues discussed by the AC and refers to the resulting documents produced for consideration at CoP14 • Reports that the AC agreed that no further action was necessary under Decisions 13.96 and 13.97 regarding fossil corals and that these Decisions should be considered implemented • Recommends that the Parties provide US\$30,000 per year from the CITES Trust Fund to assist the work of the Chair of the AC if this person is not able to benefit from 	<p>AC Recommendations: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN believes that the AC makes an enormous contribution to the operation of the Convention and supports the work of the Chair and the Committee Members • SSN agrees that Decisions 13.96 and 13.97 regarding fossil corals should be considered implemented • Funds provided to assist the Chair of the AC should be on the condition that some are also provided by the sponsoring government. SSN believes that both the Chair and Members of the Committee must secure some measure of support from within their government to fulfill their role on the Committee • Decision 13.93 regarding Periodic review of Felidae should be continued until CoP15, as the review is incomplete

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>adequate governmental or institutional financial and technical support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends to the CoP that Decision 13.93, regarding Periodic review of Felidae, be continued until CoP15 • Provides a number of draft Decisions to support range States in complying with the recommendations formulated by the AC under the Significant Trade Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Psittacus erithacus (African grey parrot): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -- directs the range States to participate in the development and implementation of regional management plans for the conservation of and trade in the species -- directs the Secretariat to seek funding and to develop regional management plans for the conservation of and trade in <i>P. erithacus</i> and <i>P. erithacus timneh</i>, in collaboration with the range States, relevant experts, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders -- directs the Secretariat, in selected cases where there has been a history of exports of <i>P. erithacus</i> in excess of quotas, to verify export permits from a specific country to ensure that exports do not exceed quotas ▪ Tridacnidae (giant clams): directs the Secretariat to seek funding and to enable a regional workshop to be held in 2007 to initiate regional cooperation on the management of sustainable fisheries for these species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the adoption of the draft Decisions related to <i>Psittacus erithacus</i>. The African grey parrot is one of the most heavily traded bird species; over 359,000 wild-caught birds were reported in trade from 1994 to 2003. The species is reported to be declining across much of its range; no range country is known to have a systematic population monitoring system in place to support the making of non-detriment findings • SSN supports the adoption of the draft Decisions related to Tridacnidae. There is little population monitoring of these species, standard approaches need to be adopted for reporting and there is a need for regional management approaches for all countries with active fisheries <p>REGARDING the Secretariat's Recommendations: In response to the Secretariat's comment that the language of one draft Decision regarding <i>P. erithacus</i> is ambiguous, SSN encourages the Parties to adopt the following changes (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "In selected cases where <u>As there has been</u> is a history of exports of <u>this species</u> in excess of quotas, the Secretariat should <u>shall</u> verify export permits from a specific country to ensure that exports do not exceed quotas." Exports of <i>P. erithacus</i> have often exceeded the allocated quotas. Trade in this species has a history of shifting between range States, so verification of <u>all</u> permits will assist the Parties in implementation of the established quotas • SSN disagrees with the Secretariat's view that benefits of a regional management plan for <i>P. erithacus</i> might have been lost because of stricter domestic measures imposed by <i>some</i> Parties. International and domestic trade, both legal and illegal, continues in spite of these measures. Regional management plans will assist the range States in enforcement, population studies, demographics, habitat monitoring and standards for making non-detriment findings
<p>Doc. 8.4 Committee Reports: Joint</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC11.1 (Rev. CoP13), on Establishment of committees, recommends that the Committees report to the CoP on the activities they have carried out or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides an overview of the issues discussed by the joint AC/PC meetings and refers to the resulting documents produced for consideration at CoP14 	<p>AC/PC Recommendations: SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the publication and distribution of the manual for regional representatives

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Report of the Chairmen of the Animals And Plants Committees</p> <p>Chairs of the Animals and Plants Committees</p>	<p>supervised between CoPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC13.1, on Financing and budgeting of the Secretariat and of meetings, recommends that all meetings of the AC and PC be held back-to-back and in the same place, and every other meeting should be convened in Geneva unless a candidate host country pays the difference in costs between its proposed venue and Geneva 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends that the Parties adopt a Decision directing the Secretariat to organize publication and distribution of the manual for regional representatives of the scientific committees Recommends that the Parties adopt Decisions directing the Secretariat, Parties and the SC to support the Master's course on Management, Access and Conservation of Species in Trade Recommends the following text be eliminated from RC 13.10 on Trade in alien invasive species: <i>"instructs the CITES Secretariat, in conjunction with the Animals and Plants Committees, to establish cooperation with the CBD Secretariat and the IUCN/SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group in their important work in relation to alien invasive species"</i> Provides draft new Rules of Procedure (RoP) for meetings of the AC and PC and requests CoP14 to amend RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13) to allow the scientific committees to adopt these RoP for their meetings, and to ensure that the Chairs of the AC and PC can invite any observer from non-Parties or experts of any organization to participate in meetings of the Committees as observers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed Rule 7 limits NGO participation at committee meetings to one delegate only Proposed Rules 9, 10, and 11 provide new procedures for review of credentials Deletes current Rule 12 that requires the committee to meet at least once every year Proposed Rule 12 states that for observers, the original of their personal invitation letter by the Chair serves as credentials Proposed Rule 20 allows for the submission of documents of more than 12 pages Proposed Rule 23 states that information documents cannot be discussed during the meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes the recommendation to remove the operable paragraph from RC 13.10. Alien invasive species are the second leading cause of global biodiversity loss worldwide, and trade in live wildlife is a major vector of invasive species. If the AC and PC cannot make a meaningful contribution to this, we suggest that the text, <i>"in conjunction with the Animals and Plants Committees"</i> be deleted but that the Secretariat continue to be engaged on efforts with the CBD to address alien invasive species issues SSN supports the proposed amendment to RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13); the scientific committees should adopt their own RoP Regarding the proposed RoP, SSN urges the Parties to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> oppose proposed Rule 7; if NGOs obtain the requisite permission and pay the required fee, multiple qualified delegates from a single NGO should be allowed to attend committee meetings. Relevant expertise within NGOs is often divided among various individuals and limiting NGO participation in this way would reduce valuable NGO input to Committee deliberations oppose proposed Rules 9, 10, and 11 as the proposed procedures for review of credentials are very cumbersome and time consuming support proposed Rule 12 as credentials are inappropriate for NGOs require that the committees meet at least two times during the intersessional period oppose proposed Rule 19, which shortens the period by which the Secretariat gives notification of the meeting from 105 to 90 days and deletes the requirement that notice be given for emergency meetings support Rule 20; strict implementation of the 12 page rule has proved impossible for key technical reports (e.g. on the Review of Significant Trade) oppose proposed Rule 23; brief discussion of information documents should be permitted under related agenda items oppose proposed Rule 29; working group reports are a key component of a meeting's summary

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed Rule 29 deletes the requirement that reports of the working groups be included in the executive summary ▪ Deletes current Rule 30 which refers to confidential documents ▪ Deletes current Rules 31 and 32 which state that in matters not covered by the present Rules, the RoP as adopted at the last regular meeting of the CoP shall be applied <i>mutatis mutandis</i> and that the RoP shall come into force on adoption by the Committee, and may be amended by the Committee as required • The Secretariat proposes that the Parties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ address the Master's course under CoP14 Doc. 16 ▪ implement Decisions regarding the manual after it has been tested and updated ▪ restrict committee documents to 12 pages ▪ adopt text in the RoP to deal with members with a conflict of interest on a subject of discussion by the committee 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ support proposed Rule 31: working documents should be made available in the three working languages of the Convention ▪ oppose the deletion of Rules 31 and 32 ▪ amend the RoP to allow the participation of individual observers in more than one working group <p>Secretariat's Recommendations: SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the Secretariat's recommendations except comments that there should be no exceptions to the 12 page minimum for committee working documents • SSN supports the recommendation that text should be included in the RoP, requiring that any member or alternate member that has a financial or personal interest that could call into question his or her impartiality on a subject to be discussed, disclose the interest to the Committee in advance of the discussions, and that they be allowed to participate in the discussion but not in making the decision with regard to that subject
<p>Doc. 8.5</p> <p>Committee Reports: Report of the Nomenclature Committee</p> <p>Nomenclature Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Nomenclature Committee (NC) consists of one zoologist and one botanist appointed by CoP • NC activities are governed by RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13), on Establishment of Committees, and RC 12.11 (Rev. CoP13), on Standard Nomenclature and operation of the Nomenclature Committee. Decision 13.94 governs Standard nomenclature for birds • The NC invites Parties to make suggestions for the names of specialists who could provide input concerning nomenclatural matters to its members • The NC contributed to the drafting of terms of reference for the review of the scientific committees (Decision 13.9) with the AC and PC, reviewed the conditions under which they performed their duties, and reported to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On review of committees, the NC recommends that in future the NC could best function as a working group of the AC and PC; independence of decision-making on nomenclature and consistency of approach should be maintained • On fauna, the NC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ proposes new references for birds (Dickinson (2003, 2005) and mammals (Wilson & Reeder 2005) with exceptions for some parrot and ungulate species, including <i>Loxodonta africana</i> (i.e. the forest elephant <i>L.a. cyclotis</i> will be retained as a subspecies) ▪ rejects Kenya's request to treat <i>Bradypodion fischeri excubitor</i> as a full species, pending a published taxonomic review ▪ proposes the CITES Checklist of Chelonians of the World as the new reference for turtle and tortoise species, while retaining the 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN believes that the specialized tasks of the NC are best carried out by a separate Nomenclature Committee (see comments to Doc. 12) • SSN supports the recommendations of the NC on fauna and flora, and agrees with the NC (flora) that funding for NC activities is an important matter <p>Secretariat's Recommendations: OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Though harmonization of nomenclature among MEAs could be useful, SSN believes that it is far more important that CITES nomenclature reflect both the best science and the practical needs of the Parties in dealing with names used in trade • As CITES lists far more species names than any other MEA, and has an active NC it should be the standard other MEAs look to on nomenclatural matters • SSN notes that important initiatives for standardizing

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>the SC (Decision 13.12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nomenclature matters concerning fauna were discussed in association with the 21st and 22nd meetings of the AC, and on flora in association with the 15th and 16th meetings of the PC • The budget line for nomenclature was deleted at CoP12; funding for nomenclature issues is now included under 'Support for Scientific Authorities' 	<p>names of five probable hybrid taxa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recommends an updated reference for <i>Cordylus</i> spp. and a new reference for six genera of Iguanidae, the latter requiring recognition of two more species of <i>Cyclura</i> ▪ proposes adopting checklists drawn from online databases as references for amphibia and Theraphosidae; these should be updated at every other CoP ▪ proposes a work program for the NC (Fauna), including developing or identifying checklists for corals and Papilionidae, for a budget of US\$ 42,000 between CoP14 and CoP15 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On flora: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ proposes adoption of new or updated references and checklists for <i>Hoodia</i>, <i>Guaiacum</i>, <i>Aloe</i> and <i>Pachypodium</i> spp., and a number of orchid genera ▪ notes that the nomenclature program must be, as far as possible, funded from external sources, as has been largely done for 12 checklists published thus far ▪ proposes preparing a new edition of the CITES cactus checklist; adding an additional volume to, and updating Vol. 1 of the CITES orchid checklist; and determining if a new checklist for ferns is suitable for CITES use, for a total budget of US\$ 39,000 between CoP14 and CoP15 • In part, the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ proposes a draft Decision directing the Secretariat, in close cooperation with the NC and in the implementation of its agreements or programs of work with other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs), to further consider ways of harmonizing the taxonomy and nomenclature of species included in their respective provisions and to report to CoP15 ▪ suggests that budgetary matters be considered under agenda item 7 and in the 	<p>nomenclature (e.g. the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature's ZooBank) are being conducted by scientific institutions outside of the MEA framework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Decision should therefore be revised to reflect CITES priorities and to direct the Secretariat and the NC to examine non-MEA-related initiatives • As many zoologists, particularly ornithologists, are not accustomed to alphabetical order, the Secretariat may wish to consider retaining the old format for the Appendices on its website as an unofficial alternative

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>light of the review of scientific committees (Doc. 12)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪intends to rearrange the listing of animal species in the Appendices into alphabetical order at the order, family and generic levels 	
<p>Doc. 11</p> <p>CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013</p> <p>Ghana as the Chairman of the Strategic Plan Working Group</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A Strategic Vision through 2005 and its Action Plan were adopted in 2000 at CoP11 (Dec.11.1). At CoP13, Parties decided to extend the validity of the Strategic Vision through 2007 ● Dec. 13.1 established a Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) as a subcommittee of the SC to develop “<i>a proposal for a Strategic Vision and Action Plan through 2013, in particular in order to contribute to the achievement of the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD) targets of significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010</i>” ● Dec. 13.1 mandated the SPWG to seek input from the Secretariat, Parties, the CITES Committees, and international organizations and to submit its proposal for approval at SC54. It mandated the SC to submit the approved proposal for adoption at CoP14 ● The SC created the SPWG at SC53 and drafted its terms of reference (see SC54 Doc.6.1). Notification 2006/18 invited Parties to submit comments for consideration by the SPWG. The SPWG met in April 2006 after receiving comments from Parties, NGOs, the AC, the PC and the Secretariat ● The SPWG report to SC54 included a draft Strategic Plan (later changed to a Strategic Vision) for the period 2008-2013. This draft did not include an Action Plan since the SPWG decided that actions to be taken should be specified in Resolutions and Decisions ● At SC54, the SC was not able to approve 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposes the adoption of a resolution on the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪adopts the revised draft of the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008-2013 (SV) ▪requests Parties to make necessary adjustments, including review of their biodiversity strategies and action plans, to ensure that the goals of the SV are achieved ▪requests the Secretariat to design its programs of work for 2008-2013 to support the implementation of the SV ▪invites relevant organizations to make adjustments to support the achievement of goals described in the SV ▪instructs the SC to review the implementation of the SV at each meeting and to report to CoP15 and CoP16 ● States that with the adoption of this SV, the CoP defines the direction of the Convention in the new millennium and addresses issues such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪“<i>meeting the UN Millennium Development Goals;</i> ▪<i>significantly reducing the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010;</i> ▪<i>ensuring stewardship of natural resources and their use at sustainable levels;</i> ▪<i>safeguarding wildlife as an integral part of the global ecosystem on which all life depends;</i> ▪<i>achieving deeper understanding of the cultural, social and economic issues at play in producer and consumer countries;</i> ▪<i>promoting wider involvement of civil society in the development of conservation policies and practices (including non-governmental</i> 	<p>SUPPORT certain elements of the Strategic Vision:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recognition that adequate implementation and enforcement are key for the success of CITES and the conservation of biodiversity ● Recognition that non-detriment findings should be made on the basis of sound and relevant scientific information ● Use of the Review of the Appendices to identify currently unlisted species that should be listed in the Appendices ● Recognition that the financial basis of the Convention needs to be secured <p>OPPOSE certain elements of the Strategic Vision: <u>The SV should be more closely tied to the core mission of CITES</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● While the current draft is an improvement from that presented at SC54, SSN believes that many elements of Doc. 11 remain beyond the mandate of CITES. The Strategic Vision also fails to integrate the Precautionary Principle which CITES has recognized as applicable to the protection of species in trade ● CITES is not properly equipped (and does not have the mandate) to address issues not related to the conservation of species in international trade. In Decision 13.1, the Parties specifically requested that the Strategic Vision contribute to WSSD targets. Doc. 11.1 goes well beyond these limitations and invites the CoP to define the direction of the Convention based on concepts not found in the Convention text and not fully compatible with its purpose ● UN Millennium Development Goals, such as achievement of universal primary education, promotion of gender equality, and reduction of child mortality, cannot be addressed through CITES. CITES should limit itself to Development Goal 7 (“<i>ensuring environmental sustainability</i>”)

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>the revised Strategic Vision. Interested participants were invited to submit comments to the SPWG for revisions of the draft. The SPWG was instructed to prepare a revised version of the Strategic Vision taking these comments into account for adoption at CoP14</p>	<p><i>organizations concerned with development or environment, community groups, professional associations, trade unions, business associations, coalitions and advocacy groups); and</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>giving greater attention to international trade in timber and aquatic species</i> • States that the purpose of the SV is 1) “to improve the working of the Convention, so that international trade in wild fauna and flora is consistently conducted at sustainable levels”; and 2) “to ensure that CITES policy developments are aligned with changes in international environmental priorities and take into account new international initiatives” • Creates a CITES mission statement: “To conserve biodiversity by ensuring that no species of wild fauna or flora becomes or remains subject to unsustainable exploitation through international trade” • Defines three key goals for the SV, each with objectives and indicators: 1: “Ensure compliance with and implementation and enforcement of the Convention”; 2: “Secure the financial basis for the Convention”; 3: “Ensure that CITES and other multilateral instruments and processes are coherent and mutually supportive” <p><u>Secretariat comments:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat states it does not share the concern of some commentators that the SV goes beyond the scope of CITES. The Secretariat argues that it is undeniable that CITES is affected by developments in other international fora aimed at balancing environmental aims and priorities with needs of people and that CITES must continue to adapt 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SV fails to define “deeper understanding of the cultural, social and economic issues at play in producer and consumer countries”, a parameter seemingly well beyond the scope of CITES. SSN recommends this text be deleted <p><u>The CITES Mission Statement should be deleted</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The CITES mission, to cooperate “for the protection of certain species of wild fauna and flora against over-exploitation through international trade”, is clearly stated in the Preamble of the Treaty. A mission statement rephrasing the Preamble is unnecessary and likely to confuse Parties as to its legal validity <p><u>Goal 3 should be amended. A more appropriate Goal 3 would be “Cooperate to ensure other multilateral instruments and processes are supportive of CITES”</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emphasis should be on ensuring that other processes are supportive of CITES. The current wording is ambiguous and could imply that CITES should adapt to other processes, which could lead to the dilution of its mandate <p><u>Objectives and indicators listed under Goals 1 and 3 should be refined</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Several sections of the SV, including the General Introduction, Purpose, the Introduction under Goal 1 (“ensuring...responsible trade in wild fauna and flora”) and Goal 3, and indicators listed under Goal 3 Objective 3.1 and Goal 3, Objective 3.2, should be reworded to seek protection for wildlife from overexploitation through trade rather than the promotion of wildlife trade. CITES’ mission is to ensure that trade does not become harmful to species, not to ensure that trade is consistently conducted, or promoted • Goal 1, Objective 1.1, indicator 2 (“A significant number of Parties have undergone assessments of their wildlife trade policies in accordance with Decision 13.74.”) is premature as the Parties have yet to approve a framework for the wildlife trade policy reviews • Goal 1, Objective 1.3 (“National wildlife trade policies are consistent with policies and regulations adopted at the international level”) goes beyond the CITES mandate. The appropriate objective should be that national policies are consistent with the purpose of the

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p>Convention and CITES Resolutions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Goal 1, Objective 1.3, indicator 1 (“<i>The Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties are implemented by all Parties in a consistent manner.</i>”). Requiring Parties to implement resolutions “<i>in a consistent manner</i>” is too vague to be measurable and may violate Article XIV of the Convention ● Goal 1, Objective 1.3, indicator 2 (“<i>Multilateral CITES processes have been further developed that reduce the need by Parties for recourse to stricter domestic measures and reservations.</i>”). This reference to stricter domestic measures and reservations in the Strategic Vision can infringe on Parties’ sovereign rights and should be deleted ● Goal 1, Objective 1.3, indicator 3 (“<i>Parties have coherent positions on environment and wildlife trade in international fora</i>”) is unclear and unnecessary. Parties are sovereign in their ability to define a position in international fora ● The National Legislation Project-should be used as an indicator of whether Parties comply with their obligations through appropriate policies, legislation and procedures (Goal 1, Objective 1.1) ● The indicators for Goal 1, Objective 1.4, should not measure the Review of the Appendices exclusively as a means to promote downlistings (“<i>identify the species that are not at risk from trade and might be considered for removal from the Appendices</i>”). The reviews also assess if CITES listed species require increased CITES protection and should be up-listed in accordance with the precautionary principle ● Goal 1, Objective 1.5 should include a reference to the Precautionary Principle ● Goal 1, Objective 1.7 should include National Enforcement Action Plans as an indicator ● In the introduction to Goal 3, where it is mentioned that CITES does not have a definition of sustainable use in addition to the reference to the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines on Sustainable Use, other concepts like the precautionary principle, the users pay principle, the ecosystem approach and the reaffirmation of traditional conservation principles should be included

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The indicators for Goal 3, Objective 3.1, referring to the development of CITES-related projects that “<i>contribute to poverty alleviation and livelihoods of local communities</i>” and to the creation of “<i>social and economic instruments to provide benefits to local communities and conservation from wildlife trade.</i>” should be deleted. CITES does not have the mandate or the capacity to deal with issues such as poverty alleviation and community development; these should be dealt with nationally and through the appropriate international organizations. Indicators under this objective (funding CITES related projects by international financial mechanisms) should focus on projects related to implementation and enforcement of the Convention ● Objective 3.2 is problematic. The current language “<i>ensure the sustainability of wildlife trade</i>” should be replaced with “<i>protect certain species against over exploitation through international trade</i>”. The evaluation through Review of Significant Trade can be one of the indicators assessing over-exploitation ● The indicator under Goal 3, Objective 3.2 (“<i>CITES permits being considered as a certification of sustainable trade</i>”) is too broad and should be deleted. Further, many species enter international trade accompanied by CITES permits though the required non-detriment findings have not been made ● Objective 3.3 (“<i>Strategic alliances are forged with environmental and trade organizations</i>”) should be amended to read “<i>with international stakeholders</i>” as in the current Strategic Plan. The alliances, in particular the reference to “<i>trade organizations</i>”, should not be specified ● Objective 3.3, indicator 1 (“<i>Common biodiversity conservation goals, objectives and principles are integrated with those of relevant multilateral environmental agreements and related conventions, agreements and associations</i>”) should be deleted. It would not be appropriate to, e.g. “<i>integrate</i>” CITES goals with those of the World Trade Organization <u>References to the user-pays principle should be restored under Goal 2</u>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SV no longer refers to the user-pays principle, mentioned in the original draft, as one of the means to secure the financial basis of the Convention. The cost of regulating wildlife trade should be paid by those who benefit from it <p>REGARDING the Secretariat's comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN does not agree that CITES necessarily has to adapt to developments in other fora. The Secretariat appears to argue that because other international fora are "...aimed at balancing environmental aims and priorities with the needs of people ...". CITES also should seek a balance between the needs of people and conservation. SSN believes that the durability and success of CITES is due to the objective nature of the treaty—that non-detriment findings and listings are science-based
<p>Doc. 12</p> <p>Review of the Scientific Committees</p> <p>Standing Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.10 directs the SC to: determine a process for review of the scientific Committees; proceed with the review based on terms of reference provided by the Committees; and report to CoP14 SC53 agreed to terms of reference and established an External Evaluation Working Group to undertake the review SC54 adopted recommendations based on the review and agreed to propose to CoP14 modifications of relevant Resolutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would include the following new language in a Resolution to be considered at CoP14 on Financing and budgeting of the Secretariat and of meetings of the Conference of the Parties (Doc. 7): <i>"INSTRUCTS the Secretariat to seek assistance from the Animals and Plants Committees in the assignment of scientific consultants and the definition of terms of reference for specific science based projects"</i> Would revise RC 12.11 (Rev. CoP13), on Standard nomenclature and the operation of the Nomenclature Committee, to eliminate the Nomenclature Committee and assign all nomenclatural duties to AC and PC Would revise RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13), on Establishment of committees: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to eliminate the Nomenclature Committee, delete Annex 3 (on Establishment of the Nomenclature Committee), move remaining relevant text to other parts of the Resolution, and assign all nomenclatural duties to AC and PC to require that nomenclatural changes not proposed by the Committees themselves 	<p>SC Recommendations: SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports most of the recommendations of the SC. The AC and PC are a valuable source of scientific expertise for the operation of the Convention. SSN supports efforts to strengthen the role of the AC and PC in science-related decisions of the Secretariat SSN believes that the current system of regional representation on the Committees must be maintained in order for all of the CITES regions to have an equal voice in the deliberations of the Committees SSN opposes the SC's proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to eliminate the Nomenclature Committee, unless it is reconstituted as a permanent working group in each Committee. Nomenclature is a highly specialized area best dealt with separately from other Committee business, with opportunity for input from taxonomists not representing any Party to include nomenclature specialists as voting members of the AC and PC. The addition of nomenclature specialists would upset the balance of regional representation. SSN recommends that the nomenclature specialists should be advisors to the AC and PC and have no voting rights or other rights of members

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>originate as proposals from Parties or the Secretariat</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪to add a Member to the PC and AC who is a specialist on zoological nomenclature (for AC) and a specialist on botanical nomenclature (for PC) appointed by the CoP ▪to revise (second RECOMMENDS, A a)) regarding election candidates to serve on AC and PC, as follows: <i>The proposals for Parties proposing candidates as representatives should confirm, at the time of nomination, that the candidate will be supported by the relevant Governments in order to ensure as far as possible and that they will obtain the necessary means to undertake their activities</i> ▪to delete text that is redundant with text of other Resolutions ▪to add to Annex 2, on Establishment of the AC and PC, <i>“AGREES that in giving instructions to the Animals and Plants Committees, the Conference of the Parties should pay due attention to whether the nature of the work is within their mandate and whether the committees have the time and personnel to undertake such work”</i> ▪to add to Annex 2, <i>“the Secretariat shall also make provision for the participation of the Committees’ chairmen at meetings of the Standing Committee and at other meetings that the chairmen are instructed to attend by the Conference of the Parties”</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Secretariat proposes a draft Decision directed to the SC to develop a costed proposal to merge the scientific Committees; to ensure that membership of the Committees reflects the need for both regional and thematic expertise (without changing the size of the Committees); to provide an independent Chair selected by the CoP on a rotation basis; and to propose amending RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13) at CoP15 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪to eliminate the need for Committee candidates to confirm support of the government that nominates them. There have been concerns in the past that Committee representatives that do not have the full support of the nominating government do not have the means nor resources to fulfill their obligations as representatives <p>Secretariat's Recommendations: OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN opposes the Secretariat’s proposal. The CoP has already considered and rejected a proposal to merge the AC and PC. SSN strongly opposes the Secretariat’s proposals to include thematic expertise on the Committees, at the expense of regional members; and to appoint an <i>“independent”</i> Chair rather than a Chair being elected from the Members who, in turn, were elected by the Parties in their regions
Doc. 13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 10.4, on Cooperation and synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● <u>The AC and PC:</u> 	<p>AC/PC Recommendations: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN generally supports the recommendations of the

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity</p> <p>Animals and Plants Committees</p>	<p>(CBD), recommends that the Secretariat investigate opportunities whereby CITES can become a partner in the implementation of appropriate provisions of the CBD</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC13.2, on Sustainable use of biodiversity: Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, urges Parties to “<i>make use of the Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity [adopted by the CBD], also taking into account scientific, trade and enforcement considerations determined by national circumstances, when adopting non-detriment-making processes and making CITES non-detriment findings</i>” (emphasis added) Decision 13.6 directed the AC and PC to identify those Principles and Guidelines of most relevance to CITES, taking into account case studies on “<i>how these could be used in specific cases of exports of specimens of Appendix-II species</i>” (emphasis added) AC21/PC15 agreed on terms of reference for case studies and stated that the point of the exercise was to assess whether principles were relevant, and that the exercise was voluntary At AC22/PC16, based on Parties’ comments and a small number of case studies received, the Committees adopted recommendations for report to CoP14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> note that CITES, unlike the CBD, is regulatory and species-specific state that CBD’s Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines relevant to CITES (e.g. 1,2,4,7,9,12) are either already implicit in CITES language or are promoted by CITES note that case studies have shown that “<i>it is evident</i>” that the Principles and Guidelines are not always immediately applicable to CITES decision-making, particularly with respect to non-detriment findings (NDFs) recommend amending RC 10.4 to acknowledge Principles and Guidelines as a <u>voluntary additional tool for making NDFs</u> note possible complications of using socioeconomic aspects of the Principles and Guidelines in making NDFs note that the Principles and Guidelines could support existing IUCN guidance on making NDFs, and would be valuable for developing taxon-specific guidelines recognize that the Principles and Guidelines were of global importance but that not all are relevant to CITES <u>The Secretariat:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> states that it “<i>concurs with the Committees that not all of the Principles and Guidelines are directly relevant [in the context of the requirement for a non-detriment finding]</i>” but that it believes nevertheless that “<i>all of the principles and guidelines are of pertinence in the implementation of CITES in a wider sense</i>” (emphasis added) proposes an amendment to RC.10.4 that differs from and goes beyond the AC/PC recommendation: “RECOMMENDS that Parties take full account of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity in the implementation of the Convention” 	<p>AC/PC and agrees that the Principles and Guidelines are not always applicable to the making of NDFs, which must be science-based</p> <p>Secretariat's Recommendations: OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes the Secretariat’s proposed amendment to RC 10.4 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the AC/PC concluded that the Principles and Guidelines are not always applicable to CITES decision-making but could be a <u>voluntary</u> additional tool in making NDFs, and proposed an amendment to RC10.4 to this effect. Their recommendations (Doc 13 Annex) were carefully worded and based on in-depth discussion and consideration of case studies in the AC22/PC16 working group. The Secretariat’s amendment goes far beyond the AC/PC recommendation and would extend the application of “<i>all</i>” the Principles and Guidelines to the “<i>implementation</i>” of CITES. By proposing this, the Secretariat has ignored the Committees’ opinion and the results of the case studies the Secretariat’s proposed amendment goes beyond RC 13.2 which specifically addresses the Principles and Guidelines and urges Parties to make use of them “<i>when adopting non-detriment-making processes and making CITES non-detriment findings</i>”, taking into account “<i>scientific, trade and enforcement considerations</i>”. RC 13.2 does not state that the Principles and Guidelines are relevant to all aspects of CITES implementation the Secretariat implies that the Committees restricted their mandate by focusing on NDFs. However, the Committees fulfilled their mandate in the context of RC13.2, which restricts the relevance of the Principles and Guidelines to NDFs and to which Decision 13.6 is linked if all aspects of the Principles and Guidelines were applied to implementation, differing socioeconomic conditions amongst the Parties would lead to varying standards of CITES implementation, weakening efforts to ensure objective, science-based non-detriment findings The Secretariat states that it will, in cooperation with the

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p>Chairmen of the AC and PC, incorporate relevant Principles and Guidelines as identified by them into its capacity-building program for Scientific Authorities. SSN believes this should be discussed first by the AC/PC and urges the CoP to direct the AC/PC to do so.. SSN also recommends that the CoP direct the Secretariat to draw attention within its capacity-building program to the AC/PC recommendation that use of the Principles and Guidelines should be as a <i>“voluntary additional tool”</i></p>
<p>Doc. 14</p> <p>CITES and Livelihoods</p> <p>Argentina, China, Germany on behalf of the European Community Member States and Nicaragua</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 8.3 (Rev. CoP13) on Recognition of the benefits of trade in wildlife, <i>“recognizes that implementation of CITES-listing decisions should take into account potential impacts on the livelihoods of the poor”</i> ● A CITES and Livelihoods Workshop took place on 5-7 September 2006, in South Africa; the objective was to <i>“identify practical measures that will contribute to the operationalisation of the new paragraph of CITES Resolution Conf 8.3 (Rev. CoP13)”</i> ● The PC and AC recognize that <i>“it is evident that the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity are not always immediately applicable for the decision-making process under CITES, particularly with respect to making non-detriment findings (NDF)”</i> (PC16/AC22 Sum. 2 (08/07/2006) and CoP14 Doc. 13 Annex) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CoP14 Doc. 14 includes a draft Decision that directs the SC to initiate processes to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ develop by CoP15, tools for rapid assessment at the national level of the impacts of CITES trade regulation on human well-being and the livelihoods of the poor ■ develop by CoP15, draft guidelines for Parties on how to consider the impacts on the livelihoods of the poor, particularly in developing countries, when implementing CITES. These should incorporate, where appropriate, the findings of the Secretariat’s proposed assessment set out below ● A second draft Decision directs the Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ provide an assessment to SC57 of the <i>“ways in which the implementation of CITES processes and measures has taken, or could take, place in ways that consider and positively deal with likely negative impacts on the livelihoods of the poor, particularly those in developing countries”</i>; and indicate positive processes available to deal with such impacts in a way which reduces and if possible removes those impacts to support human well-being and livelihoods. Processes including the significant trade review and its evaluation and wildlife trade policy reviews should be assessed ● Both draft Decisions direct the SC and the Secretariat to take into account the process initiated at CoP13 to consider the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Undermines the core objective of CITES as stated in its Preamble, the protection of <i>“certain species of wild fauna and flora against over-exploitation through international trade”</i> ● CITES has no mandate to regulate the distribution of benefits of trade. The Convention on Biological Diversity is the appropriate forum to deal with the relationship between biological diversity and livelihoods of the poor ● The draft Decision directed to the SC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ refers to the impacts of <i>“CITES trade regulation”</i>, broader language than that in RC 8.3 (Rev. CoP13). Future proposals to amend the CITES Appendices could be subjected to a <i>“human-well being and livelihoods of the poor impact assessment”</i>, this additional burden on Management Authorities could discourage Parties from submitting listing proposals and undermining RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) ■ will produce guidelines and tools for rapid assessment that will be impossible to implement for most CITES Parties, and will serve merely to complicate and undermine implementation and enforcement at the national and international level ● The draft Decision directed to the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ could result in restricting the scope and undermining the effectiveness of CITES processes, such as the Significant Trade Review, by subjugating them to socioeconomic considerations. Differing socioeconomic conditions amongst the Parties would lead to varying standards of CITES implementation, weakening efforts to ensure objective, science-based non-detriment

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		Sustainable Use of Biodiversity (RC 13.2 and Decisions 13.6 and 13.7)	<p>findings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ refers to “<i>likely negative impacts [of CITES] on the livelihoods of the poor</i>”. This language ignores the positive contributions of CITES protection of wildlife from over-exploitation to the livelihoods of poor people directly dependent on the conservation of natural resources ● Parties may take into account human well-being and livelihoods of the poor as part of broad conservation and socioeconomic planning at the national level. The use of measures such as the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines should continue to be voluntary, as recommended by the PC and AC (PC16/AC22 Sum. 2 (08/07/2006) and CoP14 Doc. 13 Annex) ● Parties to CITES should not be expected to come to a consensus about what negatively affects “<i>human well-being and the livelihoods of the poor</i>”. That is an evaluation best left to each country to solve as part of its broader ecological and development policies; at best, CITES can assist Parties in ensuring that these policies take the goals of the Convention thoroughly into account.
<p>Doc. 15</p> <p>National Wildlife Trade Policy Reviews</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● This issue was initiated by the Secretariat at CoP12 in 2002 ● Decision 13.74 directs the Secretariat, contingent on the availability of external funding and in collaboration with interested Parties and building on the findings and recommendations of the workshop on trade policy and economic incentives (Geneva 2003), to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) conduct, in cooperation with the Parties, a review of their national policies regarding the use of and trade in specimens of CITES-listed species, taking into account economic incentives, production systems, consumption patterns, market access strategies, price structures, certification schemes, CITES-relevant taxation and subsidy schemes, property rights, mechanisms for benefit sharing and reinvestment in conservation, as well as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports on the current status of the conduct of national policy reviews: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ pilot projects will be led, at the national level, by national CITES authorities and relevant ministries and implemented by independent national research institutions ▪ provides a list of the members of the International Advisory Group (IAG) that has been created to advise the Steering Committee and participating countries on the implementation of the projects ▪ four pilot countries (Madagascar, Nicaragua, Uganda and Vietnam) were selected from the applications received ▪ Switzerland and the European Union, as consumer countries, have expressed interest in undertaking wildlife trade policy reviews with their own funding ▪ the Steering Committee will convene a three- 	<p>OPPOSE National Wildlife Policy Trade Reviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Issues such as taxation, property rights, price structures, market access, subsidy schemes or the distribution of benefits of trade go well beyond the CITES mandate ● SSN is concerned that the trade policy reviews place a significant emphasis on promoting trade, consumption and profit and fail to recognize the need for effective implementation and enforcement of CITES and sound science in wildlife management ● The socioeconomic issues addressed in the national policy reviews are political in nature; it is highly unlikely that consensus will be reached if the proceedings are transparent and inclusive. The direct benefits anticipated for wildlife as a result of the reviews are not described ● Plans for the wildlife trade policy reviews are extensive and will require the use of scarce personnel resources in the Secretariat. SSN believes that trade policy reviews will likely yield little or no concrete results for species threatened by trade, and that the Convention, the Parties, and wildlife would be better served if available

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>stricter domestic measures that Parties apply or are affected by;</p> <p>b) compile and synthesize the information provided by the Parties, and produce a report analyzing the impacts of national policies for trade in CITES-listed species in terms of socio-economic and conservation benefits and costs, including on the economic value of the species, levels of legal and illegal trade, improvement of the livelihood of local communities, and on how they affect the role of the private sector involved in such trade;</p> <p>c) report at SC54 and subsequent meetings of the SC and at CoP14 on the progress made with regard to the implementation of this Decision; and</p> <p>d) submit a project proposal to the Global Environment Facility, and other funding institutions and development agencies, to seek financial support to prepare the trade policy reviews in the interested countries, in the context of their national and regional strategies for biodiversity conservation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.75 directs the Secretariat to invite all Parties, governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide technical assistance for conducting the national wildlife trade policy reviews. 	<p>day capacity-building workshop for national project participants in Geneva from 26-28 February 2007</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a side event will be held during CoP14 to provide an opportunity for participating project countries to share compiled and synthesized information on the initial results from their wildlife trade policy reviews during CoP14, the Steering Committee will meet with members of the IAG so that they can give the participating countries initial feedback on project development and implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarizes elements of the final draft of the wildlife trade policy review framework. The Secretariat recommends revisions to Decision 13.74: retain paragraphs a) and b); renew the deadlines in paragraph c); and delete paragraph d)) The Secretariat recommends the adoption of Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> inviting importing countries to carry out national wildlife policy reviews directing Parties that undertake a wildlife trade policy review to include relevant details in their biennial reports. Other Parties that have not undertaken a wildlife trade policy review, but have experience with the policy measures described in paragraph a) of the current Decision 13.74, are invited to include relevant details in their biennial reports encouraging Parties, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide feedback on the draft of the wildlife trade policy review framework, as well as financial and technical assistance for conducting the national trade policy reviews 	<p>resources and time were directed to key processes such as the Significant Trade Review, which is moving at a very slow pace due to limitations in time and budget, and towards supporting enforcement, which is suffering from a serious lack of capacity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN doubts that CITES can adequately assess all social, economic, political, and cultural aspects of wildlife management, even within one country. This is evidenced by the ongoing country-based review of Madagascar under the Significant Trade Review. Despite clear scientific objectives, this country-based review has been less successful than species-based reviews because there is little focus on the species of greatest need, large amounts of resources are expended with few measurable results, and attempts to address general wildlife policies have become mired in 'gray areas' where socio-economic and political issues take priority over scientific standards While Decision 13.75 directs the Secretariat to invite all Parties, governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to provide technical assistance for conducting the national wildlife trade policy reviews, the Secretariat has not provided the final draft of the wildlife trade policy review framework for comment If the Parties proceed with the national wildlife policy trade reviews, SSN urges that the objectives of the reviews be amended to focus on CITES implementation and enforcement, and to ensure that trade in CITES-listed wildlife is non-detrimental. Paragraphs a) and b) of the draft Decision directed to the Secretariat should be re-drafted to reflect this focus
<p>Doc. 16</p> <p>Capacity Building Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building in the context of CITES means supporting and improving national and regional efforts to implement the Convention. Efforts in this regard are undertaken by the Secretariat, by Parties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explains the Secretariat's efforts on capacity building including: training workshops, cooperation with Master's degree programs, and tools available from the Secretariat (such as publications, interactive CDs, and the 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports the development of training materials and the founding of a CITES Virtual College as an effective and low cost addition to the available tools for CITES-related training

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>and by inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.104 directs the Parties to provide financial assistance for the continuation of the Master's course on Management, Access, Conservation and Trade of Species: The International Framework Decision 13.105 directs the SC and the Secretariat to seek external funding to support the participation of students from developing countries and countries with economies in transition in the Master's course 	<p>CITES newsletter); and encourages Parties to support and to make use of these</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presents a plan to establish a CITES Virtual College for CITES-related training to offer interactive Internet-based courses in the three working languages of the Convention using an Internet portal that will also provide a virtual library of materials relevant to CITES study, discussion forums and other electronic "workspaces" Recommends the adoption of Decisions replacing Decisions 13.104 and 13.105 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> direct the Secretariat to seek external funding to develop the Virtual College with relevant authorities and experts request Parties to provide financial assistance to academic institutions offering Master's degree courses on CITES 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN recommends that the Secretariat and Member States give capacity-building through training workshops a higher priority as the most essential measure to increase enforcement capacity and cross-agency and cross-border cooperation. The Secretariat and Parties also need to recognize that many agency officials and law enforcement officers around the world may not have sufficient Internet access, if at all, and that CITES-related training should also be made available via distance-learning courses.
<p>Doc. 18.1</p> <p>Cooperation with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Since 1997, CITES and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) have been collaborating on issues including the International Plan of Action for Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-SHARKS), the definition of 'decline' for commercially exploited aquatic species, and the definition of "introduction from the sea" CITES-FAO collaboration has been beneficial for species such as queen conch, sturgeons, sharks, and sea cucumbers CoP12 directed the Secretariat to draft a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) with FAO, which was approved by the SC in 2005 Under the MoU, FAO and the CITES Secretariat will work together to ensure adequate consultations in the scientific and technical evaluation of listing proposals for commercially exploited aquatic species, and cooperate in addressing technical and legal issues involved with the listing of such species and the implementation of those listings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat proposes two Decisions directed to the Standing Committee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> to create a "<i>Fishery Working Group</i>" to address practical implementation issues for fish and marine invertebrates listed in the Appendices to present a report at CoP15 that describes the progress of the Working Group The Secretariat also proposes two Decisions directed to the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> initiate discussions with FAO to enhance and formalize cooperation between the two organizations relating to forestry and non-timber forest products report at CoP15 on progress toward an MoU with FAO relating to forestry and non-timber forest products 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports the creation a "Fishery Working Group" to assist Parties in implementing CITES for fish and marine invertebrates. SSN cautions, however, that discussion of species within a Working Group should not be considered an alternative to the inclusion of species in the CITES Appendices SSN also supports a broad discussion within CITES of the appropriate relationship between CITES and FAO relating to forestry and non-timber forest products. The Secretariat's report will help ensure that specific FAO recommendations are evaluated independently by the CITES Parties Collaboration with FAO could facilitate consultations in the scientific and technical evaluation of proposals for timber species. It could also include guidance on best practices for verifying legality of timber harvests and timber trade However, SSN believes that guidance from FAO, while valuable, cannot substitute for the independent assessments of the CITES Parties or the Secretariat with regard to scientific findings and trade concerns

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The MoU does not deal with other areas of existing collaboration between FAO and the CITES Secretariat, such as international trade in listed timber species and non-timber forest products 		
<p>Doc. 18.2</p> <p>Cooperation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) Regarding Trade in Tropical Timber</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC 10.13 (Rev. CoP13) recommends that prior to submitting a proposal to amend the Appendices to include a timber species, a Party should consult with at least four of fourteen listed international organizations, including the ITTO Members of the ITTO can submit proposals to the International Tropical Timber Council (ITTC) to fund projects designed to implement CITES listings of timber species The ITTO has funded several CITES-related projects including meetings of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group and the Expert Meeting on the Effective Implementation of the Uplisting of Ramin to Appendix II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Urges Parties which are also party to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994 or its successor agreement, to consult with the ITTO as recommended in RC 10.13 (Rev. CoP13) Recommends that Parties bring any concerns regarding the effects of international trade on tropical timber species to the attention of the ITTC Directs the CITES Secretariat to cooperate with the ITTO Secretariat on all matters related to international trade in tropical timber species and their sustainable management Encourages cooperation between Parties and relevant intergovernmental organizations to improve forest governance and combat illegal logging and associated trade 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed Resolution rightly acknowledges the valuable contribution the ITTO has made to CITES implementation for timber species and provides for future cooperation Bringing concerns regarding the effects of international trade on tropical timber species to the attention of the ITTC should be <i>in addition to</i>, and not as a substitute for, bringing those concerns to the CITES Secretariat, the PC or the CoP The proposed Resolution should identify those activities for which ITTO support would be most valuable such as funding forest inventories, assisting range States in establishing chain of custody systems in order to make valid legality findings under Article IV(2)(b), and making available trade data to help identify those tropical timber species that might benefit from CITES protection Cooperation to improve forest governance and combat illegal logging and associated trade should include the participation of non-governmental organizations ITTO funding for a project to implement the listing of a timber species under CITES should not be used as an excuse to justify continued violation of the Convention
<p>Doc. 19.1</p> <p>Terms of Reference for CITES Dialogue Meetings</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dialogue meetings are held when there are strong divisions between range States over proposals for amendments of the Appendices with respect to a certain species or group of species Dialogue meetings have been held to examine proposals to amend the Appendices in relation to the African elephant and the hawksbill turtle since 1996 and 2001, respectively At the 5th dialogue meeting of African elephant range States (Santiago, October 2002), Rules of Procedure were agreed 	<p>The document contains a draft Resolution that would establish dialogue meetings as formal CITES meetings, subject to draft Rules of Procedure agreed to at SC53 and included as an Annex to the draft Resolution. The draft Resolution contains the following provisions:</p> <p><u>Organization of dialogue meetings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A dialogue meeting may be called for either by the CoP or by the SC. If a Party intends to submit a proposal to amend the Appendices and, as a result of seeking the comments of the other range States, becomes aware that there is a "significant division" between them it may ask the SC to instruct the Secretariat to 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <p><u>Organization of dialogue meetings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports the roles of the CoP and SC <u>Dialogue meeting participants</u> Range States should be able to decide without restriction who will represent them at the meetings (Rule 1) Rule 1 should also allow Parties to attend with advisers. The Party's representative, and its alternate and advisers, should all have the right to speak The Rules should clarify how and when the decision to approve observers (Rule 2) is made (e.g. by majority vote) and how disagreements as to who should attend

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>upon and presented to CoP12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> At SC50, the Secretariat presented an adapted form of these Rules, which could then be used for all future dialogue meetings, in relation to any species The Secretariat's draft was discussed at SC50 and subsequently at SC53, with some amendments made on each occasion. The SC approved draft terms of reference and Rules of Procedure for dialogue meetings and agreed that the Secretariat should prepare on that basis a draft Resolution for consideration at CoP14 	<p>organize a dialogue meeting, subject to the availability of external funding</p> <p><u>Dialogue meeting participants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 1: each range-State Party is entitled to attend. Representatives "<i>shall be government officials designated to attend by the Management Authority.</i>" Rule 2: non-range States and organizations may be represented by observers if approved by range-State representatives Rule 5: intergovernmental organizations and other technical experts can be invited to attend as resource persons, upon the recommendations of the range States (clause 2 of the preamble of the draft Resolution recognizes the role of IUCN participation) <p><u>Attendance costs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 8: funds to cover the attendance of at least one representative from developing countries or countries with economies in transition shall be paid from the Trust Fund budget, or where funds have not been so allocated, the Secretariat shall seek sufficient funding <p><u>Role of the Secretariat</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 3: the CITES Secretariat shall participate in dialogue meetings in order to advise the Parties and to serve as Secretary and organizer of the meeting <p><u>The Chair and Vice-Chairs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 11: the Chairman of the SC shall serve as the Chair of each CITES dialogue meeting. If he/she is unable to serve, he/she should appoint the Vice-Chair or Alternate Vice-Chair of the SC to serve in his/her place or identify a Chair who is acceptable to the range States Rule 12: two Vice-Chairs for each meeting shall be elected from among the participants <p><u>Confidentiality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preamble notes that dialogue meetings provide the opportunity for States to exchange views frankly and freely, without the pressures 	<p>will be resolved. Observers should only be permitted to participate if a request has been submitted to the Secretariat at least 30 days prior to the meeting, or at least 7 days prior to emergency meetings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Range States should be able to propose NGOs as resource persons (Rule 5). Given the sensitivity concerning invited experts, it is inappropriate to single out IUCN in the draft Resolution The Rules should specify that observers and resource persons have the right to participate but not to vote <p><u>Role of the Secretariat</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN recommends deleting "...in order to advise the Parties and..." in Rule 3. The Secretariat should play a neutral role in the conduct of the meetings Range States should be entitled to elect the Secretary for each meeting. <p><u>The Chair and Vice-Chairs</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes Rule 11; range States should always elect the Chair and choose the number of Vice-Chairs appropriate for the meeting <p><u>Confidentiality</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes Rule 15 as written. Meetings should be transparent; confidentiality should be decided on an as-needed basis. Range States should be able to consult with others, including advisers, independent experts, NGOs and other Parties, on all aspects of the meeting. If the range States so decide, these consultations can take place on a confidential basis. Rules should be adopted to clarify how the decision to keep meetings confidential should be made <p><u>Publication of the agenda</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the interests of transparency, the provisional agenda for each meeting should be published on the CITES website at least 45 days before the meeting <p><u>The final decision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Resolution would place undue pressure on range States to reach consensus. It should be made explicit that the outcome can also be proceedings of the discussion, a record of majority and minority views, or a record that no consensus was reached In paragraph 3 of the preamble, "<i>without the pressures</i>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>that exist during CoP meetings. Rule 15 provides that no record is kept of discussions at the meetings and that the discussions are confidential. Participants cannot communicate with the media or other (non-participant) organizations concerning statements made by other participants</p> <p><u>The final decision</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Resolution states that the aim of dialogue meetings is to seek consensus or an agreed position. Rule 14 provides that decisions should be made by consensus, as far as possible. When this is not possible the final communiqué of the meeting may indicate majority and minority views Rule 16 provides that the communiqué should be drafted by the Secretary in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chairs and, if agreed [by the range States], will provide the official record to be presented at the next CoP <p><u>Amendment of the Rules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rule 17 provides that the SC may amend the Rules at any time 	<p><i>that exist on delegations during meetings of the Conference of the Parties</i> should be deleted as inappropriate. The CoP is a transparent and democratic process; public accountability should be promoted rather than restricted. Lack of transparency can increase pressures on attendees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If consensus cannot be reached, then clearly no decision in relation to the Proposals under discussion can be made, and the range States' communiqué may simply state this without the need to elaborate. Alternatively, where consensus cannot be reached the final communiqué may indicate majority and minority views. There should be provision for consultation with all range States at the drafting stage to ensure that the communiqué represents all views accurately <p><u>Amendment of the Rules</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes Rule 17; as the Rules are to be made by the CoP, only the CoP should be able to amend them
<p>Doc. 20.1</p> <p>Review of Resolutions Relating to Appendix-I Species</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.21 states: <i>"The Secretariat shall, in consultation with the Standing Committee, examine all species-specific Resolutions concerning Appendix-I species with a view to preparing a consolidated resolution concerning the enforcement of trade controls for all Appendix-I species for consideration at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties"</i> SC54 approved the Secretariat's plan to prepare two sets of draft consolidated resolutions relating to Appendix-I species; Resolutions relating to hunting trophies; and Resolutions relating to conservation of and trade in specimens of specific species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Invites the CoP to adopt a draft consolidated resolution on hunting trophies for Appendix-I species that contains text of the following Resolutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC 10.14 (Rev. CoP13) on Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use RC10.15 (Rev. CoP12) on Establishment of quotas for markhor hunting trophies RC 13.5 on Establishment of export quotas for black rhinoceros hunting trophies RC 2.11 (Rev.) on Trade in hunting trophies of species listed in Appendix I RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13) on The interpretation and application of quotas for species included in Appendix I Invites the CoP to adopt a draft consolidated resolution on conservation of and trade in specimens of specific Appendix-I species that 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN urges Parties to <u>support</u> the adoption of the draft resolution on hunting trophies for Appendix-I species, with amendments The proposed consolidated resolution will help bring consistency to treatment of quotas for specimens of Appendix I species. Indeed, much of the language of the operative paragraphs of existing Resolutions is already similar or identical SSN notes that there appears to be an inconsistency between RC 2.11 (Rev.) and RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13). Specifically, paragraph b) of RC 2.11 (Rev.) suggests that the Scientific Authority for the country of export must make a non-detriment finding for the export of hunting trophies. In contrast, RC 9.21 (Rev. COP13) states that a quota established by the CoP <i>"satisfies"</i> the requirements that the export of the specimen will not be detrimental to the survival of the species. Such an export quota also satisfies the requirement that the

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>contains text of the following Resolutions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) on Conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses ▪Conf. 11.8 (Rev. CoP13) on Conservation of and control of trade in the Tibetan antelope ▪Conf. 12.5 on Conservation of and trade in tigers and other Appendix-I Asian big cat species ▪Conf. 13.4 on Conservation of and trade in great apes ▪The Secretariat states that it would be desirable in the next review of Resolutions to consider ways of simplifying these texts 	<p>purposes of the import will not be detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the quota is not exceeded and <i>"no new scientific or management data have emerged to indicate that the species population in the range State concerned can no longer sustain the agreed quota."</i> In other words, the export quota established by the CoP effectively substitutes for the non-detriment finding that would otherwise be required for the import and export of an Appendix I specimen. SSN does not support this provision in RC 9.21.. RC 2.11 (Rev.) better reflects the requirements of the Convention text. In accordance with Article III, a scientifically based non-detriment finding should always be required. Para. b) of RC 2.11 (Rev.) indicates that scientific and management data are required for a non-detriment finding This approach should be followed in the consolidated resolution on hunting trophies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN urges the Parties to maintain the original intent of the sixth paragraph of the preamble of RC 13.5, indicating that the financial benefits derived from trophy hunting a limited number of specimens may benefit conservation of black rhinoceros <i>only</i> and not all species, as proposed by the Secretariat . As existing resolutions demonstrate, the Parties have recognized the potential benefits of trophy hunting only for specific species in particular circumstances, and contrary to the Secretariat's proposal, have not adopted a statement on the conservation impacts of trophy hunting of general applicability to all Appendix I species. ● SSN urges the Parties to maintain the following text from RC 13.5 by including it as an additional requirement, a) iii) under <i>"RECOMMENDS that:"</i>: <i>"Black rhinoceros trophies being considered are from a range State to which an export quota has been granted as part of a national black rhinoceros conservation and management plan or programme "</i> ● SSN urges the Parties to <u>oppose</u> the draft resolution on conservation of and trade in specimens of specific Appendix-I species <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪The compiled draft text is confusing and unwieldy ▪The species dealt with include those most threatened by illegal international trade. The biology, threats to, and conservation needs of these species are strikingly

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p>different and cannot be adequately reflected in a generic resolution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪The current Resolutions have proven highly successful in mobilizing resources and support for species-specific conservation initiatives to protect highly endangered species such as tigers and great apes ▪Efforts to shorten the text will result in deletions of important species-specific recommendations ▪The Parties should direct the Secretariat to maintain the current species-specific Resolutions and consider no further consolidation efforts <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN would support an additional Resolution addressing enforcement of trade controls for all Appendix I species
<p>Doc. 21</p> <p>Revision of Resolution Conf. 11.16 on Ranching and Trade in Ranched Specimens of Species Transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II</p> <p>Animals Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC11.16, on Ranching and trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, includes specific monitoring and reporting requirements in relation to species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching • AC22 agreed to propose amendments to RC 11.16 on the basis of the findings of a review of crocodile ranching operations that was conducted by the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group in 2004 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The AC recommends that RC 11.16 be amended to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪include in the text of the preamble, the statement, “<i>RECOGNIZING that as a management system, ranching for some species has proven to be a ‘safe’ and robust form of sustainable utilization relative to wild harvests of adults</i>” ▪change the definition of ranching, “(...) <i>the rearing in a controlled environment of specimens taken from the wild <u>at an early stage</u></i>” ▪reduce certain mandatory reporting requirements for annual reports and, instead, require the production of this information only upon request to the Secretariat. Among this information is an estimate of the percentage of the production of the wild population that is taken for the ranching operation and the number of animals released and their survival rates estimated on the basis of surveys and tagging programs, if any ▪delete the requirement to report on sales and exports of products (“...<i>production, sales and exports of products</i>”) • The Secretariat recommends additional amendments to RC 11.16 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪rephrase the current requirement to report on production, sales and exports of products 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes to RC11.16 based on experiences with crocodilian ranching may not be appropriate for all species that may be traded under the Resolution • SSN recommends the following amendments to the proposed new text for the preamble (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪“<i>RECOGNIZING that as a management system, ranching for crocodilians has proven to be <u>can be, under appropriate circumstances and with strict controls, a ‘safe’ and robust form of sustainable utilization relative to wild harvests of adults</u></i>” ▪SSN recommends adding the following: <u><i>NOTING however that ranching for crocodilians remains problematic for some range States [as illustrated in SC54 Doc. 32] and the appropriateness of ranching for other species has not been assessed by CITES</i></u> • Regarding the definition of ranching, neither the current definition nor that proposed by the AC adequately describes the distinguishing components of ranching. SSN recommends the following amendments (new text <u>underlined</u>): “<i>the term ‘ranching’ means the rearing in a controlled environment of specimens of species that exhibit both high fecundity and high levels of natural mortality in early life, taken from the wild at an early life stage, which are the result of a method of management that is proven to increase production while maintaining or increasing recruitment in the wild population</i>” • Regarding proposals to transfer populations from

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>as “...production, sales and for exports of products”)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ separate the paragraphs that relate to preparation, submission and adoption of proposals from those that refer to actions that are recommended once the proposal has been adopted, and incorporate the former text into RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) ▪ clarify the general criteria regarding ‘local population’, the marking of products, ‘appropriate inventories’ and which ‘stocks of specimens’ need to be inventoried ▪ merge both paragraphs (c) I and c ii)) that deal with marking ▪ move paragraphs concerning actions of the Parties after approval, to the section of the resolution titled, <i>Regarding trade in ranched specimens of species transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II</i> 	<p>Appendix I to Appendix II for ranching, SSN recommends the following amendments to the current text of RC 11.16:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (d)(i) “<i>evidence that the taking from the wild will have no significant detrimental impact on wild populations</i>”; there should not be any detrimental impact on a wild population as a result of a ranching operation ▪ amend paragraph (e) by requiring the Secretariat to seek “<i>appropriate scientific and technical advice</i>” to verify that <u>all</u> the required criteria for a proposed ranching operation have been met and not only those criteria specified in paragraph (d) ▪ delete paragraph (f) as it allows for the take of adult specimens for ranching operations and therefore conflicts with the proposed definition of “<i>ranching</i>”, which refers to specimens taken from the wild “<i>at an early stage</i>” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding monitoring and reporting requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SSN opposes deleting the mandatory reporting requirements because this is an important monitoring tool ▪ SSN opposes deleting the reporting requirement for sales and exports because this allows monitoring of the quantity of products produced and the percentage that enter international trade. Annual reports will not indicate exports per individual ranching operation as RC 11.16 requires ▪ all annual reports received from approved ranching operations should be made available on the CITES website • Regarding the Secretariat’s recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SSN recommends that the Parties direct the AC to develop language to clarify the ‘general criteria’ in RC 11.16, rather than the CoP ▪ SSN considers the Secretariat’s suggested incorporation of parts of RC 11.16 into RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) to be unnecessary. RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13) was carefully negotiated during a lengthy process and should not be reopened for discussion at CoP14
<p>Doc. 25 Enforcement</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This generalized document replaces the Secretariat’s Report on Alleged Infractions that was prepared for Parties until CoP11 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports that the CITES Trade Infraction and Global Enforcement Recording System (T.I.G.E.R.S.) database has failed due to 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN strongly supports a further meeting of the CITES Enforcement Experts Group and agrees there is a need

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Matters</p> <p>CITES Secretariat</p>	<p>when the Secretariat changed the format</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Since CoP13, the Standing Committee has addressed enforcement matters at SC53 and SC54 ● A suspension of CITES trade to and from Nigeria, established at SC53 for non-compliance with implementing and enforcing CITES, is still in effect; Doc 25 reports that Nigeria has not responded to communication ● At CoP13, amendments to RC 11.3 were adopted, including, <i>inter alia</i>, encouraging the formulation of enforcement action plans and providing for establishment of <i>ad hoc</i> enforcement task forces. Task forces were subsequently established for falcons, caviar and great apes ● At CoP13, Decision 13.84 was also adopted directing Parties to submit contact details of their relevant national law enforcement agencies. As of January 2007, 59 Parties had done so 	<p>inadequate input of information and that its use will be discontinued</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommends that the Secretariat convene a second meeting of the CITES Enforcement Experts Group to: 1) identify measures to improve information gathering and analysis of illicit trade data; and 2) consider means for measuring effectiveness of CITES enforcement at international level ● Directs the SC to consider endorsing any Enforcement Experts Group recommendations that could be implemented before CoP15 ● Notes the Secretariat's recommendation to SC54 that formulation of enforcement action plans should not be mandatory or monitored because of the additional work burden this would impose ● Recommends deleting the provision in RC 11.3 (Rev. CoP13) urging ICPO-Interpol to appoint a wildlife crime officer since this has been done ● Reports that only three Parties have not designated a Scientific Authority ● Draws attention to: the low priority allocated to wildlife law enforcement and lack of senior level support for enforcement officials; the lack of progress in this respect since enforcement experts met in February 2004; and the lack of resources in the Secretariat to deal with a growing enforcement-related workload 	<p>to improve information gathering and analysis of illicit trade data. The EU also recommends such a meeting (Doc. 26) but with a view, <i>inter alia</i>, to producing guidelines on enforcement action plans for CoP15. SSN recommends that the draft Decisions proposed by the Secretariat and the EU be combined and, additionally, the Enforcement Experts Group be mandated to assess Parties' capacity to implement RC 11.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● In order to assist the work of the Experts Group, an additional draft Decision should be directed to the Secretariat to gather and present information to the Group on: 1) successful examples of information / intelligence exchange and collaboration to deter and detect illicit wildlife trade; 2) studies of approaches to data collection, integration, analysis and dissemination regarding illicit wildlife trade; and 3) studies of law enforcement efforts, including inter-agency co-operation and information sharing ● SSN does not support the Secretariat's view that the formulation of enforcement action plans should not be monitored. Such plans will help initiate and/or improve processes at national and regional levels to strengthen CITES enforcement and cooperation, and may enhance political will ● The failure of the T.I.G.E.R.S. database is disappointing as is the apparent lack of political will among Parties to support wildlife law enforcement and related work of the Secretariat. ● SSN notes that the Secretariat's concerns regarding inadequate capacity to deal with its enforcement-related workload, which is a core function of the Secretariat, should be taken into account by Parties when considering the Secretariat's substantial and growing capacity commitments on secondary issues such as economic incentives and national wildlife trade policy reviews
<p>Doc. 26</p> <p>Compliance and Enforcement</p> <p>Germany on behalf</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 11.3 (Rev.CoP13) on compliance and enforcement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provides guidance, <i>inter alia</i>, on national enforcement and border controls, national and international cooperation (including with ICPO-Interpol and World Customs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Doc. 26 proposes amendments to RC.11.3 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ include two new preambular paragraphs in RC 11.3 to: 1) acknowledge the need to ensure that trade is legal and sustainable; and 2) recognize that illegal trade damages wildlife and threatens sustainable development 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Regular meetings of the Enforcement Experts Group will enhance CITES enforcement, support work of the Secretariat, improve international cooperation and help to integrate wildlife law enforcement officers in CITES

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>of the European Community Member States</p>	<p>Organization) and communication on illegal trade, inter-agency coordination, enforcement activities of the Secretariat and provides for <i>ad hoc</i> CITES enforcement task forces</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recommends, <i>inter alia</i>, that Parties consider formulating national plans to enhance CITES enforcement, inform each other and the Secretariat on cases of illegal trade, use standardized nomenclature on permits and certificates, inform the Secretariat of contact details of their relevant national law enforcement agencies, develop regional cooperation and coordination mechanisms, consider nominating officials to participate in the Interpol Wildlife Crime Working Group, develop comprehensive strategies for border controls, audits and investigations and consider forming national wildlife law enforcement units ▪ prioritizes Secretariat activities on enforcement ▪ outlines a procedure for implementing Article XIII on international measures to deal with non-compliance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recommend the formulation of regional enforcement action plans ▪ recommend that the Enforcement Experts Group meets at regular intervals ▪ encourage Parties to legislate for and implement deterrent sanctions and to establish inter-agency committees of Management Authorities and enforcement agencies ▪ encourage senior decision-makers to allocate higher priority to CITES enforcement and prosecution ▪ recommend the conduct of capacity-building activities and reinforcement of communication between Parties through closer liaison <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doc. 26 further proposes two draft Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ directing SC to convene a 2nd CITES Enforcement Experts workshop to, <i>inter alia</i>, produce guidelines on national and regional enforcement action plans for CoP15 ▪ directing the Secretariat to assist workshop preparations and prepare a discussion paper and/or draft resolution for consideration by the SC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines on national and regional enforcement action plans will help initiate and/or improve processes at national and regional levels to strengthen CITES enforcement and cooperation, and may enhance political will • SSN suggests the following recommendations to enhance the EU amendments to RC 11.3: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ regional action plans: establish an agenda item on the subject at regional meetings, and organize special sessions at those meetings involving enforcement officers to consider formulation and implementation of such plans as well as information exchange and regional cooperation in investigations ▪ deterrent sanctions: in new paragraph b) under <i>Regarding compliance, control and cooperation</i>, include a recommendation that Parties undertake a review of current sanctions and their implementation to be used as a basis for future efforts to strengthen penalties to improve the deterrence effect of enforcement actions ▪ inter-agency committees: include senior officials involved in decision-making and technical level officials with experience in wildlife trade crime; task the committees with establishing national central databases on wildlife trade crime and enforcement effort ▪ 2nd Enforcement Experts Workshop: mandate that this workshop assess Parties' capacity to implement RC 11.3 • SSN suggests additional amendments on CITES permits and detention of illicit shipments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Permits: under <i>Regarding compliance, control and cooperation</i>, insert: "AGREES that the issuance of permits without appropriate findings constitutes a lack of compliance with the Convention and seriously undermines species conservation" ▪ Detention of illicit shipments: amend paragraph d) to allow detention of shipments traded in contravention of the laws of any country involved or without relevant permit findings being made or without adequate support for the finding, regardless of whether the permit specifies that the finding has been made • SSN suggests an additional draft Decision directed to the Secretariat to issue a notification requesting Parties to submit information on national and regional

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			enforcement action plans, and to compile the information received for consideration by the 2 nd Enforcement Experts workshop
<p>Doc. 27</p> <p>Disposal of Illegally Traded and Confiscated Specimens of Appendix-II and -III Species</p> <p>Indonesia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC. 9.10 (Rev. CoP13) recommends that confiscated dead specimens of Appendix II and III species be disposed of in the “<i>best manner possible to benefit enforcement and administration of the Convention</i>” RC 9.10 (Rev. CoP13) confirms, however, “<i>that Parties have the right to allow, or should they choose to do so, not to allow the sale of confiscated dead specimens, including parts and derivatives, of Appendix-II and -III species</i>” RC 9.10 (Rev. CoP13) recommends that Parties transfer confiscated dead specimens of Appendix I species only for <i>bona fide</i> scientific/educational or enforcement/identification purposes and that Parties store or destroy excess specimens whose transfer is not for these purposes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on Indonesia’s view that RC 9.10 (Rev. CoP13) wrongly regards confiscated specimens as the property of the confiscating country, this draft Decision directs the SC to review and propose amendments to RC. 9.10 (Rev. CoP13) that include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Management Authority of the importing/confiscating country shall inform the country of origin as soon as possible of illegally shipped specimens and determine whether the country of origin requires repatriation of the confiscated specimens if the country of origin does not require repatriation or does not respond to the confiscating country, then the confiscating country shall immediately auction confiscated specimens of Appendix II or III species after auction, the importing country shall return profits from the sale to the country of origin 	<p>GENERALLY OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes the sale of confiscated specimens in general, and specifically opposes amending RC. 9.10 (Rev. CoP13) to re-direct profits from the sale of confiscated specimens back to the country of origin SSN recognizes that confiscated specimens represent a loss of biodiversity for the country of origin. However, the sale of confiscated specimens could promote laundering and other illegal wildlife trade and hasten biodiversity loss Profits received from the importing country’s sale of confiscated specimens do not provide an incentive for exporting countries to enforce wildlife laws Indonesia’s proposal is based on the assumption that confiscated specimens are the property of the state of export. This is inconsistent with some Parties’ approaches to ownership of wildlife, and is therefore not uniformly applicable to all CITES Parties. Consequently, the proposed amendments could create administrative burdens and complicate implementation SSN supports the call for the Management Authority of the confiscating country to inform the country of origin about the confiscation because that may assist law enforcement authorities in identifying wildlife traffickers. RC 11.3 (Rev. CoP13) on Compliance and Enforcement could be amended in future to encourage such communication
<p>Doc. 28</p> <p>Internet Trade in Specimens of CITES-listed Species</p> <p>Germany on behalf of the European Community Member States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Internet has created new and rapidly expanding markets promoting the illegal trade in wild species and their parts and derivatives. For example, in 2002 the Humane Society of the United States documented 900 ivory items offered for sale on eBay every day; in 2005, IFAW found 5,527 elephant products on the Internet in one week and Defenders of Wildlife found over 8,500 ivory products for sale on eBay on one day in 2005 Current monitoring and enforcement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doc. 28 contains a draft Decision that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proposes a Workshop on Internet wildlife trade be convened to consider implementation and enforcement issues associated with the growing illegal trade of wildlife on the Internet directs the SC subsequent to the workshop, to submit a discussion paper and/or draft resolution for consideration at CoP15 directs the Secretariat to request CITES Parties to provide information on: the scale and nature of trade in CITES – listed species on Internet sites registered in their countries, 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Several studies (HSUS 2002; TRAFFIC 2004; IFAW 2004, 2005; Commission for Environmental Cooperation/North American Wildlife Enforcement Group 2005) have exposed the use of the Internet as a platform for legal and illegal wildlife trade in a number of industrialized CITES Parties, and as a means to open new markets All studies have shown that the volume of this trade, which involves live specimens of CITES-listed species as well as their parts and derivatives, is increasing significantly

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>activities have been insufficient to deal with the apparent nature and scale of the trade</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITES is currently not attending to the impact the Internet is having on CITES-listed species 	<p>the effectiveness of existing measures taken to deal with the illegal Internet trade and changes in trade routes and methods of shipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪requires the Secretariat, subject to funding, to prepare an overview of the scale and nature of trade in CITES-listed species on the Internet and its impact. The Secretariat is also directed to prepare a discussion paper and/or draft resolution for consideration by the SC and CoP15. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature of the Internet allows traders to operate anonymously and to circumvent national and international law more easily; urgent action needs to be taken to deal with this issue • A workshop on Internet Wildlife Trade would bring together a wide range of experts from Governments, enforcement agencies, Internet service providers and NGOs to assess the extent of the problem and develop mechanisms for improving enforcement • However, in recognition of the urgent need to take immediate action to deal with the problem, SSN strongly encourages Parties to establish an Enforcement Task Force at CoP14 to deal with illegal trade on the Internet, in addition to the adoption of the draft Decision
<p>Doc. 29</p> <p>National Reports Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article VIII sets out Parties' reporting requirements, including submission of annual reports on trade and biennial reports on implementation • The Secretariat has issued guidelines to Parties for implementation of these reporting requirements • Several Resolutions require Parties to submit species-specific reports. Over 20 such reporting requirements exist • Currently, only two Parties are subject to trade suspensions for failure to submit annual reports. Seventy Parties (41%) had not submitted their 2006 annual reports by 31 January 2007, 9 of which have failed to submit them for three consecutive years. This will be reported to SC55 • The level of biennial reporting is higher than in previous years, but as of 31 January 2007 only 85 (50%) of Parties had submitted reports • Three CoP13 Decisions direct the Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪find ways to reduce the reporting burden on Parties through, <i>inter alia</i>, software and internet-based tools (Dec. 13.90) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat proposes two draft Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪The first directs the Standing Committee, along with the Secretariat, UNEP-WCMC, and IUCN, to review all special reporting requirements to assess whether they can be incorporated into either the annual or biennial reports ▪The second draft Decision directs the Secretariat to: a) continue its collaboration with the Secretariats of other biodiversity conventions to promote harmonization; b) identify additional ways to reduce Parties' reporting obligations; and c) to report on its effort at COP15 	<p>OPPOSE IN PART / SUPPORT IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN generally supports a review of all special reporting requirements; however, the purpose should not be to eliminate them. Instead, the SC should review special reporting requirements with a view, primarily, to identifying ways to encourage Parties to meet these requirements • The value of species-specific reporting requirements should be considered within discussions on those species • In certain situations, an expert group's review might be useful, but it should not replace Party obligations to report. Convening expert groups is expensive and thus use would be limited; moreover, obligations to report engage Parties in the information review process, which is beneficial to conservation and management • Consolidating reporting requirements may be beneficial in some cases, but only if it does not diminish the contribution of special reporting to compliance and enforcement • To the extent, however, that special reporting obligations are consolidated with biennial reporting obligations, Parties should adopt a compliance regime for biennial reporting obligations, much like that set out in RC 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) for annual reports • In the interest of transparency, annual reports should

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ incorporate guidance on plants, raw ivory, corals and timber in its <i>Guidelines for CITES annual reports</i> (Dec. 13.91) ▪ continue efforts to ensure harmonization of reporting requirements amongst biodiversity conventions (Dec. 13.92) • The Secretariat has been unable to contract UNEP-WCMC to develop software to facilitate reporting, but it has made recommendations regarding reduction of special reporting, including, <i>inter alia</i>, eliminating reporting on Asian big cats (COP14 Doc. 52) and suggesting revisions to reporting requirements for tortoises and freshwater turtles (COP14 Doc. 57) • Guidance for reporting on trade in certain specimens has been included in <i>Annual Reports Guidelines</i> • The Secretariat is participating in a project on “Knowledge Management,” which aims at developing a strategic approach to information management for four biodiversity-related conventions by means of a harmonized information base (SC54 Inf. 2). The Secretariat also participated in a workshop on harmonization of reporting (SC54. Inf. 1) 		<p>be available online, as are biennial reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harmonized reporting carries the danger that specialized information valuable to promote compliance may be lost. If a “core” report is developed for biodiversity-related conventions it should not take the place of the reporting obligations under Article VIII • The funding necessary to support the Secretariat’s endeavors in this regard would be better spent on direct engagement with Parties to strengthen capacity to meet their obligations • SSN opposes paragraph (b) of the Secretariat’s second draft Decision. The Secretariat’s energy should not be focused on “<i>reduc[ing] the reporting burden on Parties.</i>” Instead, the Secretariat’s efforts should be geared toward ensuring that Parties are meeting their obligations and that the information provided by Parties is reviewed and effectively utilized to further compliance and enforcement of the treaty
<p>Doc. 30</p> <p>Reporting on Trade In Artificially Propagated Plants</p> <p>Switzerland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article VIII, paragraph 7 (a), of the Convention requires Parties to submit annual reports on trade in specimens of species included in Appendices I, II and III • A select number of artificially propagated plants are exempt from CITES controls and therefore, trade in these specimens is not reported • RC 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) urges Parties to submit their annual reports in accordance with Guidelines; the Guidelines for the preparation and submission of CITES annual reports state that trade in manufactured products derived from species in Appendices II and III may be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends the adoption of Decisions, directing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the Secretariat to consult with UNEP-WCMC to investigate the quality of data relating to trade in artificially propagated plants, and identify cases where the compilation of trade data pertaining to artificially propagated plants has contributed to a significant extent to the detection of illegal trade or to any other analysis related to the conservation of wild flora. The Secretariat shall list options for limiting or simplifying reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants and report its findings to the PC ▪the PC to assess the usefulness of reporting on trade in artificially propagated plants, 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN agrees it would be helpful to investigate the quality and quantity of data relating to trade in artificially propagated plants, particularly to investigate the use of exemptions agreed to at CoP13 and their effects. Until the results of the current exemptions are adequately studied, it is premature to seek additional broad exemptions for artificially propagated plants (from reporting or trade requirements) • A broad exemption from reporting for artificially propagated plants would create a significant loophole for laundering wild specimens, particularly for those species difficult to propagate or those for which artificially propagated specimens are difficult to distinguish from specimens taken from the wild; seeking such an exemption should not be the primary purpose

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>summarized, listing the quantities and type of specimens in trade and the States with which trade occurred</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC 11.11 (Rev. CoP13) recommends Parties use annual reports to detect illegal trade 	<p>analyze ways in which such reporting could be limited or simplified, and report the results to CoP15 as draft amendments to the Resolutions and Guidelines concerned</p>	<p>of the draft Decision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examination of reporting should seek ways of improving the value of reports in the detection of illegal trade. Examination of the trade data should seek to identify cases where current or additional exemptions might create the potential for laundering wild specimens as artificially propagated or where exemptions pose a threat to the conservation of the species in the wild
<p>Doc. 31</p> <p>Monitoring of the Implementation of the Annotations to <i>Euphorbia</i> spp. and Orchidaceae spp. Included in Appendix II</p> <p>Switzerland</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current Decisions 13.98 and 13.99 instruct the Parties and the PC to monitor the implementation of the current exemption of certain artificially propagated orchid hybrids from CITES controls and report to CoP14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposes the adoption of decisions directing the Parties and the PC to monitor the proposed amended annotations to <i>Euphorbia</i> spp. and Orchidaceae included in Appendix II (Prop. 29 and Prop. 34, respectively), if these proposals are adopted at CoP14 The proposed decisions direct the Parties to monitor trade in these species (with an emphasis on possible illegal trade in wild-collected <i>Euphorbia</i> spp.) and report to the PC. The PC is directed to report to CoP15 on the implementation of the annotations 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN opposes the adoption of Prop. 29 and Prop. 34. However, if these proposals are adopted, then monitoring and reporting the effects are key to ensuring that their implementation does not result in laundering or illegal trade For additional information, please see our comments on Prop. 29 and Prop. 34 SSN recommends that this proposal only be considered after a decision has been taken on Prop. 29 and Prop. 34; if these are not adopted, this proposal becomes unnecessary
<p>Doc. 32</p> <p>Incentives for Implementation of the Convention Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.76 states, “<i>The Secretariat shall invite all Parties and relevant organizations to provide information, experiences and, where possible, outcomes on their use of economic incentives and report at SC53 for consideration on the manner in which this might be taken up for further action on capacity building and possible regional cooperation.</i>” Decision 13.77 states, “<i>Subject to the availability of funding, the Secretariat shall continue its cooperation on incentive measures with the CBD Secretariat and other biodiversity-related conventions (e.g. Ramsar and CMS), as well as with the private sector and relevant governmental, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations. This cooperation shall focus, inter alia, on the exchange of experiences in the design and use of economic incentives for sustainable management of wild fauna and flora, compilation of case-</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends that Decisions be adopted directing Parties to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> develop incentive measures for the effective implementation of the Convention and to include relevant details in their biennial reports consider the adoption of standard operating procedures to complete the formalities required for trade in CITES-listed species in an efficient manner. Management Authorities are encouraged to liaise with national ministries and agencies responsible for regulation and promotion of exports and imports in their countries to benefit from the expertise and support they offer in this area Recommends that Decisions be adopted directing the SC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider at SC57, practical ways to enhance stakeholder engagement in the implementation of the Convention, with a particular emphasis on local communities and the private sector 	<p>OPPOSE IN PART / SUPPORT IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports incentives for effective implementation of CITES, providing that these are designed to enhance the conservation function of the Convention and not to simply promote wildlife trade or the commercialization of wildlife under an assumption that trade in wild specimens contributes to conservation The Decision directed to the Parties should be amended as follows: “<i>...to liaise with national ministries and agencies responsible for regulation and promotion of exports and imports in their countries to benefit from the expertise and support they offer in this area - promote the implementation and enforcement of CITES.</i>” CITES has no mandate to regulate economic incentives, benefit sharing, quota auctioning, compensatory mechanisms, or property rights. References to these activities should be deleted from the draft Decisions. SSN opposes the formation of a working group under the SC to explore such issues. The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is the appropriate forum to deal with the relationship between

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p><i>studies, best practices and lessons learnt, as well as the development of targeted recommendations, operational guidelines and associated instruments for the sustainable use of wild flora and fauna.</i>"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In Notification to the Parties No. 2005/022 (20 April 2005), Parties and organizations were invited to provide information, experiences and, where possible, outcomes on their use of economic incentives. No responses were received • At SC54, the Secretariat described the experience of several Parties regarding the use of economic incentives obtained primarily through their biennial reports and the U.N. Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) National BioTrade Programmes. The Secretariat advised the SC that an information document on incentive measures used within the BioTrade country programs would be provided at CoP14 and a side event on the issue would be held 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ create a working group to identify the most promising options for CITES authorities to explore in designing and using specific incentive measures, with particular emphasis on compensatory mechanisms, certification schemes, communal property rights, auctioning of quotas and cost recovery and environmental charges. The terms of reference should include an evaluation of the role of incentive measures in the different production systems and pilot valuations for a few target species ▪ present a report at CoP15 on implementation of these Decisions • Recommends that Decisions be adopted directing the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ using, inter alia, information provided by Parties in their biennial reports, to conduct a survey of the fees for CITES permits and CITES-related administrative services and provide basic guidance to Parties on how cost recovery programs can be designed and used for internalizing the cost of implementing the Convention ▪ to continue its cooperation with the BioTrade Initiative of UNCTAD under a signed MoU to ensure the conservation of the species, enhance the livelihoods of poor people and promote private sector compliance with CITES requirements and national legislation ▪ contingent on the availability of external funding, to continue its cooperation on incentive measures with interested Parties, as well as with biodiversity-related conventions, relevant governmental, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations and the private sector. This cooperation shall focus, inter alia, on the development of targeted recommendations, operational guidelines and associated incentive measures for the conservation and sustainable use of wild flora and fauna. ▪ to report at CoP15 on implementation of 	<p>biological diversity and livelihoods of the poor and is developing voluntary guidance on incentive measures; it is duplicative and unnecessary for CITES to produce operational guidelines as well. At SC54, it was noted that other forums, such as the CBD, deal with economic incentives and <i>"duplication of efforts should be avoided"</i> (SC54 Summary Record)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN notes that the concept of <i>"stakeholder"</i> can differ among countries, as national laws pertaining to the ownership of wildlife resources differ. SSN believes that CITES is best served by transparency and active public participation in the implementation of the Convention at both the national and international level. Therefore, we recommend that the term <i>"stakeholder"</i> be replaced with <i>"public"</i> in the 1st draft Decision directed to the SC and that the Decision be re-drafted to engage the public as a whole and remove the focus on the private sector, local communities and streamlining CITES procedures • SSN urges the Parties to discourage expanding work with the BioTrade initiative through an MOU and to restrict any future collaborative work to ensuring that the project incorporates provisions aimed to secure effective implementation <i>and</i> enforcement of the Convention, e.g. through ensuring non-detriment findings are conducted and enforcement measures are introduced • SSN notes that economic incentives, no matter how well intentioned, might be misused, causing harm to the wildlife resources they are meant to conserve. For example, SSN supports the <i>"user pays"</i> principle but if finances available to national CITES authorities are directly linked to user fees, this might act as an incentive to issue permits regardless of the impact on wild populations. SSN recommends that user fees be appropriately channeled (e.g., by an independent body) to contribute to implementation and conservation but that national CITES policies and implementation actions not be directly dependent on or linked to income from user fees • SSN supports the idea of a survey of CITES permits and administration fees but funding for this project should be sought from external sources. The survey should be aimed at implementing the users' pays

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>these Decisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Encourages the Parties to create a working group that would identify the most promising options for CITES Authorities to use CITES as a “brand name” 	<p>principle at an international level, not guidance on national cost recovery programs and internalizing implementation costs. SSN also encourages the Parties to expand the survey to include penalties for trade in non-CITES and CITES-listed species and to compare the penalties allowed by law versus the penalties imposed by a judge or court</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports the use of voluntary certification schemes but urges the Parties to oppose the Secretariat’s efforts to make the CITES permitting system a recognized regulatory and branding-type certification scheme. Firstly, CITES’ mission is not to promote trade in wildlife and their parts and products. Secondly, CITES has neither the means nor ability to verify that each CITES permit issued satisfies the requirements of the Convention, most notably that those requirements are relevant to non-detriment findings SSN is concerned by a number of expressions of opinion by the Secretariat which clearly do not reflect the view of the Parties or that concern issues clearly outside of CITES’ remit: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Penalties, ... may have some deterrent effect [emphasis added]...” It is premature to conclude that the disincentive approach to promoting compliance is insufficient. The penalties imposed by many Parties for violations of the Convention are inadequate to serve as a deterrent. Even when penalties are sufficient, courts are often reluctant to apply the maximum fine or sentence. As a result, penalties have become a cost of doing business. Instead of promoting complex and sophisticated economic incentive schemes, the Secretariat should ensure that Parties have the institutional base to secure compliance: adequate legislation and penalties, trained enforcement personnel, sufficient funding to facilitate enforcement efforts, and a judiciary that applies the law consistently “Giving them [quotas] away on a first-come first-served basis and not allowing re-sale is inefficient and tends to give windfall gains to politically well-connected groups”. It is not CITES’ business to determine who gets to use a quota unless the quota is being misused; this is an internal management issue Compensatory mechanisms may or may not relieve

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			human-wildlife conflict, but it is inappropriate for the Secretariat to be critical of compensatory mechanisms yet supportive of trophy hunting as an incentive for implementation
<p>Doc. 33</p> <p>Introduction from the Sea</p> <p>Secretariat at the Request of the Standing Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A number of marine species are currently included in Appendices I and II • When specimens of these species are taken from the “<i>marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State</i>,” and then “<i>transported into a State</i>,” the “<i>State of introduction</i>” must issue a certificate of “<i>introduction from the sea</i>” • Because Parties implement and define provisions for “<i>introduction from the sea</i>” differently, CoP13 directed the SC to convene a workshop to consider relevant implementation and technical issues • The workshop members, who represented Parties, FAO, and NGOs, agreed on a definition of “<i>marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State</i>” • After taking into account a range of views at SC54, the workshop members revised this definition. Both of these definitions are included in the draft Resolution • The workshop members, while describing a range of issues concerning the interpretation of “<i>transportation into a State</i>” and “<i>State of introduction</i>,” could not reach consensus on a definitions for these terms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The draft Resolution provides two alternatives for defining the “<i>marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State</i>”: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option 1 includes references to specific areas, such as the Exclusive Economic Zone, that are found in the U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) that are within a State’s jurisdiction ▪ Option 2 omits references to specific UNCLOS terms, but instead generally references “<i>areas subject to sovereignty and sovereign rights of a State</i>” consistent with international law and UNCLOS • The draft Decision directed to the SC calls for the establishment of a working group to communicate primarily by email to consider a definition of “<i>transportation into a State</i>” and clarification of the term “<i>State of introduction</i>” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The working group would be composed of Parties, FAO, regional fishery bodies, and NGOs, among others ▪ The working group would submit a discussion paper and draft Resolution for consideration by the SC and for consideration at CoP15 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports either definition of the “<i>marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State</i>.” SSN prefers the second definition because it is clearer and more consistent with international law • SSN also supports the creation of a working group to consider definitions of “<i>transportation into a State</i>” and “<i>State of introduction</i>.” Based on earlier discussions, it is clear that a range of legal and technical issues would benefit from further discussion • SSN agrees with the Secretariat that a more precise time-frame for completing the work of the working group would be useful. For example, the SC should establish the working group “<i>at its 57th meeting</i>” and the working group should meet “<i>prior to the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee</i>”
<p>Doc. 34</p> <p>Trade in Appendix I Species</p> <p>CITES Secretariat on behalf of the Standing Committee</p> <p>-----</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 13.20 directs the SC to conduct a review of trade in Appendix-I plant and animal species through UNEP-WCMC, taking into account all exports, re-exports, and imports of Appendix-I specimens, including the species name, the source and purpose codes, and existing exemptions for the last five years. Based on the report, the SC is to present recommendations for consideration at CoP14 • The report of the review was presented to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While Decision 13.20 instructs the SC to make recommendations for consideration at CoP14, the SC did not do so • The Secretariat, in response to the agreements reached at SC54, reports that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) It has contacted the States concerned and, at the time of writing, had no reason to initiate proceedings under Article XIII B) It has contacted all concerned Parties and will inform the SC if it appears there are persistent problems 	<p>Doc. 34: NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species listed in CITES Appendix I are the most deserving of protection from detrimental trade and addressing instances of inappropriate trade in these specimens should be a high priority for the Parties and the CITES Committees • SSN supports the recommendations made by the SC and the resulting actions taken by the Secretariat but believes that further action, as recommended below and by Israel, must be taken to address the instances of trade in Appendix I species that appear to be of a

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Inf. 7</p> <p>Commercial Trade in Appendix-I Species</p> <p>Israel</p>	<p>SC54 which noted that, among other issues, there were a number of indications of potentially illegal trade and that there is ongoing commercial trade in specimens of Appendix-I species that, contrary to RC 12.10 (Rev. CoP13), are not captive-bred at registered breeding operations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC54 agreed that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A) The Secretariat should examine the evidence of cases of anomalous records or where it appears that there might have been a contravention of the Convention and discuss these with the Parties concerned B) The Secretariat shall remind Parties that appear to be authorizing commercial exports of captive-bred animal specimens that do not originate from operations included in the Secretariat's Register that such trade is contrary to RC 12.10 (Rev. CoP13) C) The Clearing House should be asked to advise the SC as to which body should consider how to deal with the problem of specimens being shipped by mail (seeds of cacti and orchids for example) D) With regard to the use of source codes on permits and in annual reports, the AC and PC should take the report into consideration when preparing their document for CoP14 regarding production systems E) The Secretariat should investigate the cases of anomalous records and seek to resolve such reports with the Parties involved 	<p>C) This issue is under consideration by the Clearing House; an oral update will be provided at CoP14</p> <p>D) The Chairman of the working group of the AC and PC on the review of production systems took the report of UNEP-WCMC into account when preparing their document for CoP14</p> <p>E) The Secretariat has been in contact with UNEP-WCMC to ensure that, when the data from the annual reports of the Parties are being entered into the CITES trade database, any anomalies are drawn to the attention of the Party concerned. The Secretariat will bring any persistent problem to the attention of the SC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat invites CoP14 to take note of the actions taken by SC54 and the follow-up of the CITES Secretariat on these recommendations ● Israel's related document, Inf. 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ notes that the UNEP-WCMC report demonstrates that zoos and circuses are responsible for much of the commercial trade in Appendix-I species ■ notes that there are shipments containing large numbers of wild-caught Appendix I specimens being traded under purpose codes S (scientific) and P (personal) suggesting that these transactions are commercial in nature, and that purpose codes are often not correctly assigned to transactions ■ notes that different purpose codes are often used for the same transaction, making enforcement and monitoring more difficult ■ recommends the adoption of three decisions, directing: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the Secretariat to report at each SC meeting on its investigation of all anomalous records, trade that might have been in contravention of the Convention, trade contrary to RC 12.10 (Rev. CoP13) and the results of all discussions with Parties about 	<p>commercial nature</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN urges the CoP to direct the Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ to coordinate with UNEP-WCMC so that any evidence of illegal trade in Appendix I species identified by UNEP-WCMC is brought to the attention of the Secretariat immediately ■ upon receipt of evidence of illegal trade in Appendix I species from UNEP-WCMC, any member Party, any observer organization, or an NGO, to immediately contact the exporting and importing countries to request additional information about the trade in question ■ to ensure appropriate non-compliance mechanisms be applied if a country has failed to respond to the Secretariat's inquiry ■ to issue a Notification to the Parties reminding them of their obligations under the Convention and seeking their cooperation in reporting illegal trade of Appendix I species <p>Inf. 7: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN supports the adoption of the draft decisions proposed by Israel in Inf. Doc. 7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ the significant quantity of trade in Appendix I species that appears to be commercial in nature should be further addressed by a SC working group ■ the Secretariat should be directed to report at each SC meeting on the success of its efforts to address the trade of Appendix I species that appears to be in contravention of the Convention and efforts to address instances of commercial trade in Appendix I species not from registered breeding programs ● SSN supports efforts to develop definitions for the different purpose codes in RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13). The lack of definitions for CITES purpose codes leads to their widespread misuse for transactions involving specimens of species listed in both Appendices I and II ● SSN encourages the Parties to adopt Israel's recommended amendment to RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) to require that the identical purpose code is used during each transaction on both the import and corresponding export, or re-export permit issued for all transactions involving Appendix-I listed specimens. The UNEP-

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>such cases; 2) SC56 to establish a working group to continue the investigation and analysis of data and information on commercial trade in specimens of Appendix-I species; and 3) the AC and PC to form a joint working group in order to prepare definitions of the purpose codes listed in RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13), and possible changes to the list. The AC and PC will provide their recommendations to the Parties for consideration at CoP15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends that the Parties adopt an amendment to RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) Part I, under, RECOMMENDS, subparagraph f) to require that Parties “ensure that the identical purpose code is used during each transaction on both the import and corresponding export, or re-export permit issued for all transactions involving Appendix-I listed specimens.” 	<p>WCMC report noted that cross matching of trade records on the basis of export permit numbers indicates that some shipments reported by the importing countries as being for non-commercial purposes were reported by the exporter as being commercial in nature</p>
<p>Doc. 35</p> <p>International Expert Workshop on Non-detriment Findings</p> <p>Mexico with the support of Canada</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Convention requires a determination that an export or introduction from the sea of a specimen of an Appendix I or II species “will not be detrimental to the survival of that species” • RC10.3, Designation and role of the Scientific Authorities, recommends that Scientific Authorities make these non-detriment findings (NDFs) based on a “scientific review of available information on the population status, distribution, population trend, harvest, and other biological and ecological factors, as appropriate, and trade information relating to the species concerned” • IUCN has developed a checklist to assist Scientific Authorities in making non-detriment findings • Despite this checklist and the obvious importance of the non-detriment finding for achieving the aims of the Convention, IUCN has reported that “many species continue to be traded in the absence of information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends a five-day workshop for up to 100 scientific experts to examine the processes to make non-detriment findings • Recommends that the participants in the workshop “explore the feasibility of developing specific categories and criteria (checklists) tailored to particular species groups” • Encourages Parties to provide, and the Secretariat to obtain, funds for this workshop • Directs the AC and PC to review the results of the workshop and prepare, for consideration at COP15, a discussion paper and, if appropriate, a draft Resolution on the making of non-detriment findings 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many Parties lack the technical expertise or financial resources to make appropriate NDFs • SSN supports the idea of a workshop on developing criteria for the making of non-detriment findings • Such a workshop should be open to participation by non-governmental organizations • Case studies can be a valuable tool for analyzing the different conditions under which Scientific Authorities make NDFs • Parties would benefit from general guidance on the specific types of information necessary for an adequate NDF and where to find it • SSN encourages Mexico to include in the Terms of Reference for the workshop: NDF-based capacity building, development of mechanisms for ensuring and verifying implementation of NDFs, and establishment of basic guidelines on (1) the type of information needed to make non-detriment findings (e.g. management, biological, ecological, level of mortality from capture to end consumer), (2) where to obtain such information, and (3) transparency in making non-detriment findings,

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p><i>about the impact of such exploitation on the wild population</i>" (Rosser and Haywood 2002)</p>		<p>as well as establishing a procedure for developing guidelines for taxa with varying life history strategies</p>
<p>Doc. 36</p> <p>Management of Annual Export Quotas</p> <p>Cameroon as Chairman of the Export Quota Working Group (EQWG) of the Standing Committee, with the assistance of the Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 12.72 (Rev. CoP13) directs the SC to consider the issue of improving the management of annual export quotas and to report to CoP14 • Decision 13.66 directs the SC to instruct its Export Quota Working Group to develop guidelines for Parties to establish, implement, monitor and report national export quotas for CITES-listed taxa • RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) on Permits and certificates recommends that, for species subject to export quotas, any export permit issued indicate the total number or quantity of specimens already exported in the current year and the total level of the quota 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a draft resolution on Management of nationally established export quotas • Contains a proposed amendment to RC 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) on National reports, recommending that, when compiling their annual reports, Parties should pay particular attention to the reporting of trade in specimens of species subject to annual export quotas • Contains proposed amendments to RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) on Permits and certificates such that Parties "<i>may</i>" (rather than shall) indicate the total number or quantity of specimens already exported in the current year and the total level of the quota 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nationally established export quotas are important tools used by the Parties to monitor and regulate trade in CITES-listed species • Regarding the draft resolution on Management of nationally-established export quotas, SSN urges the CoP to adopt the following changes to paragraphs in the Annex (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 1 b) "<i>...an annual export quota is a limit on the number or quantity of specimens of a particular species that may be exported from the country concerned within a 12-month period, <u>beginning 1 January...</u></i>" SSN recommends standardizing the period to 1 January through 31 December each year ▪ 1 c) "<i>...The setting of an export quota advised by a Scientific Authority effectively meets the requirement of CITES to make a non-detriment finding for species included in Appendix I or II and, for species in Appendix II, to ensure that the species is maintained throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystems in which it occurs.</i>" SSN recommends that export quotas be in addition to, not a replacement of, non-detriment findings (see comments on paragraph 2 c) below) ▪ 1 d) a well-implemented export quota system "<i>eliminates the need for a non-detriment finding for each individual shipment of CITES specimens, provides a basis for monitoring the trade and may facilitate the issuance of export permits <u>provided that a scientifically-based non-detriment finding has been made for specimens subject to the quota...</u></i>" ▪ 2 a) "<i>Where export quotas have not already been agreed at the international level (e.g. by the Conference of the Parties or as a result of the <u>Significant Trade Review</u>), ...</i>" SSN notes that export quotas are often established under the Significant Trade Review ▪ 2 c) "<i>When export quotas are established, they should <u>must</u> be set as a result of a non-detriment finding by a Scientific Authority, ... and should <u>must</u> ensure that the</i>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p><i>species is maintained throughout its range at a level consistent with its role in the ecosystems in which it occurs, ... Export quotas for wild-taken specimens should be set at a level that takes account of the number or quantity of specimens that are taken from the wild legally or <u>and</u> illegally. A non-detriment finding should <u>must</u> be made whenever an export quota is established for the first time or revised <u>and each year the quota is in effect.</u>" SSN recommends that quotas be based on scientifically-valid, up-to-date non-detriment findings that are revised at least every year</i></p> <p>▪2 e) "<i>... once the Secretariat has received and published details of an annual export quota from a Party, it should <u>not</u> publish the same quota for the following years until it receives a <u>communication revised quota</u> from that Party <u>that the quota will be maintained...</u>" SSN recommends that Parties must communicate their annual export quotas each year to the Secretariat based on up-to-date, scientifically-valid non-detriment findings</i></p> <p>▪3 a) "<i>In accordance with Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP14), Parties should inform the CITES Secretariat of their nationally established export quotas and of revisions of such quotas. Such information can be provided at any time but, as far as possible, should be communicated no later than 1 December of the proceeding year or at least 30 days before the start of the period to which the export quota relates." SSN recommends standardizing the period to 1 January through 31 December each year</i></p> <p>▪3 d) "<i>...In such cases the Secretariat and the Parties concerned should try to resolve the issue as quickly as possible. Once If it is resolved, the Secretariat should promptly publish the quota on its website. <u>If the issue is not resolved, the Secretariat will not publish the quota and will refer the issue to the Animals or Plants Committee.</u>" SSN recommends that the Secretariat should not publish a quota when it has inadequate information about the status and management of the species concerned</i></p> <p>▪3 e) "<i>Unless otherwise indicated by the Conference of the Parties, once the Secretariat has received and published details of an annual export quota from a Party, it should <u>not</u> publish the same quota for the</i></p>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p><i>following years until it receives a revised quota-communication from that Party that the quota will be maintained. If any Party is concerned that a published quota may be too high, it should consult the appropriate Management Authority of the Party that established the quota regarding its concerns. If this procedure is not feasible or successful, the Party may make use of the provisions of Article XIII to call upon the assistance of the Secretariat and the options provided by Article XIV to apply stricter domestic measures, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 11.18 on Trade in Appendix-II and -III species.”</i> SSN recommends that Parties must communicate their annual export quotas each year to the Secretariat based on up-to-date, scientifically-valid non-detriment findings. SSN recommends that quotas should not be repeated for successive years unless based on an up-to-date, scientifically-valid non-detriment finding. The additional text includes all recommendations in RC 11.18</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the proposed amendment to RC 11.17 (Rev. CoP13) • Regarding the proposed amendment of RC 12.3, SSN urges the Parties to maintain the existing wording in Section VIII, paragraphs a) and b) which require that the number of specimens exported in the current year and the annual export quota should be specified on each permit; this system helps to ensure that export quotas are complied with and not exceeded, works well and is implemented by the majority of Parties
<p>Doc. 37.1</p> <p>Leopard Export Quota for Mozambique</p> <p>Mozambique</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leopard, <i>Panthera pardus</i>, is on Appendix I • CITES Article III states that, for species on Appendix I, the Management Authority of the State of import shall issue an import permit only after the Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species • RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13) states that whenever the CoP has set an export quota for a species listed on Appendix I, this satisfies the requirements of Article III regarding the finding that the export and the import will not be detrimental to the survival of the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes to double Mozambique’s annual leopard skin export quota from 60 to 120 • Document states that the following number of skins were exported each successive year from Mozambique between 2000-2005: 45, 24, 21, 27, 46, 57 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mozambique’s proposal does not provide accurate data for the number of skins exported in 2005: according to the CITES Trade Database Mozambique exceeded its leopard skin and trophy export quota in 2005 by exporting 80 trophies • Document states, “<i>little research has been conducted into the status, distribution or ecology of the leopard in Mozambique</i>”; and that there are “no detailed field studies” • Document suggests a substantial decrease in Mozambique’s leopard population between 1998 and 2004. Using a model (Martin and de Meulenaer 1988), based on a correlation between leopard density and

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>species, provided that the quota is not exceeded; Parties must provide the CoP with the scientific basis for the proposed quota</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 10.14 (Rev. CoP13): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪establishes annual export quotas for leopard skin hunting trophies and for personal use for eleven range States ▪recommends that importing Parties approve permits if the skins are from States with quotas ▪creates a skin tagging system ▪provides that increased or new quotas must be approved by the CoP in accordance with RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13) ● Up to 2560 leopard skins may be exported under quotas annually; annual export quota for Mozambique currently is 60 		<p>rainfall, Mozambique's leopard population was estimated to be 37,542 (range 20,648 – 68,326) in 1988; using the same model, the document provides a conservative estimate of 20,000 leopards in Mozambique today. Insufficient detail is given as to the cause of this decrease. Further research is required to determine whether the leopard population is continuing to decrease</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The model used by Mozambique for estimating leopard abundance based on annual rainfall has been widely criticized for not taking into account persecution of leopards as “pests” and prey density (Nowell and Jackson 1996); field studies have provided far lower population estimates than provided by the model (in one case, the model predicted 40 leopards per 100 km² but a field study found only 6.25 leopards per 100 km²); therefore, the estimate of 20,000 leopards used to justify the increase in export quota by Mozambique may be 6.4 times the actual number of leopards; actual number of leopards in Mozambique may be as few as 3,125 ● The document fails to take account of the total offtake (i.e. “problem animal control”, persecution as “pests” and illegal killing) and only considers those specimens exported for legal trade under a CITES quota ● SSN urges Parties to apply scientific rigor to the consideration of establishing quotas in accordance with RC 9.21 (Rev. CoP13). CITES Parties should not approve export quotas without demanding demonstration of an adequate scientific basis for the quotas; at CoP13, Parties approved a doubling of South Africa's leopard skin export quota from 75 to 150 which was a few months later put on hold by the South African government because the increased quota was based on incorrect information
<p>Doc. 37.2 Black Rhinoceros Export Quotas for Namibia and South Africa Kenya</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Black rhino, <i>Diceros bicornis</i>, is on Appendix I and is listed as Critically Endangered (IUCN 2002) ● The wild population declined by over 90 percent in sixty years reaching a low of 2410 in 1995; better protection has allowed the population to increase to 3610 by 2005 (International Rhino Foundation (IRF 2005)) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposes to repeal RC 13.5 because new data have emerged indicating that Namibia and South Africa populations can no longer sustain the agreed quota (RC 9.21 (b)(ii)) 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The IUCN African Rhino Specialist Group (IUCN/SSC AfRSG) and Namibia's CoP13 proposal stated there were 1134 black rhino in Namibia in 2003 and 2004 respectively and that the population was increasing; however, at a 2006 IUCN/SSC AfRSG meeting, Namibia reported it in fact had only 1024 black rhino in 2004, indicating a loss of 110 animals

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>but this is low compared to an estimated population of 65,000 in 1970; much greater population increases will be needed before the long-term viability of the species is assured</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are 1138 black rhino in Namibia and 1284 in South Africa (IRF 2005) • Threats include poaching for the international rhino horn trade: horns are used for traditional Chinese medicine and for ornamental purposes (carved handles for ceremonial daggers worn in some Middle East countries) • CITES Article III states that, for species on Appendix I, the Management Authority of the State of import shall issue an import permit only after the Scientific Authority of the State of export has advised that the export will not be detrimental to the survival of the species • RC 9.21 states that whenever the CoP has set an export quota for a species listed on Appendix I, this satisfies the requirements of Article III regarding the finding that the export and import will not be detrimental to the survival of the species, provided that the quota is not exceeded and that no new scientific or management data have emerged to indicate that a population can no longer sustain the agreed quota • At CoP13 (2004) the Parties agreed to RC 13.5 which establishes annual export quotas for five black rhino hunting trophies from Namibia and five from South Africa 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Namibia's black rhino management and anti-poaching abilities in Etosha National Park, where the largest black rhino population in the world exists, have been questioned by numerous reports: In 2000, a WWF study found serious problems in anti-poaching capacity including insufficient funding, not enough patrolling, and lack of equipment; two 2004 reports found lack of equipment and transportation, insufficient patrolling and poor staff management; a 2006 report by a former Chief Warden of the Park confirmed problems with poor management capacity, high staff turnover, crumbling infrastructure, and insufficient funding • South Africa's CoP13 proposal stated that there was no evidence to suggest that there is significant illegal international trade in rhino products from South Africa. However, there have been very high levels of rhino poaching in South Africa in recent months, including rhinos in Kruger National Park, which indicates a serious problem with anti-poaching efforts. Eighteen rhino were poached from January to September 2006, mostly from Kruger National Park. In June 2006, two Kruger field rangers appeared in court on charges of rhino poaching. Although it is unknown how many of these were black rhinos, this new information on the emergence of a significant threat to South Africa's rhino populations since CoP13 points to the need to repeal the quota • Critically endangered species should be managed so as to utilize all the genetic variability available. The relevant black rhino subspecies exist in other range States where their numbers are seriously reduced or where the subspecies have gone extinct. Neither Namibia nor South Africa has demonstrated that they have exhausted all options to use their specimens to enhance other such populations • Serious problems with management and anti-poaching abilities in Namibia's Etosha National Park, and the significant discrepancy in black rhino population figures for Namibia, were not discussed at CoP13 when the quotas were established. • Since the black rhino export quota was established at CoP13, the subspecies <i>D.b. longipes</i>, which recently only existed in Cameroon, was declared "extinct"

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Doc. 38</p> <p>Production Systems for Specimens of Cites-Listed Species</p> <p>Animals and Plants Committees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.68 directs the AC and PC to establish an intersessional joint working group with terms of reference to <i>inter alia</i> define key elements of the different production systems for CITES-listed species of animals and plants, and, if appropriate, to develop as far as possible a list of specific production systems currently being utilized by Parties; to determine whether the addition of any new source codes is necessary; and to consider the definition of 'ranching' within the context of existing CITES Resolutions At the AC22 and PC16, the working group could not conclude discussions on source code R (for 'ranching') and conclusions could not be reached on the use of source codes A, C, D and F in RC 10.16 (Rev.). There also was no consensus on extending the application of source code F to plants. There was no agreement on a possible revision of RC 11.16 Nevertheless, in view of the progress made, the AC and PC concluded that in regard to the codes, the deliberations should be continued 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To allow the continuation of this work, the AC and PC propose that the CoP consider the adoption of a Decision directing the AC and PC: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to review the CITES trade data maintained by UNEP-WCMC to determine the species for which source code R has been used for trade, and the countries where this has occurred; b) to survey countries applying the R code to species other than crocodylians downlisted from Appendix I to Appendix II subject to ranching, and obtain information on the management program for the species to which this source code is applied; c) to review the literature on wildlife management for current information on management systems that would resemble ranching (i.e. primarily focused on the harvest of specimens representing early life stages for rearing in captivity) and identify common elements in these programs; d) based on this review, propose a definition of ranching and the use of source code R for CITES purposes; and e) report at CoP15 	<p>(IUCN/SSC AfRSG 2006), and there are newly emerging poaching threats in Kenya</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports adoption of the Decision and the continued work of the working group and believes that a review of the current applications of ranching is a positive way for the working group to move forward SSN supports the ongoing process to develop an appropriate definition of ranching, but in the meantime suggests that Parties adopt the amended definition proposed under "SSN View" in this Digest for Doc. 21 ("<i>the rearing in a controlled environment of specimens of species that exhibit both high fecundity and high levels of natural mortality in early life, taken from the wild at an early life stage which are the result of a method of management that is proven to increase production while maintaining or increasing recruitment in the wild population</i>") SSN also believes that proper allocation of clearly defined source codes to the various production systems is key to ensuring compliance with CITES provisions
<p>Doc. 39</p> <p>Purpose of Transaction Codes on CITES Permits and Certificates: Revision of Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. COP13) on Permits and Certificates</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13), Permits and certificates, provides a list of purpose codes that should be used on each permit and certificate, but does not provide sufficient definitions of the purpose codes. As a result, purpose codes are often misapplied to transactions, negatively affecting the enforcement of CITES and the conservation of CITES-listed species Correct use of purpose codes is required to establish whether transactions are for primarily commercial purposes or to identify categories of trade that may pose a threat to species 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to deal with the inconsistent use of purpose codes, the document proposes the following amendments to RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides more specific and clear definitions for the purpose codes currently in use (H, P, N, L, T, Z, Q, S, M, E, and B), eliminating current confusion as to whether the transaction covered is of a commercial or non-commercial nature Deletes purpose code G (botanical gardens) and defines purpose code Z to include trade for zoos, botanical gardens and aquariums Requires that the purpose of the transaction be included on all CITES permits and 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishing clear and consistent purpose or transaction codes is vital to ensuring correct implementation and enforcement of the Convention SSN agrees with the majority of definitions suggested, however urges the Parties to adopt the following revisions : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Purpose code N</u>. Revise the definition as follows (underlined text is new, recommended deletion in strikeout): "<i>Reintroduction or introduction into the wild – live specimens to be used in conservation efforts to reintroduce or supplement wild populations, including the movement of specimens for non-commercial breeding in captivity or artificial propagation in support of for in-situ conservation efforts.</i>" (SSN is concerned

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently codes are not used consistently. This can result in conflicts and raise questions about appropriate implementation of the Convention. It also affects reporting and analysis of trade data • RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) does not require that the same purpose code be used for import, export and re-export permits issued for one transaction 	certificates	<p>that the term “<i>in support of in situ conservation efforts</i>” could be broadly interpreted to include the sale of live specimens for economic benefits transferred to <i>in situ</i> conservation programs. Any breeding should, where possible, directly result in the production of specimens for reintroduction programs and not merely for the production of <i>ex situ</i> populations)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Purpose Code P</u>. Revise the definition as follows: “<i>P Personal and household effects – personal, non-commercial activities involving live or dead specimens, parts or products (does not include specimens covered under H)</i>”. (SSN is concerned that Parties are using the P code for transactions (such as trade in tourist souvenir specimens) that do not meet the definition of personal and household effects contained in RC 13.7 on Control of trade in personal and household effects. Specifying that Code P is only to be used for trade in items that meet the definition of personal and household effects in RC 13. 7 will ensure that this code is not misapplied) ▪ <u>Purpose Code T</u>. Revise the definition as follows: “<i>T Commercial trade – trade in live or dead specimens, parts, or products for economic benefit not covered under B, M, or Z; and other activities not covered by the available codes</i>”. (SSN is concerned that in instances when a transaction does not strictly meet the definition of an available code, there may be confusion as to which code applies, resulting in misapplication of the codes. The proposed text provides clarification that activities not covered by the available codes (for example, trade in tourist souvenir specimens that do not meet the definition of personal and household effects in RC13.7 such as trade in five or more seahorses (<i>Hippocampus</i> spp.) per person) are deemed to be commercial and require the making of a non-detriment finding) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Under Recommends</u>, SSN recommends requiring the use of identical purpose codes for a single transaction on both import, export and re-export documentation. Requiring that the same purpose code be applied to the import, export and re-export of a single transaction would insure that the proper exemptions were being granted for trade in Appendix I specimens and would make interpretation of CITES trade data more accurate.

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Doc. 40</p> <p>Electronic Permitting: Report of the Secretariat</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) on Permits and certificates, creates a model format and standard requirements for the content of export and import permits, re-export and pre-Convention certificates, certificates of origin and certificates of captive breeding and artificial propagation ● Decision 12.76 directs the Secretariat to study and evaluate the possibility of creating a future centralized system that would allow the establishment of a communications network through the CITES website that would make it possible to check online the authenticity and veracity of permits and certificates issued and received by the Parties ● Decision 13.70 directs the Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) advise the Parties on the work done in the development of simple Internet based software tools and provide recommendations based on experience and testing by Parties; b) evaluate the experience of other permit-based agreements or conventions in using electronic permitting systems; c) provide guidance to the Parties on the extent to which it may be practicable to make use of computerized systems to meet their obligations under CITES; and d) engage the World Customs Organization on data harmonization and how it relates to the implementation of CITES and report on their efforts at SC54 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports on actions taken in regard to electronic permitting ● Provides an overview of the electronic document systems currently used by CCAMLR (Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources) and some Parties ● Provides a description of global initiatives and trends in the use of information and communication technologies to facilitate trade and transport ● Regarding the use of computerized systems to meet obligations under CITES, notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ there is strong interest in moving towards a fully automated permitting system but there is recognition of the need for a paper-based system to exist in parallel to an electronic system, at least for the near future ■ the electronic systems in use by the Parties are being developed independently and may not be interoperable. Therefore, there is a need for effective collaboration, in particular, in the areas of information exchange formats, protocols and standards ■ the electronic automation of the permit and certificate procedure will require a revision of RC 12.3 (Rev. CoP13) to accommodate electronic signatures and other security measures. Such changes should be proposed after a review of how electronic signatures and other electronic security measures are applied in electronic trade transactions. ● Recommends the adoption of two Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ directing the SC Working Group on the Use of Information Technology and Electronic Systems to extend its mandate pursuant to Decision 13.69 to assist the Secretariat in drafting guidelines in the use of common information exchange formats, protocols and standards and electronic signatures and to present a progress report at CoP15 	<p>It would also facilitate the enforcement of CITES</p> <p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● While recognizing the contributions that can be made with the use of electronic permitting systems, SSN notes that many Parties may lack the capacity to use electronic permitting for CITES purposes and, therefore, recommends that there be no immediate move to implement such a system ● SSN urges the Secretariat to encourage donors, including Parties and non-governmental organizations, to provide assistance to the CITES authorities of developing countries so that they might increase their participation in electronic and Internet technologies

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪directing the Secretariat to prepare a CD-ROM and Web-based toolkit on electronic permitting systems for consideration at SC57 to assist Parties with implementation of electronic permitting systems 	
<p>Doc. 41</p> <p>Transport of Live Specimens</p> <p>Animals Committee, in consultation with the Plants Committee and the Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● CITES Articles III, IV ,V and VII require Management Authorities to be satisfied, before granting export permits or re-export or traveling exhibition certificates, that live specimens will be prepared and shipped so as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health or cruel treatment ● CITES <i>Guidelines for Transport and Preparation for Shipment of Live Wild Animals and Plants</i> were adopted at CoP2 ● RC 10.21, on Transport of live animals: directs the AC to deal with matters related to the transport of live animals; establishes that the International Air Transport Association (IATA) Live Animal Regulations (LAR) meet CITES requirements for transport by air and can be used as a reference for other modes of transport; and makes related recommendations to Parties, the Secretariat and the SC ● RC 10.21 also establishes a systematic review of mortality, injury and damage to health by: urging Parties to collect and submit such information to the Secretariat along with annual reports; directing the AC to review this information and make species- and country-specific recommendations to Parties; and directing the Secretariat to convey recommendations to the Parties concerned after they have been approved by the SC, and, in consultation with the AC and SC, to monitor the implementation of recommendations and of other aspects of this Resolution and report its findings and recommendations at each CoP ● Decision 13.88 directs the AC, in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposes the adoption of two Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪with regard to transport of live animals by means other than air, the Parties should consider the International Animal Health Organization (OIE) Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Sea and the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Land published in the Terrestrial Animal Health Code in instances when the IATA LAR are inappropriate ▪the AC, in consultation with the Secretariat, should: a) participate in the regular meetings of the Terrestrial Animal Health Standards Commission of the OIE and in the ongoing reviews of the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Sea, the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Land and, if appropriate, the OIE Guidelines for the Transport of Animals by Air; b) collaborate with OIE in the development of its web portal with information on regulations and guidelines for transport of live CITES specimens; c) examine new or additional references for transport of live animals; d) develop a Notification to the Parties, requesting the Parties to provide the AC with copies of their national legislation for transport of live animals by road, rail or ship before AC24 for analysis; and e) report on the implementation of this Decision at CoP15 ● Proposes a revision of RC 10.21 by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪broadening the scope of the Resolution to encompass the transportation of plants by including reference to “<i>plants</i>” and the “Plants Committee,” replacing “animals” with “<i>specimens</i>” as appropriate; and including reference to the IATA Perishable Cargo Manual (PCM) (for plants) 	<p>AC Recommendations: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN is concerned that high levels of mortality and injury experienced by animals and plants in international trade are an indication that Parties are not adequately implementing CITES Articles III, IV, V and VII or RC 10.21, and urges Parties to fully implement these measures ● Regarding the proposed Decisions, SSN agrees with the proposed actions to insure greater application of guidelines to minimize injury or cruel treatment of live specimens in trade ● Regarding the revisions to RC 10.21: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Although SSN recognizes that there is little support for the part of RC 10.21 that calls for a systematic review of injury and mortality, SSN remains convinced that this species-specific, country-specific approach is the only way to address ongoing transport problems; therefore, while SSN supports the proposed elimination of the systematic study, we urge the CoP to adopt the proposed amendment “<i>d) to regularly examine high mortality shipments of live specimens and make recommendations to relevant Parties, exporters, importers and transport companies on how to avoid this in the future</i>” as another, perhaps less onerous, way to deal with the problem ▪Mortality and injury rates for certain species subject to transport in international trade remain unacceptably high, the suffering endured by these animals is unacceptable. SSN recommends that a new paragraph be included in the operative part of RC 10.21 that states, “ENCOURAGES Parties to require any commercial operation engaged in the transport of live animals by air, rail, sea, or road to submit quarterly reports on animal mortality/injury statistics to a governmental agency so designated to receive such information. Such information should be made available to the public for analysis and dissemination.”

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>collaboration with organizations and the Secretariat, to develop recommendations regarding transport of live animals by road, rail or ship, and regarding cost-effective options for containers and packing materials for all means of transport to supplement, where necessary, the IATA LAR and to report to CoP14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.89 directs the AC, in consultation with the PC and the Secretariat, to undertake a review of RC 10.21 in order to revise the requirements regarding the collection, submission and analysis of data on the mortality and injury or damage to health in transport of live animals, domestic measures directed to Parties, and reporting obligations; incorporate references to the transport of live plants; and clarify how IATA manuals and regulations can be mechanisms through which up-to-date guidance on the transport of live animals and plants of CITES-listed species can be provided, replacing the <i>Guidelines</i>; and report to CoP14 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> recommending regular communication between the Secretariat and the SC with the Animals Transportation Association (AATA), the OIE and the International Plants Protection Convention (IPPC) eliminating the systematic review of mortality and injury directing the AC and PC, in consultation with the Secretariat, to: a) participate in meetings of the IATA Live Animals and Perishables Board in order to amplify or update the LAR and PCM; b) examine new or additional references for transport of live specimens and incorporate them into this Resolution; c) examine developments related to the transport of live plant specimens and incorporate them into this Resolution; and d) regularly examine high mortality shipments of live specimens and make recommendations to relevant Parties, exporters, importers and transport companies on how to avoid this in the future encouraging the Secretariat, Parties and relevant organizations to assist in the distribution and increase public awareness of the IATA LAR and PCM adding references to Article VII and traveling exhibition certificates wherever other Articles are mentioned making other minor amendments to clarify the text 	<p>Secretariat’s Recommendations: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports the Secretariat’s recommendations, particularly the proposal to replace paragraph d) in the proposed Decision directed to the AC with “d) review at its 24th meeting the following documents from the Secretariat: i) an analysis of the Parties’ legislative provisions on the transport of live animals by road, rail and ship contained in materials gathered under the CITES National Legislation Project; and ii) draft legislative guidance for the transport of live specimens; and” SSN urges information on transport of live specimens gathered under the CITES National Legislation Project be made publicly available on the CITES website
<p>Doc. 42</p> <p>Physical Inspection of Timber Shipments</p> <p>Germany on behalf of the European Community Member States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Illegal and unsustainable exploitation is threatening many timber species and has a detrimental impact on the conservation of tropical forests While a variety of timber species are already listed in the CITES Appendices, others are not, which complicates inspections of shipments: Timber species often look similar and are very difficult to distinguish; logs of protected timber can be hidden between or beneath unprotected 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The draft Decision urges the Secretariat, in consultation with the PC, CITES Parties and relevant organizations, to identify existing timber identification tools and gaps and to report to the SC The SC, in consultation with the Secretariat, Parties, and relevant organizations, would be directed to develop unified criteria and guidelines for enforcement of timber listings, specifically the inspection of timber shipments 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unified criteria and guidelines would harmonize the inspection procedure of timber shipments and would likely reduce international trade in illegal timber Authorities in countries with limited financial and personnel resources—especially those in range States of economically significant timber species—would benefit from these guidelines and could focus their efforts accordingly The proposed guidelines on enforcement are not limited to physical inspection of timber shipments. SSN

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>species</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The volume of shipments must be correctly assessed. This is hampered by the large volume of some shipments and different sizes of wood parts and products • Identification material has been developed by several CITES Parties and organizations. However, much of this material is neither accessible nor known to all CITES Parties 		<p>recommends the following additional items be included in the guidelines: methodologies for establishing a chain of custody system; available technology for tracking timber; and services provided by third party certification and verification bodies</p>
<p>Doc. 43</p> <p>Effectiveness of the CITES Universal Crocodilian Tagging System</p> <p>United States of America</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All crocodilian species are listed in Appendix I or II; CITES import, export and re-export permits must be issued for trade (CITES Article III and IV) • RC 11.12 establishes a tagging system for the international trade in raw, tanned or finished skins or skin pieces • RC 11.16 requires that all products (including live specimens) of ranching operations must be adequately identified, marked and documented to ensure that they can be readily distinguished from products of Appendix-I populations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes to evaluate the effectiveness of the tagging system and to determine whether any improvements or changes would be advisable, including how Parties are implementing the system, benefits derived for <i>in situ</i> conservation of crocodiles, and alternative identification tools or regimes that complement or augment the current system • Proposes two draft Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the SC would instruct its Clearing House, if adequate resources are received, to develop a budget and parameters to conduct a review of the implementation and effectiveness of the universal tagging system recommended in RC11.12; in consultation with the Chair of the SC, recommend an appropriate consultant to carry out such a review, so that the completed study can be provided to SC58; work with the consultant, as it determines appropriate, to refine the scope and execution of the study as it progresses; and report recommendations to CoP15 for any adjustments it finds necessary to the universal tagging system based on the findings and recommendations of the review ▪the Secretariat would seek funding to support the execution of the study and coordinate with the SC's Clearing House to ensure that fundraising efforts are in-line with the financial requirements of the project 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It has been twelve years since the crocodile tagging system was first established; an evaluation may lead to improvements • It should be clearly stated in the Terms of Reference for the evaluation that its purpose is to improve implementation and enforcement of the Convention • The Terms of Reference should also clearly state that that the marking of parts and derivatives in trade from ranched crocodilian species is necessary to achieve adequate control (RC 11.16). Specimens reported as originating from captive-breeding or ranching operations could have been illegally taken from the wild. Both production systems can seriously impact the conservation of a species if they are not strictly regulated and controlled
<p>Doc. 44</p> <p>Identification Manual</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 11.19 on the Identification Manual: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪transfers the responsibility for the publication of the Identification Manual to the Secretariat 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a summary of the Secretariat's reports on the Identification Manual since CoP13 including an overview of the current status of the Manual and a list of Parties that 	<p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN commends the Secretariat for its plan to have all Identification Manual sheets on-line in early 2007 • SSN encourages Parties to submit the necessary

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪requires the Secretariat to regularly report on the Identification Manual at meetings of the SC, AC and PC ▪urges Parties that have submitted proposals to include species in the Appendices, to provide appropriate data for inclusion in the Identification Manual within one year after CoP acceptance of such proposals 	<p>have yet to submit the appropriate information for the Manual for new species in the Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports that by early 2007 all Identification Manual sheets will be accessible from the CITES website 	<p>sheets for the Identification Manual</p>
<p>Doc. 45</p> <p>Personal and Household Effects</p> <p>Standing Committee's Working Group on Personal and Household Effects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Article VII Paragraph 3 of the Convention exempts "specimens that are personal or household effects" from the provisions of Articles III, IV and V • The treaty does not define "specimens that are personal or household effects." Article VII Paragraph 3 only lists 4 situations when the exemption does not apply • RC 13.7 on Control of trade in personal and household effects includes a list of Appendix-II species often traded as personal and household effects (PHE) and sets quantitative limits for these specimens. Currently, Parties may propose changes to this list at a CoP • Decision 13.71 directs the SC, in consultation with the Secretariat, Parties and relevant organizations, to develop a process at CoP14 "for consideration of specimens of [PHE] of Appendix-II species which may need to have quantitative limits set to be exempted from permitting requirements according to Article VII, paragraph 3, of the Convention." • A Working Group was established at SC53 to assist with the implementation of Decision 13.71. The Working Group determined that amending the Convention in order to clarify the coverage of PHE of Appendix-II species was not necessary and decided instead to develop additional guidance to incorporate into RC13.7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes amendments to RC 13.7 in order to establish a process for amending the list of PHE of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits. The new process would require the processing of requests through the Clearing House rather than direct submission to the CoP. Submission would be processed in three stages: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Parties would need to: prepare a proposal, containing supporting information and a justification, for amending the list of personal and household effects of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits; consult range States, producer countries and consumer countries for the specimens and species included in the proposal; and submit the proposal and results of the consultations to the SC's Clearing House, through the Secretariat 2) The Clearing House would deal directly with any proposal made for primarily enforcement purposes and would direct any proposal made for primarily conservation purposes to the appropriate technical committee 3) Upon the recommendation of either the Clearing House or the technical committee, the proposal will be submitted by the initiating Party to the CoP for discussion and decision • Provides a draft Decision directing the SC to extend the operation of its Working Group on Personal and Household Effects until CoP15 and oversee the Group's work in fulfilling the following terms of reference: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) monitor implementation of the process 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART/ OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the process proposed by the Working Group but agrees with the Secretariat that the SC, rather than the Clearing House, should decide whether a proposal goes forward to the CoP. The advice of the technical committees is also necessary for Parties to make an informed decision on the appropriateness of quantitative limits. In order to avoid a prolonged process, SSN proposes amending Paragraph 6 of the proposed Annex to RC 13.7 (new text underlined): <i>"(. . .) the proposal will be submitted by the initiating Party to the <u>next</u> Conference of the Parties for discussion and decision."</i> • SSN also supports the suggestion of the Secretariat to develop a standard format for any proposed amendments to the list of PHEs of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits for Parties to submit to the CoP. • SSN supports the draft decision to prepare guidance for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪<u>determining whether a PHE is 'legally-acquired'</u>: the PHE should be accompanied with documentation that it 1) is pre-Convention, 2) was taken in the country of residence in keeping with the laws of that country by a national or foreign national who can demonstrate that he/she has resided in the country for 3 months or more, or 3) was acquired in accordance with the Convention upon proof of a prior import or export permit ▪<u>clarifying the relationship between 'tourist souvenirs' and 'personal and household effects'</u>: current levels of trade in parts and products of CITES-listed species as tourist souvenirs occurs at commercial levels. The majority of these products are produced for commercial purposes to export as souvenirs. Even with quantitative

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>for amending the list of PHE of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits and determine whether any adjustments are needed (e.g. whether criteria for proposed amendments should be added to the process or whether the entire process should be replaced by another process which is not based on quantitative limits)</p> <p>b) prepare guidance for:</p> <p>i) determining whether a PHE is 'legally- acquired'</p> <p>ii) clarifying the relationship between 'tourist souvenirs' and 'personal and household effects'</p> <p>iii) the treatment of hunting trophies, and</p> <p>c) report at each regular meeting of the SC until CoP15 and at CoP15.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The Secretariat proposes two alternative options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ substitute the Clearing House with the SC and eliminate the role of the technical committees; accept proposals with limited or no consultations with range States; and allow the submission of proposed amendments to the CoP upon the recommendation of the SC ■ develop a standard format for proposed amendments to the list of PHE of Appendix-II species with quantitative limits for Parties to submit directly to the CoP 	<p>limits, tourist demand is likely to be significant and, therefore, likely to adversely impact those species collected to be sold as tourist souvenirs. SSN strongly believes that tourist souvenirs should not qualify as PHE and quantitative limits should not be established for tourist souvenirs. In the event such limits are set, quantitative limits set for any tourist souvenirs must be evaluated by the PHE Working Group or another working group established by the SC at each SC meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ treatment of hunting trophies: Hunting trophies should only be considered as a PHE when they are part of a household move and are accompanied with documentation that the trophy: 1) is pre-Convention, 2) was taken in the country of residence in keeping with the laws of that country, or 3) was acquired in accordance with the Convention upon proof of a prior import or export permit. This exemption should not apply to CITES-listed specimens killed in one country and imported into the owner's usual State of residence ● The current resolutions that govern the movement of PHEs are confusing; the Parties should clarify that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The PHE exemption does not broadly apply to all tourist souvenirs ■ Live specimens may only be traded as PHEs under RC 10.20 and such certificates should only be issued by the owner's usual state of residence ■ Appendix I species should not be traded as PHEs
<p>Doc. 46</p> <p>Trade in Some Crocodylian Specimens</p> <p>Germany on behalf of the European Community Member States</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All crocodylian species are listed in Appendix I or II; CITES import, export and re-export permits must be issued (CITES Article III and IV) for trade ● RC 11.12 establishes a tagging system for the international trade in raw, tanned or finished skins or skin pieces ● Most, but not all, small crocodylian leather goods (purses, belts, etc.) traded internationally are manufactured outside of range States 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● A SC working group would be established to develop a proposal to exempt small crocodylian leather goods from CITES provisions ● The working group's remit would be to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ examine the actual benefits and costs of the need to issue CITES documents and conduct trade controls for small crocodylian leather goods ■ consider possible ways and conditions to exempt small crocodylian leather goods from 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● An exemption for small crocodylian leather goods would undermine the implementation of the Convention, in particular Articles III and IV, requiring grant and presentation of a permit or certificate for transactions involving CITES-listed species ● Exempting small crocodylian leather goods from CITES provisions would allow unregulated trade in such goods manufactured in range States, including those from wild specimens. This would open a loophole for illegal trade and have a negative impact on wild populations ● Though most small leather goods in international trade

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most, but not all, small crocodylian leather goods are manufactured from captive-bred or ranched specimens • Tens of thousands of re-export permits for small crocodylian leather goods are issued annually by non-range States 	<p>the CITES provisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪develop a proposal, if appropriate, to contribute to the improvement of the effectiveness of the Convention, providing for the exemption of small crocodylian leather goods from the CITES provisions ▪report to the SC on the results of its work at its 58th meeting (2009) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SC would submit recommendations to CoP15 if relevant 	<p>originate from non-range States, some are manufactured in range States. Some originate from wild specimens, and some are of illegal origin</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proponents note that control of trade in crocodylian skins is considered to be effective and has eliminated most of a formerly flourishing illegal trade. CITES permitting of trade in small leather goods contributes to the effectiveness of this system • Specimens reported as originating from captive-breeding or ranching operations could have been illegally taken from the wild. Both production systems can seriously impact the conservation of a species if they are not strictly regulated and controlled. For example, the IUCN crocodile specialist group recently expressed concern about Madagascar’s ranching program for <i>Crocodylus niloticus</i> which may be used to launder skins of crocodiles harvested from the wild (see SC54 Doc. 32 p.3). A reform of the tagging and skin marking procedures was deemed necessary by the SC to ensure proper implementation of CITES • Illegal exploitation of crocodylians continues in many range States, including the Critically Endangered Siamese crocodile in Cambodia and Vietnam, black caiman in Brazil and American crocodile in Colombia • Terms describing products in trade are not always used correctly and consistently; eliminating small crocodylian leather goods from CITES controls could further encourage use of inappropriate terms on CITES permits • If small crocodile leather goods exporting Parties have difficulties in issuing thousands of permits annually, they should increase the processing fees for such permits, rather than seek to eliminate the requirement
<p>Doc. 48</p> <p>Relationship Between <i>Ex Situ</i> Production and <i>In Situ</i> Conservation: Report of the Standing Committee</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 13.9, on Encouraging cooperation between Parties with <i>ex situ</i> breeding operations and those with <i>in situ</i> conservation programs, urges Parties to encourage <i>ex situ</i> operations that breed Appendix-I animal species or that artificially propagate Appendix-I plant species to “support” <i>in situ</i> conservation • Decision 13.78 directs the SC, through its Clearing House, “to decide on the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides background information and terms of reference for a study to examine the benefits and risks of international trade in <i>ex situ</i>-produced, CITES-listed species to wild populations of the same species • The study would evaluate the <u>benefits</u> of <i>ex situ</i> production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the extent to which it relieves pressure on wild populations 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN recommends that the CoP reject the proposed study because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the issue is sufficiently dealt with in RC 13.9 which embraces <u>voluntary</u> efforts by Parties to encourage <i>ex-situ</i> operations to support <i>in-situ</i> conservation ▪previous SC and AC attempts to draw conclusions on this issue were unsuccessful and little more can be expected from an expensive, in-depth study ▪many of the possible risks and benefits (e.g. transfer

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p><i>appropriate way to continue consideration of the relationship between ex situ production (of animals and plants) and in situ conservation in the context of CITES</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At SC53, the SC instructed its Clearing House to submit recommendations at SC54 to fulfill Decision 13.78 • The CITES Clearing House and the AC at AC20, found it difficult to draw general conclusions from the 80 case studies that were provided by Parties and organizations in response to Notification No. 2003/72. The Clearing House, in SC54 Doc. 34, recommended that the SC seek the approval of the CoP for a study on the issue and drafted terms of reference for this study • These terms of reference were edited based on the discussions which took place at SC54 and appear in CoP14 Doc. 48, Annex • SSN notes that the AC, in its report to CoP13 (CoP13 Doc. 56.3.1), commented that further examination of this issue <i>“might run into a very time-consuming process... that might not bear direct relevance to CITES and lead to discussions of a rather philosophical nature. In addition, it seemed increasingly difficult to discuss the issue under a purely CITES perspective (trade that is “detrimental” or “non-detrimental” to the survival of the species concerned) and to keep it separate from the Convention on Biodiversity issue of access and benefit sharing in relation to ex situ production of species”</i> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the value of <i>ex situ</i> production as a source of founder stock ▪the added incentive for habitat conservation from specimens removed for ranching purposes ▪the benefit derived from observation and research carried out on <i>ex situ</i> populations ▪the scope for transfer of benefits from <i>ex situ</i> production to <i>in situ</i> conservation purposes ▪the extent to which range States are able to transfer benefits from <i>ex situ</i> production in their territory to <i>in situ</i> conservation work ▪the scope of economic activity generated by <i>ex situ</i> production • The study would also evaluate the <u>risks</u> of <i>ex situ</i> production: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the risk of creating a mechanism for laundering of wild taken specimens ▪the removal of the incentive to conserve the habitat of the wild population owing to the existence of an alternative <i>ex situ</i> source • The terms of reference also direct the study to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪provide recommendations for maximizing the benefits and minimizing the risks of <i>ex situ</i> production and whether a voluntary mechanism or a formal regime is needed for this ▪consider the possibility of different approaches to different categories of species and/or production systems (e.g. different approaches for Appendix-I and Appendix-II species, different approaches for animals and plants, different approaches for range States and non-range States, etc.) 	<p>of benefits, scope of economic activity generated by <i>ex situ</i> production) are beyond the scope of CITES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪there is no scientifically rigorous research method to assess the benefits or consequences of <i>ex situ</i> production or any standard measurement to quantify such impacts; thus the study is likely to be based largely on the opinion of the authors ▪the Clearing House recommends meeting the cost for this project from the CITES Trust Fund; SSN recommends that CoP clarify that these issues are not a priority for CITES • If the proposal is approved, SSN urges the CoP to eliminate the following paragraphs of the study that relate to benefit-sharing because CITES does not have the authority or the mandate to regulate this: (Annex, Paragraphs (1) (a) (iii), (v), (vi) (vii), and (b)(ii)). SSN also urges the CoP to add to the terms of reference: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪a standard measurement or framework to evaluate the adverse and beneficial impacts of <i>ex situ</i> production on the conservation of wild species ▪an evaluation of the risks associated with the reintroduction of specimens from <i>ex situ</i> production to the biology and ecology <i>in situ</i> species, including genetics, morbidity, mortality, age structure, behavior, and the role of the species in the ecosystem ▪evaluation of the adverse impacts to <i>in situ</i> populations caused by the removal of wild specimens to facilitate ranching or other <i>ex situ</i> operations ▪evaluation of increased enforcement costs that result when <i>ex-situ</i> production puts pressure on wild populations • SSN also is concerned about the following inaccuracies in Doc. 48: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Receipt of economic benefits by range States, whether by transfer of benefits or from the direct proceeds of trade, cannot be assumed to be beneficial to conservation (e.g. while trade in wild-caught specimens of parrots listed in Appendix II may provide economic benefits to range States, it does not necessarily provide benefits to conservation of the species in the wild). And while there may be isolated cases where <i>ex situ</i> production provides economic

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p>benefits that are applied to conservation, CITES has no mandate to regulate the distribution of such benefits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪The Clearing House claims that fraud and illegal trade “<i>may arise in response to stricter measures on the part of importing or exporting countries</i>”. Similarly, in a recent press release, the CITES Secretariat stated that, “...<i>bans risk creating black markets</i>”. SSN notes that Article XIV(1),(2) reserves the right for any Party to enact stricter domestic measures to regulate wildlife trade. Neither the Secretariat nor the Clearing House has a mandate to evaluate or call into question the appropriateness of stricter domestic measures ▪The Clearing House claims that <i>ex situ</i> production can undercut the trade in wild-caught specimens which it calls “<i>the main incentive for communities to conserve the species in its habitat</i>”. Capture and trade of wild specimens rarely act as incentives to conserve habitat. SSN is concerned that the Clearing House is equating trade in wild-caught specimens with conservation and that this might lead to the conclusion that CITES should promote trade in wild-caught specimens in order to further species conservation
<p>Doc. 49</p> <p>Reservations Regarding Species Transferred from One Appendix to Another</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITES allows Parties to take a reservation: with respect to any species included in Appendix I, II or III or any parts or derivatives specified in relation to a species included in Appendix III, when a State becomes a Party (Article XXIII, paragraph 2); within 90 days of when Appendix I or II is amended (Article XV, paragraph 3), and at any time, with respect to any species included in Appendix III or any parts or derivatives specified in relation to a species included in Appendix III (Article XVI, paragraph 2) • CITES provides that “<i>until such reservation is withdrawn, the State shall be treated as a State not a Party to the present Convention</i>” with respect to trade in the species or part or derivative concerned.(Article XXIII, paragraph 3; Article XV, paragraph 3; Article XVI, paragraph 2) • CITES does not clearly state whether a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposes amendments to RC 4.25 to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪clarify that the transfer of a species from one Appendix to another must be viewed as a deletion from one Appendix and its simultaneous inclusion in the other ▪require that a reservation no longer be considered valid in cases where a Party maintains a reservation in relation to a species that is deleted from one Appendix and included in another. If the Party wishes to preserve the reservation, the Party would need to enter a new reservation in accordance with Article XV, paragraph 3, or XVI, paragraph 2 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed amendments to RC 4.25 provide clarification that reservations will no longer be considered valid when a species is deleted from one Appendix and included in another • Reservations may be made in relation to the parts and derivatives of species included in Appendix III. However, for animal species listed in Appendix I or II, reservations cannot specify which part or derivatives are covered. The proposed amendments solve potential problems when a species is transferred from Appendix III to Appendix I or II by ensuring that the reservations in relation to parts or derivatives should no longer be considered valid when the species is included in Appendix I or II • The proposed amendments are more in keeping with the conservation spirit of the Convention than the current interpretation and with the widely held view that reservations undermine the effectiveness of conventions. The amendments promote the broadest application of CITES

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>reservation remains valid when a species is transferred from Appendix I to II, or vice versa, or when a species in Appendix III is subsequently included in Appendix I or II. CITES Parties have adopted RC 4.25 which also fails to clarify what becomes of a reservation in such circumstances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Following CoP13, the Secretariat has interpreted the Convention to mean that a reservation remains valid until it is withdrawn with the consequence that when a species is transferred from one Appendix to another, any reservation relating to that species remains in effect 		
<p>Doc. 50</p> <p>Great Apes</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 13.4 on Conservation of and trade in great apes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ urges the Parties to adopt legislation to protect great apes, strengthen enforcement controls, and promote the protection of great ape habitat ▪ directs the Secretariat to report to each SC meeting on implementation of this Resolution ▪ directs the SC to: review the implementation based on the Secretariat's report; consider other measures such as technical missions, organized in cooperation with GRASP (Great Apes Survival Project) and other appropriate partnerships, followed by political missions if necessary; and report at each CoP on implementation of this Resolution, with any recommendations for further actions • SC53 approved a technical mission to Indonesia to examine illegal trade in orangutans, by the CITES Secretariat and the GRASP Secretariat, which took place in May 2006. The mission recommended: specialized protection units should be expanded and target illegal activities in the field as well intelligence gathering and combating illegal trade; the authority and status of the Forest Department should be 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding poaching and illegal trade in orangutans in Indonesia, CoP14 should decide whether measures, including non-compliance measures, are necessary given the results of the mission and the response by Indonesia • Regarding illegal trade in orangutans in Malaysia and Thailand, CoP14 should consider the report of the missions and decide whether measures, including non-compliance measures, are necessary given the results • Regarding illegal trade of orangutans in Cambodia, CoP14 should decide whether additional measures, including non-compliance measures, are necessary, particularly given that the Secretariat received no response from Cambodia to the request that they facilitate a mission • Regarding illegal trade of primates in Egypt, CoP14 should decide whether measures, including non-compliance measures or a verification mission by the Secretariat, are necessary, particularly given that Egypt did not prepare a report for CoP14 on its enforcement of the Convention with regard to illegal trade in primates 	<p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN recommends that the strongest possible actions be taken by the CoP to address the ongoing, unsustainable illegal trade in orangutans. It is clear from the Indonesia orangutan mission report that: illegal activities are at levels that the population cannot sustain; current efforts to protect orangutans and prevent poaching and illegal trade are not effective; and there is no effective policy or practice in place to deter criminal activities directed at orangutans. Customs authorities at sea ports and air ports undertake no routine or random inspections of goods leaving the country and they will not inspect contents unless there is information that it contains contraband (shipments that are declared to have wildlife are inspected by wildlife authorities but those not declared to contain wildlife are not inspected); this policy is open to significant and serious exploitation by those engaged in wildlife crime The report states, <i>"the situation is so serious that the CITES Secretariat would be justified in invoking the relevant processes under Article XIII"</i> • SSN recommends that the CoP use the Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand mission reports to create a series of recommendations with specific deadlines by which these Parties must comply to the satisfaction of the SC. In the event of non-compliance, the SC should issue a recommendation that the Parties not accept any imports of specimens of CITES-listed species from the relevant Parties. This recommendation to the Parties

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>increased and they should be able to deal directly with prosecution authorities; illegal trade to domestic and international markets should be evaluated using covert methods initially, and clear and effective action should be taken against it; fresh education and awareness campaigns targeted at the public, enforcement authorities and the judiciary should be conducted; the government should ensure that people found in possession of orangutans are promptly prosecuted and that adequate penalties are imposed; and a message should be conveyed from the highest levels of government, to politicians, the military and police that the possession of orangutans by these officials will not be tolerated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malaysia and Thailand have indicated they would welcome missions on illegal trade in orangutans which are planned before CoP14 • SC54 discussed orangutans that had been illegally imported to Cambodia and whether the Convention was being adequately implemented there; SC54 called upon Cambodia to facilitate a mission by the Secretariat and requested the Secretariat to report on this to CoP14; no response from Cambodia was received • SC53 approved that the Secretariat should convene a CITES Great Ape Enforcement Task Force, which met from 31 October to 2 November 2006 and decided: to collect and analyze information regarding the nature of the trade; to prepare an information poster for Customs, police and wildlife offices and ports; and to hold training course on implementation and enforcement of CITES, investigation techniques and other relevant subjects • SC54 requested Egypt to prepare a report for CoP14 on its enforcement of the 		<p>should remain in effect until the relevant Parties implements all of the CoP recommendations and should be withdrawn only after the Secretariat confirms, by <i>in situ</i> verification, that they have been met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If by CoP14, Cambodia has not responded to the Secretariat's request that they facilitate a mission regarding illegal trade in orangutans, SSN recommends that Cambodia be given a specific deadline by which they must respond positively or the SC will issue a recommendation that the Parties should not accept any imports of specimens of CITES-listed species from Cambodia. Once the results of the mission are known, they should be used to create a series of recommendations with specific deadlines by which Cambodia must comply to the satisfaction of the SC or the SC will issue a recommendation that the Parties should not accept any imports of specimens of CITES-listed species from Cambodia • SSN recommends that CoP14 approve a mission to Egypt and the results of the mission be used to create a series of recommendations with specific deadlines by which Egypt must comply to the satisfaction of the SC or the SC will issue a recommendation that the Parties should not accept any imports of specimens of CITES-listed species from Egypt. Evidence indicates that for many years Egypt has been a major destination for great apes taken from the wild and illegally exported from West Africa (WSPA 1997, SC54 Doc.38) • SSN encourages the Secretariat to seek external funding to facilitate a second round of great ape technical missions to targeted Parties in Central Africa • SSN encourages the Parties to provide support to CITES for organization of the training courses recommended by the CITES Great Ape Enforcement Task Force

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	Convention, particularly with regard to illegal trade in primates; no report has been received		
<p>Doc. 51</p> <p>Cetaceans</p> <p>Japan</p>	<p><u>The AC Periodic Review Process</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● AC decided in 2005 (AC21) to limit the Periodic Review to listed species of Amphibia and Galliformes as a test of the process adopted by the SC ● In 2006 AC22 recommended the inclusion of the Central North-Atlantic stock of fin whale (an IWC protected species) in the Periodic Review after two controversial votes. Several range states protested. A final decision on the inclusion is pending consultation between the AC and SC <p><u>CITES status of IWC regulated Cetaceans</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● All ten species of great whales were listed on CITES Appendix I partly in deference to the International Whaling Commission's (IWC) primary authority for the management of whales and in response to IWC's species-specific bans on commercial whaling which were consolidated into the 1986 global commercial whaling moratorium ● The relationship between IWC and CITES has been established in a series of resolutions consolidated in RC 11.4 (Rev. CoP12) (hereafter RC11.4) ● RC 11.4 recognizes the IWC's primary competence for the management of whales, notes the risk of illegal trade, and recommends "that the Parties agree not to issue any import or export permit, or certificate for introduction from the sea, under this Convention for primarily commercial purposes for any specimen of a species or stock protected from commercial whaling by the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling" ● Japan, Norway and Iceland trade, or plan to trade, whale meat commercially under their Reservations to the CITES Appendix I 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Document proposes two draft Decisions, the first of which directs the AC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ include all cetacean species managed by the IWC in the Periodic Review ■ review and propose amendments to RC 11.4 (Rev CoP12) for consideration at CoP15 based on: "i) a review of the current situation regarding illegal trade in whale products, ii) advice from the IWC Scientific Committee concerning the status of whale stocks and, iii) the decision of the IWC that the moratorium on commercial whaling is no longer required" ● The second draft Decision directs the Secretariat to write to IWC conveying concern at postponement of the RMS discussions; requesting scientific data and advice on CITES listing of whale species 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The first draft Decision directed to the AC, regarding the Periodic Review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ is inconsistent with the SC's recommendation that AC not select "<i>species [for Periodic Review] that have already been evaluated for listing in the CITES Appendices as proposals submitted for consideration at the last two meetings of the Conference of the Parties</i>" (SC 51 Doc.16) and the CITES Secretariat's interpretation that "<i>species subject to other reviews such as those targeted by valid Decisions and Resolutions of the Parties (including ... Cetaceans...)</i>" should be excluded from the Periodic Review selection process (AC21 Doc.11.1 (Rev.1) Paragraph 5(ii)) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ would interfere with AC's orderly implementation of the Periodic Review; significantly increase its workload and therefore, budget; and establish a precedent for politically-motivated selection of species for review ■ would politicize the scientific processes of the AC, thereby undermining the Terms of Reference under which the AC operates (RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13)) ● The first draft decision directed to the AC regarding RC 11.4: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ is based on an incomplete and misleading summary of the facts (for example, it is incorrect to infer from the St Kitts declaration, a non-binding declaration adopted by some IWC members in 2006, that the IWC will soon lift the moratorium on commercial whaling). The moratorium will remain in force until removed by a ¾ majority ■ prescribes a process that could lead to a transfer from Appendix I to II of species protected by the IWC; this is inconsistent with RC11.4 and reasons that led to the adoption of this Resolution (i.e. deference for the IWC moratorium) that are still valid today. For CITES to permit trade in whale products while the moratorium on commercial whaling remains in force would violate RC11.4. and seriously undermine the IWC ■ would weaken the authority of the IWC by seeking

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>listing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CITES Parties have repeatedly agreed that the illegal international trade in whale products is a continuing problem • CITES has rejected fourteen proposals by Norway and/or Japan at the last four CoPs to transfer species or stocks of whales from Appendix I to Appendix II 		<p>advice from the IWC's Scientific Committee while disregarding the IWC's decision to maintain the moratorium</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The second draft Decision directed to the Secretariat is inappropriate; CITES should not interfere with the internal decision-making processes of the IWC by requesting its resumption of negotiations of a new scheme to manage commercial whaling (the RMS). The IWC has not been able to agree on the details of the RMS and decided collectively (i.e. including Norway, Japan and Iceland) to halt discussions in 2006
<p>Doc. 52</p> <p>Asian Big Cats Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For many years, CITES has dealt with poaching and trade in tigers, undertaking many political and technical missions to tiger range and consumer States since 1993 • RC 12.5, on Conservation of and trade in tigers and other Appendix-I Asian big cat species, urges all Parties and non-Parties, range States and consumer States, to introduce more effective enforcement mechanisms including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪in paragraph d) <i>“those Parties and non-Parties in whose territory tigers and other Asian big cat species are bred in captivity to ensure that adequate management practices and controls are in place to prevent parts and derivatives from entering illegal trade from or through such facilities;”</i> ▪in paragraph e) <i>“those Parties and non-Parties in whose countries there exist stocks of parts and derivatives of tiger and other Asian big cat species (such as tiger bone stocks), but not including pre-Convention specimens, to consolidate and ensure adequate control of such stocks, and where possible destroy the same, with the exception of those used for educational and scientific purposes”</i> • SC53 requested Asian big cat range States to submit reports on their implementation of RC 12.5 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The document relates to illegal trade in Appendix I species of Asian big cats, particularly tigers, leopards and snow leopards • Highlighted are particular concerns regarding continuing illicit trade in China and India • The Secretariat states that it: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪will give a verbal report to CoP14 following a verification mission to China ▪encourages Parties to take note of whether progress has been made in India regarding the establishment of the Wildlife Crime Control Bureau ▪observes that what is required is simply the proper implementation of the Convention, including renewed efforts to eliminate illicit trade ▪suggests that calling upon Parties to repeatedly submit reports is not particularly effective and notes that the CITES community is generally very effective in identifying where specific problems lie ▪suggests that specific cases for concern can be brought to the attention of the SC and CoPs and encourages the wider CITES community, particularly civil society, to assist with this task 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN agrees with the Secretariat that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪a greater impact on illicit trade can be achieved if more targeted intelligence-led enforcement operations and mechanisms are employed ▪the failure to establish a wildlife crime unit in India seven years after first committing to do so has had a detrimental impact on the capacity to combat organized criminal networks which control the poaching and trafficking of Asian big cat specimens ▪commercial breeding of tigers would be disastrous for wild tigers throughout their range and would undermine existing conservation and enforcement efforts • SSN recommends that the CoP acknowledge: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪statements by the traditional medicine industry that tiger bone is neither needed nor wanted by them and is not necessary for human health (American College of Traditional Chinese Medicine 2006) ▪that with the advent of the 1993 domestic trade ban in China, tiger farms should have been phased out, as the specimens in these facilities do not serve any conservation purpose • SSN acknowledges the positive impact of awareness campaigns amongst Himalayan communities, resulting in a significant decline in use of Asian big cat skins among this particular segment of the market, and welcomes efforts to improve regional enforcement cooperation to combat trans-Himalayan trade • SSN notes that only 6 out of 21 Asian big cat range States submitted reports (contained as Annexes to Doc. 52) and supports the Secretariat's invitation for civil

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At SC54 the CITES Secretariat recommended a high-level enforcement summit, while the United States of America (USA) recommended that the SC agree to parameters by which progress in range States is measured and that trade suspensions be considered if inadequate progress is made • SC54 deferred this matter to CoP14 and asked range States again to submit reports 		<p>society to alert the CITES community to specific instances of concern as a more effective way of focusing CITES efforts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN urges the CoP to carefully review country reports, independent reports and the Secretariat's verification mission report to CoP14 to determine if there is adequate evidence of effective law enforcement, using standard performance indicators routinely used by law enforcement agencies • In the event that Parties fail to provide verifiable evidence of effective enforcement, SSN urges the CoP to employ the full range of measures available to them, including trade suspensions as recommended by the USA at SC54 • SSN urges the CoP not to defer decisions and discussion to a later SC or CoP in light of the current tiger conservation crisis • SSN notes with great concern that Doc. 52 (Annex 1), the country report from China: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ fails to address RC 12.5, Paragraph (d) under "Urges", to ensure controls are in place to prevent tiger parts and derivatives from entering illegal trade from or through captive breeding facilities ▪ in contravention of RC 12.5, Paragraph (e) under "Urges", indicates that stockpiles of tiger parts and derivatives are not being consolidated and destroyed • SSN notes that, regarding Doc. 52 (Annex 2), the country report from India: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ there are no data indicating that seizures of Asian big cat specimens are leading to convictions and the disruption of criminal networks ▪ between 1999 and 2004, 91 tigers were found dead due to poaching and a further 153 tiger skins and 817 leopard skins were seized (Wildlife Protection Society of India) ▪ over 600 individuals have been arrested in association with these seizures but only 10 have been convicted (ibid) • In the absence of a country report from Nepal, SSN looks forward to a verbal report on progress relating to improved legislative protection for the leopard

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Doc. 53.1</p> <p>Elephants: Trade in Elephant Specimens</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<p><u>The Action Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), on Trade in elephant specimens, makes recommendations on the control of trade in ivory • Decision 13.26 contains an action plan for the control of trade in African elephant ivory that requests range States to submit reports detailing progress on its implementation, including in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ paragraph 1, “<i>All African elephant range States should urgently: a) prohibit the unregulated domestic sale of ivory (raw, semi-worked or worked). Legislation should include a provision which places the onus of proof of lawful possession upon any person found in possession of ivory in circumstances from which it can reasonably be inferred that such possession was for the purpose of unauthorized transfer, sale, offer for sale, exchange or export or any person transporting ivory for such purposes; b) issue instructions to all law enforcement and border control agencies to enforce existing or new legislation rigorously; and c) engage in public awareness campaigns publicizing existing or new prohibitions on ivory sales</i>” ▪ paragraph 2, “<i>Parties should, by 31 March 2005, report to the Secretariat on progress made. Such reports should include details of seizures, copies of new legislation, copies of administrative instructions or orders to enforcement agencies and details of awareness campaigns. The Secretariat should report on Parties’ progress at the 53rd meeting of the Standing Committee</i>” ▪ paragraph 5, “<i>All elephant range States are recommended to cooperate with existing research projects studying the identification of ivory, especially by supplying relevant samples for DNA and other forensic science profiling</i>” 	<p><u>The Action Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat advises that if the CoP decides the action plan should continue to be implemented, the wording will need to be updated for adoption as a Decision of CoP14 • 19 African range States have provided progress reports on implementation of the action plan, while 18 have not • Though the Secretariat expressed disappointment about the lack of implementation of the action plan, it states that failure to report on progress alone should not result in trade suspensions and that it would only recommend trade sanctions in cases involving “<i>serious non-compliance</i>” • Thailand’s written report on steps it has taken to implement the action plan is contained in Doc. 53.1, Annex 2 <p><u>Mission to Zimbabwe</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat, during its mission to Zimbabwe (6 - 10 December 2006), found a “<i>degree of complacency</i>” in the implementation of controls and made suggestions for improvement, but found no evidence of corruption or that ivory of illicit origin was entering Zimbabwe’s domestic markets, and concluded that the control systems in Zimbabwe were basically sound <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat states that no additional measures need be taken at CoP14 in relation to Zimbabwe’s ivory trade <p><u>Potential ivory trading partners</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat will submit an updated report concerning Japan at SC55 and hopes to make a recommendation regarding China’s position as a potential trading partner <p><u>Illegal ivory trade</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat notes that illegal trade continues to occur at serious levels and “<i>in a highly organized manner</i>”, and that seizures of ivory totaling “<i>well over 20 tonnes</i>”, all of African origin, have been made in the last 18 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <p><u>The Action Plan</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointment has been expressed over the Action Plan’s implementation (WWF/TRAFFIC 2006) • SSN recommends that the CoP adopt a revision to Decision 13.26 that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ continues and updates the action plan, noting the need for more resources for implementation ▪ expands paragraphs 1, 2 and 5 to Asian countries with unregulated ivory markets as these are the main destinations for illegal ivory ▪ establishes compliance provisions and deadlines for implementation of components of the action plan, particularly those in paragraph 1 ▪ clarifies in paragraph 8 whether it is the role of the Secretariat or SC to recommend a suspension of trade in case of non-compliance • Contrary to the Secretariat’s interpretation, failure to submit progress reports should be considered a failure to implement the action plan and grounds for a suspension of trade. As was the case with regard to Parties failing to provide annual reports, a warning could be given before the suspension came into effect • In the interest of transparency and to enable evaluation of compliance with the action plan, information in the progress reports should be publicly available to the extent possible <p><u>Mission to Zimbabwe</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN disagrees that no further steps need to be taken in relation to Zimbabwe’s ivory trade and urges the CoP to direct the SC to further assess 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 RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP13)) • 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 “<i>2.5 fold increase in the number of dead elephants</i>” was observed in the

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>▪ paragraph 8, “<i>In cases where Parties or non-Parties are found not to implement the action plan, or where ivory is found to be illegally sold, the Secretariat should issue a Notification to the Parties advising them that the Conference of the Parties recommends that Parties should not engage in commercial trade in specimens of CITES-listed species with the country in question</i>”</p> <p>▪ paragraph 9, “<i>The Secretariat should continue to monitor all domestic ivory markets outside Africa to ensure that internal controls are adequate and comply with the relevant provisions of Resolution Conf.10.10 (Rev. CoP12) on Trade in elephant specimens. Priority should be given to China, Japan and Thailand, with particular attention being paid to any Party that has notified the Secretariat that it wishes to authorize imports of ivory for commercial purposes</i>”</p> <p><u>Mission to Zimbabwe</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At SC54, following reports of illegal exports to China of ivory obtained from government stocks, the Secretariat was directed to conduct a mission to Zimbabwe to assess ivory trade controls and enforcement <p><u>Potential ivory trading partners</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China and Japan requested they be designated as importing countries for the one-off sale of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa conditionally agreed at CoP12 • The Secretariat conducted missions to China and Japan to verify ivory trade controls • At SC54 the SC designated Japan as a trading partner and requested the Secretariat to provide an update on Japan at SC55 and “<i>bring to the attention of the Committee any reason for reviewing Japan as a trading partner</i>” SC54 Sum. 9 (Rev. 1) 	<p>months (before January 2007)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • China continues to be the main destination, but Japan “<i>has also seen significant seizures</i>” • Nevertheless the Secretariat states that until the ETIS report to CoP14 is presented it is difficult to determine if the increase in seizures reflects an increase in illicit trade or better law enforcement, more awareness among enforcement agencies or more accurate reporting 	<p>Sebungwe area, for which illegal killing was at least partly responsible; in Northwest Matabeleland, a partial survey revealed “<i>a considerable increase in the carcass ratio (i.e. the ratio of dead elephants to all elephants both dead and alive), from 3.2% in 2001 to 5.6% in 2006</i>”; tusks were missing in 90% of elephants found</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN is concerned that the Secretariat only met with government officials and others with an interest in ensuring that no evidence of corruption or problems with the control system were found • The Secretariat’s report fails to address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ illegal trade of ivory out of Zimbabwe (e.g. to China or South Africa); ▪ poaching of elephants; or ▪ how ivory from government-owned stocks entered illegal markets • CoP14 Prop. 6 (Annex 4) submitted by Kenya and Mali cites evidence that poaching, ivory trade and sport hunting are uncontrolled in Zimbabwe • Senior army and police officials, and a deputy government minister, are reportedly involved in poaching (Zim Online 2006). Gratwicke and Stapelkamp (2006) report recent incidences of alleged corruption affecting wildlife management and state that efforts to curb poaching are sometimes hindered by “<i>direct interference by the State</i>” <p><u>Potential ivory trading partners:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designation of a Party as a “<i>potential trading partner</i>” will inevitably influence the global illegal ivory market. The consequences are especially worrying given that China and Japan are the main destinations of illegal ivory. In light of the number of significant seizures since CoP13, especially in China and Japan, SSN recommends that potential trading partners should be decided at CoP14, not SC55, to allow all Parties to consider all the issues at stake • Neither Japan nor China have sufficient trade controls to prevent illegal ivory entering the legal market and should not be designated trading partners. Illegal imports into China continue and loopholes in regulations persist (IFAW 2005 and 2006)

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> China has not yet been approved as a trading partner 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At SC54, a number of serious problems with Japan's ivory trade controls were raised by Parties (JWCS 2006, IFAW 2006, TRAFFIC/WWF 2006). These need to be addressed by the Secretariat and Japan's approval reviewed <p><u>Illegal trade:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considerable evidence suggests there has been a marked increase in illicit trade since CoP13 (Doc 53.4 and CoP14 Prop. 6). However, the Secretariat implies that the increase in seizures could also be due to better law enforcement, more awareness among enforcement agencies or more accurate reporting. This would suggest that similar quantities of ivory were being smuggled prior to CoP13 but simply undetected or unreported, and if so, would be a cause for even more concern Reasons behind an increase in seizures or poaching cannot be established with certainty. However, whatever the reasons are for the current high level of illegal trade, releasing more ivory into the market at such a time would be irresponsible. SSN therefore supports the call for a moratorium (per CoP14 Prop. 6) to allow time to bring illegal ivory trade under control
<p>Doc. 53.4</p> <p>Elephants: Illegal Ivory Trade and Control of Internal Markets</p> <p>Kenya and Mali</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This document establishes that the estimated total amount of ivory reported seized since CoP13 is 41,043 kg which indicates a total of about 20,000 elephants poached annually since CoP13 to supply illegal ivory markets (the document evaluates that if enforcement authorities seize 15% of illegal ivory, nearly 274 tonnes of ivory were in trade which represents about 39,550 elephants) At SC54, the Director of ETIS (Elephant Trade Information System) reported an increase in seizures and organized crimes in the last year, and that government stockpiles were disappearing in some countries At CoP13, Parties adopted an Action Plan for the control of trade in African elephant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document supports Prop. 6, also submitted by Kenya and Mali, and the Action Plan on trade in African elephant ivory. It provides an analysis of domestic ivory markets in several countries The information available leads to the following conclusions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> large-scale, poorly regulated domestic ivory markets fuel illegal trade and poaching and present a major enforcement problem legal trade in worked ivory products for domestic markets and tourist souvenirs provides an opportunity for laundering large quantities of illegal ivory the continued existence of large volumes of "legal" ivory on the international market through stockpile sales of raw ivory and exemptions for trade in ivory products from 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ghana and Togo, range States for the species, strongly support this document and would have been co-sponsors if circumstances had allowed Evidence of increased poaching for illegal trade shows that stronger action is required by CITES to protect elephants against the harmful effects of international trade The adoption of a 20-year moratorium on ivory trade will send a clear message to the public and to people involved in illegal trade. It will also allow Parties to respond to the threat of increasing poaching and unlimited illegal trade by strengthening enforcement capacity in elephant range States, especially those in central and west Africa and Asia where elephant populations are small and fragmented, and expanding the use of DNA profiling to trace shipments and assist investigations

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>ivory. The Plan calls, <i>inter alia</i>, for the prohibition of all unregulated domestic sales of ivory in all African range States (except Parties for which an annotation in the Appendices authorizes trade in worked ivory, i.e. Zimbabwe and Namibia) and <i>in situ</i> verification missions. It further calls on the Secretariat to monitor all domestic ivory markets outside Africa to ensure that internal controls are adequate and comply with the requirements of RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP12), with priority being given to China, Japan and Thailand. A suspension of commercial trade in specimens of CITES-listed species is recommended where Parties or non-Parties are found not to implement the Action Plan or where ivory is found to be illegally sold</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC.10.10 (Rev.CoP12) on trade in elephant specimens makes recommendations to Parties on the control of trade in ivory 	<p>Namibia and Zimbabwe, renders effective enforcement impossible and fuels the laundering of ivory from poached elephants through the market</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doc. 53.4 proposes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a 20-year moratorium on ivory trade which would give Parties time to bring illegal trade under control; ensure implementation of the Action Plan; secure enforcement; determine the effects of the one-off sale agreed at CoP12 (which would not be affected); and refine MIKE ▪ amendments to RC.10.10 (Rev.CoP12) on trade in elephant specimens which would, <i>inter alia</i>, prohibit domestic sales of ivory (unless proved legally acquired) in all Parties not designated as ivory importing countries; introduce new recommendations on illegal trade; strengthen trade controls in designated ivory importing countries; and urge those Parties to financially support verification and on-site missions ▪ Parties are urged not to submit downlisting proposals during the proposed 20-year moratorium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disappointment has been expressed over implementation of the Action Plan (WWF/TRAFFIC, Joint briefing for SC54, September 2006) • Updating and improving the requirements laid out in RC10.10 (Rev. CoP12) will strengthen ivory trade controls in countries outside Africa and support and extend the effect of the Action Plan to regulate domestic markets. If implemented, new provisions on illegal trade will enable more effective enforcement to combat such trade • In order to prevent laundering of privately owed ivory into the trade, SSN suggests an additional amendment to RC 10.10 that would require in designated ivory importing countries: registration of whole tusks of any size, and cut pieces of ivory that are 20cm or more in length or one kilogram or more in weight regardless of the possessor's intention to trade them
<p>Doc. 54 Rhinoceroses Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13), on Conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses, directs the SC to pursue actions aimed at reducing illegal trade in rhinos • Decisions 13.23 and 13.24 direct the Parties to support the work of the IUCN/SSC African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups in regard to information collection • Decision 13.25 directs the Secretariat to invite the Rhino Specialist Groups to share information on the status, trade, and management of rhino species and provide a written summary to CoP14 including recommendations for further reporting • Regarding indicators for success, SC54 agreed that the best solution is for the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a report by IUCN and TRAFFIC on status, trade, illegal killing, conservation and management strategies for the species, and on CITES matters relating to rhinos • Proposes amending RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13), to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ delete the role of the SC in ensuring that standardized indicators of success are developed and/or refined to measure changes in levels of illegal hunting and of the status of rhino populations in range States ▪ recommend that the IUCN/SSC African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC submit, at least six months before each CoP, a written report to the Secretariat on status, trade, illegal killing and conservation and management strategies for rhinos, with an evaluation of their effectiveness 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART <u><i>IUCN/TRAFFIC report</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 13.25 invites IUCN to share information on status, poaching, trade and conservation and management strategies concerning African and Asian rhinoceros species. It does not seek an evaluation of CITES rhino-related Decisions as contained in section 4 "<i>CITES rhino matters – a report back</i>". IUCN and TRAFFIC have exceeded their mandate by presenting such an evaluation <u><i>Amendments to RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13)</i></u> • SSN supports deleting the provision in RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) regarding development of standardized indicators and agrees in part with the recommendation that IUCN and TRAFFIC should submit a report to each CoP • SSN believes that the proposed IUCN/TRAFFIC report should only describe conservation and management

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>Rhino Specialist Groups to continue collating and reporting on rhino issues, drawing on information from ongoing monitoring rather than developing a new, potentially complex or expensive indicator process</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪direct the Secretariat to review the report and formulate recommendations for consideration by the CoP ▪urge Parties to support the IUCN/SSC African and Asian Rhino Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC in their work for reporting to the Secretariat • Proposes the adoption of a Decision directing the rhino range States and Parties that have stocks of rhino horns and derivatives to declare the status of their stocks before CoP15 • Proposes the adoption of Decisions directing the Secretariat to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪invite TRAFFIC to review information on the rhino horn stocks in range States and routes of illegal trade, with priority given to those countries where there has been a recent increase in poaching levels, where discrepancies might exist in stockpiles, where stockpiles are unknown or where insufficient cross-border collaboration to combat illegal rhino horn trade has been reported ▪request IUCN and TRAFFIC to include an analysis of stocks of rhino horns and derivatives and illegal trade in rhino horns in their reporting to the Secretariat pursuant to RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) and for CoP15 ▪examine the implementation of RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) in States where poaching of rhinos appears to have increased, particularly in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Nepal and Zimbabwe ▪collaborate with the World Heritage Convention in addressing rhino poaching and illegal trade issues in World Heritage sites in the DRC ▪encourage relevant range States to link rhino conservation actions with the CITES program for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) ▪report on the implementation of this Decision 	<p>strategies as well as the status of and threats to rhino populations. It should not include an evaluation of the effectiveness of conservation actions and management strategies (or of the effects of CITES Decisions). Such an evaluation may cause the report to lose its objectivity and may not reflect views of all the range States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed amendment to RC. 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) should be amended as follows (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough): “<u>DIRECTS the Secretariat, in consultation with the Standing Committee and range States, to review the report...</u>”; the SC and range States should review and comment on the proposed IUCN/TRAFFIC report and any resulting recommendations before it is submitted to the CoP • Some unexplained reductions in reported stockpiles have been recorded between 2004 and 2006 from Botswana and Zimbabwe; the current provision in RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) urging “<i>all Parties that have stocks of rhinoceros horn to identify, mark, register and secure all such stocks</i>” is insufficient. Parties should be urged to destroy the stocks as is the case in RC 12.5 on conservation of tigers and Asian big cats, and used to be the case in RC 6.10, which was the predecessor of RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) on rhinos <p><u>Draft Decisions</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the draft Decisions with the exception of Decision c) directing the Secretariat to encourage range States to link rhino conservation actions with MIKE. Such a move could lead to an inappropriate focus on MIKE sites • The draft Decisions should include a provision for the SC to follow-up with range States where problems are identified with poaching, trade or discrepancies with stockpiles as in Botswana and Zimbabwe. TRAFFIC should be requested to report to the SC on these matters and the SC should be directed to review TRAFFIC’s report, follow-up with the identified range States and recommend measures for non-compliance with RC 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) if necessary

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Doc. 55</p> <p>Tibetan Antelope</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC 11.8 (Rev. CoP13), on Conservation of and control of trade in the Tibetan antelope, directs the SC to undertake a regular review of enforcement measures taken by the Parties in eliminating the illicit trade in Tibetan antelope products and to report the results at each meeting of the CoP 	<p>at SC57 and CoP15</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a summary of the work conducted in relation to Tibetan antelope Regarding Thailand, welcomes enforcement action against shahtoosh shawl traders but reports that Thailand has not responded to an SC request to prepare a report for CoP14 on its enforcement of the Convention and progress in adopting new legislation in relation to the illicit trade in Tibetan antelope Regarding India, reports that a committee has determined that captive-breeding of Tibetan antelope for commercial purposes should not be considered Regarding China, reports that China advised SC54 that its populations were estimated to have increased to 200,000 but concludes that regular seizure of shatoosh products along with evidence of poaching in China demonstrates that illicit trade of Tibetan antelope continues to be a problem Notes that shawls on the market made from goat wool have been mistakenly identified by experienced officers as shahtoosh. It has also been noted that shawls are available that contain a mixture of shahtoosh and other fine wools Indicates that forensic science facilities around the world have the skills to identify the wool of Tibetan antelope 	<p>ACTION NEEDED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As illegal hunting of Tibetan antelope continues to be a serious problem, SSN supports continued efforts to address the illicit trade in Tibetan antelope products through RC 11.8 (Rev. CoP13) SSN is concerned that Thailand has not reported on its enforcement of the Convention as requested at SC54, particularly in relation the adequacy of Thailand's domestic legislation to address poaching of the Tibetan antelope or the illicit trade in its wool, and its law enforcement capabilities SSN recommends that appropriate non-compliance mechanisms be applied if Thailand does not produce the requested report for CoP14 SSN strongly encourages the Parties to direct the Secretariat to immediately provide advice on distinguishing Tibetan antelope wool from other wool products to all law enforcement agencies and not only to those that may request such advice
<p>Doc. 56</p> <p>Saiga Antelope</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The saiga antelope (<i>Saiga tatarica</i>) was included in Appendix II in 1995 Trade in the species from Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation has been suspended by the SC under the Significant Trade Review since 2001, with the allowance of trade in live specimens from breeding facilities for conservation purposes at SC54 Decisions 13.27 to 13.35 direct: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parties to report on their saiga stockpiles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reports that significant stockpiles of saiga horns have been accumulated in Asian countries that trade in and consume saiga antelope; it appears that seized saiga parts in Mongolia, the Russian Federation, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan seem to simply disappear from government control Notes that the Russian Federation is the only range State that has not signed the MoU Recommends that the Parties adopt Decisions regarding saiga, directing: 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The saiga antelope has been listed as Critically Endangered by IUCN since 2002; the population has shown an observed decline of over 90% in the last 10 years due to poaching and illegal trade SSN supports the proposed Decisions but also urges the Parties to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> direct the SC to apply appropriate non-compliance mechanisms to Kazakhstan and the Russian Federation as they continue to export specimens despite SC recommendations to suspend imports

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪donor Parties, aid agencies and NGOs to aid conservation of the saiga through donations, monitoring, and other activities ▪the SC to discuss trade and conservation of saiga at SC53 and SC54 ▪range States to insure the conservation of the species and sign the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) concerning Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use of the Saiga Antelope (<i>Saiga tatarica tatarica</i>) ▪the Secretariat to cooperate with the Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) on saiga issues including the MoU, work with range and consumer countries on conservation of saiga, undertake missions to the range and consumer States, and report to SC53, SC54 and CoP14 on implementation of the Decisions • The MoU on the saiga antelope came into effect on 24 September 2006 • A technical workshop on saiga management and conservation was held in September 2006; the meeting endorsed a Medium-Term International Work Program for the saiga antelope (2007-2011) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the Secretariat to work with CMS in implementation of the Work Program, organize a second meeting of the signatories of the MOU, and report on implementation of related Decisions at CoP15 ▪consumer and trading States to collaborate in managing and controlling trade in saiga antelope, develop coherent policies and procedures for the disposal of confiscated saiga parts and derivatives, reduce consumption of saiga, improve trade controls and enforcement, and report on implementation of these Decisions in their biennial reports ▪Parties and others to assist all range States and consumer countries with the conservation of the saiga antelope • Current status and trade of saiga horns are summarized in reports from the IUCN/SSC Antelope Specialist Group and TRAFFIC, appended to the document, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the equivalent of 518,000 to 931,500 saiga horns were traded by CITES parties between 1995 and 2004 representing 259,000 to 465,700 male saiga ▪the saiga population has declined from 1.25 million in the mid-1970s to an estimated 56,300-61,300 today as a result of poaching and illegal trade in horns and meat. Over the past decade, the population has declined by over 90% but is now stable ▪citing national reports, the IUCN/ SSC Antelope Specialist Group claims that the Russian population of saiga antelope is 15,000-20,000 and stable; Kazakstan, 40,000, increasing; Turkmenistan, 2000 in some winters, stable; Uzbekistan, 15,000 in winter, declining; Mongolia, 2000, declining 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪direct the SC to report on the implementation of the Decisions at SC57 and SC58 ▪delete text from the Work Program that seeks to use trophy hunting as a means to generate funding for conservation of the species. Populations have not recovered sufficiently to permit a legal hunt; trophy hunting, like hunting for the horn trade, targets males, resulting in skewed sex ratios and reproductive collapse; governments unable to control poaching, illegal trade or properly monitor existing stockpiles of horns or other seized parts would be equally unable to control legalized hunting ▪Given the status of the species, indications that government officials are involved in the illegal hunting of and trade in saiga products, and that current stocks in China (the largest importer and consumer) are likely to last only for another six years while wild populations will not sufficiently recover to meet demand in that time, SSN encourages the Parties to invite a CoP15 proposal to list the species in Appendix I
<p>Doc. 57</p> <p>Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 11.9 (Rev. CoP13), on Conservation of and trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles, urges Parties authorizing trade in these species to include information on progress 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat recommends: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪that Asian range States assess the need to maintain reporting obligations specified in RC 11.9 (Rev. CoP13), and delete 	<p>OPPOSE IN PART / SUPPORT IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN does not agree that important reporting requirements should be deleted because of lack of compliance; instead, ways should be found to improve

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Secretariat</p>	<p>in implementing this Resolution in their periodic reports</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decision 13.36 directs the Secretariat to summarize this information for consideration at CoP14; however, as of 7 January 2007, no information had been received; biennial reporting format does not allow for reporting on species management issues Decision 13.37 directs the Secretariat to (a) liaise with the World Customs Organization to promote the establishment and use of specific headings within the standard tariff classifications of the Harmonized System for tortoises, freshwater turtles and their products; (b) ensure that the proceedings of the Kunming workshop on conservation of and trade in tortoises and freshwater turtles are available on the CITES website (done as of April 2002); and (c) report to CoP14 	<p>recommendation to provide reports should these not be of interest or helpful to range States</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> renewing Decision 13.37 (a) if necessary, but directing it specifically to Parties in the Asian region amending the biennial report format to allow for specific reporting on species management issues called for in Resolutions or Decisions 	<p>the level of compliance with RC 11.9 (Rev. CoP13)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN agrees that Decision 13.37 (a) should be renewed, but does not agree that it should apply only to Asia as the turtle trade affects other Parties and regions SSN supports amending the biennial report format, as such a change should encourage greater compliance with specific reporting
<p>Doc. 58</p> <p>Hawksbill Turtle</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The hawksbill sea turtle (<i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i>) is listed in Appendix I Decision 13.38 (which followed a similar request in Decision 12.44) requests States and territories in the wider Caribbean to develop and implement regional conservation strategies and national management plans (including measures to reduce illegal catch and illegal trade in hawksbill turtles and parts and derivatives) and report to the Secretariat on their progress Decision 13.41 directs the Secretariat to collate reports on this progress and present a written summary at CoP14 Decision 13.40 directs the Secretariat to arrange a meeting of the region on the hawksbill turtle, subject to funding. The Secretariat is still searching for funding for this meeting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> At the time this document was prepared by the Secretariat, reports had been received from the Bahamas, Cuba, Nicaragua, and Saint Kitts and Nevis and Saint Lucia. None of the States that are party to the Inter-American Convention for the protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) provided reports In view of no proposal having been submitted to change the hawksbill listing status, the apparent lack of interest from Parties to comply with Decisions 13.38 and 12.44, and lack of funding to comply with Decision 13.40, the Secretariat does not recommend further action on this matter at present 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a continued need for a regional conservation strategy for hawksbill turtles in the wider Caribbean region and a need for reporting in regard to management and illegal trade. SSN urges the Parties, while officially noting that there is no interest in amending the Appendices to change this listing, to adopt Decisions directing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Secretariat to request Parties in the region to create national management plans and work together to develop a regional conservation strategy in collaboration with multilateral environmental agreements and relevant organizations States and territories in the region to provide national reports and to comply with the CITES Decisions. Reports should be provided irrespective of whether there is a species proposal for consideration (which in the past appears to have acted as an incentive to report) States and territories in the region to report on incidents of illegal trade of the hawksbill turtle (or sea turtle products) within their country and report on enforcement efforts to control such trade

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the Secretariat to request that the Secretariats of the IAC and SPAW (Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the Wider Caribbean's Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife) ask member countries that are also CITES Parties to send reports on their hawksbill conservation efforts to the CITES Secretariat ▪the Secretariat to collate information and reports received from the CITES Parties, and present a written summary at CoP15 ▪the Secretariat to arrange a meeting of the region on the hawksbill turtle with mandates to stem illegal trade, to advance conservation and to improve management of the species
<p>Doc. 59.2</p> <p>Sharks: Additional Conservation Measures</p> <p>Australia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Three shark species, the great white, whale and basking, are currently listed in Appendix II of CITES ● Of the 547 shark and ray species assessed by the IUCN, 20% are listed as threatened with extinction ● Shark populations continue to decline. Studies suggest that 100 to 200 million sharks are killed each year ● Most shark populations are poorly managed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Only four of the top 20 shark fishing countries have developed National Plans of Action (NPOAs) under the U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization's International Plan of Action-Sharks (FAO's IPOA-Sharks) ▪Many countries do not use species-specific and product specific customs codes; as a result catch and trade data are not accurately reported ▪The lack of accurate catch and trade data is exacerbated by the large number of sharks that are retained as bycatch. It is estimated that 50% of the total shark catch is bycatch ▪Finning also complicates the problem by increasing the difficulty of identification. A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Recommends that CoP14 adopt a decision that directs Parties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪to request, through their delegations to RFMOs, that these RFMOs implement regional plans of actions as contemplated by IPOA-Sharks. To assist in accurate species identification, these plans should require a weight ratio not exceeding 5% fin to 95% dressed carcass or 2% fin to 98% whole body weight be required when landed ▪to report catch and landing data at a species level to the FAO and RFMO ▪to amend, through their delegations to Council on Fisheries (COFI), COFI catch data fields to require species-specific reporting ● Recommends that CoP14 adopt a decision calling on FAO through COFI to assist countries with limited management capabilities ● Recommends that CoP14 adopt a decision directing the AC to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪review with COFI the technical workshop's finding ▪prepare a discussion paper for CoP15 which includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●an analysis of shark mortality resulting from both legal fishing and IUU (illegal, 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The FAO established IPOA-Sharks to aid in the conservation and management of shark species. NPOAs are an integral part of IPOA-Sharks. Completing an NPOA encourages States to analyze the status of shark populations and determine possible past and future threats to shark populations. NPOA could be an invaluable tool in filling current information gaps. States should be encouraged to complete NPOA. RFMOs should also be encouraged to complete NPOA, particularly since sharks are migratory ● The lack of accurate reporting makes it difficult to ascertain shark population levels and exact quantities traded. This information is vital if appropriate management measures are to be taken ● Shark finning increases the difficulty of accurate species identification, increases the number of sharks killed, and is wasteful. Requiring a mandatory landing ratio based on fin to whole body weight should be the minimum conservation measure taken. Finning bans that require the fin to be attached to the shark body when landed are preferable and should be used when practicable ● Due to the high value of shark products, IUU fishing has become a serious threat to shark populations. Since up to 80% of shark catch is unreported it is difficult to know how much is caught illegally. IUU fishing poses a serious threat to global fish stocks and can undermine

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>number of States and six Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) have begun regulating finning (the process of removing and retaining a shark's fin and discarding the rest of the shark) through bans or mandatory landing ratios based on fin to body weight</p>	<p>unregulated, unreported) fishing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •the identification of successful catch reductions which have been maintained •potential trade measures that can ensure sustainable shark populations in the wild •proposed data collection forms for parties to document seizures of IUU caught sharks and shark specimens <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends that CoP14 adopt a decision directing the Secretariat, with COFI, to convene a technical committee to assist the AC in preparing its report for CoP15 	<p>management schemes. Increased information about the effect of IUU fishing on shark populations is necessary to determine what measures should be implemented to combat the problem. Data collection forms from Parties can ensure a more accurate picture of the problem is known</p>
<p>Doc. 59.3</p> <p>Sharks: Trade Measures Regarding the Porbeagle <i>Lamna nasus</i> and the Spiny Dogfish <i>Squalus acanthias</i></p> <p>Germany on behalf of the European Community Member States</p>	<p><u><i>Lamna nasus</i> (porbeagle shark):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an apex predator characterized by a long life span, slow growth, and low fecundity. These characteristics make this species vulnerable to over-exploitation • Populations have experienced dramatic declines: in the Northeast Atlantic and the Mediterranean the species is listed as Critically Endangered (IUCN 2006), in the Southern Hemisphere the species is listed as Near Threatened (IUCN 2006), and in the Northwest Atlantic the species is listed as Endangered (IUCN 2006) • Targeted and incidental fisheries are primary threats to the species • Products, primarily meat and fins, are traded internationally <p><u><i>Squalus acanthias</i> (spiny dogfish shark):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is an apex predator with a long life span, slow growth rate, and low fecundity. These characteristics make the species vulnerable to over-exploitation • Populations have experienced dramatic declines: the Northeast Atlantic subpopulation is Critically Endangered (IUCN 2006), the Northwest Atlantic, Mediterranean, and Northwest Pacific subpopulations are Endangered (IUCN 2006), the Northeast Pacific, Black Sea, and South American subpopulations are 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directs the AC, in consultation with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and other experts, to examine trade in <i>Lamna nasus</i> and report at CoP16 any specific quotas or trade measures that may be necessary to ensure exports do not exceed levels that would be detrimental to the survival of the species • Directs the AC, in consultation with the FAO and other experts, to examine both legal and illegal trade in <i>Squalus acanthias</i> and report at CoP16 any specific quotas or trade measures that may be necessary to ensure exports do not exceed levels that would be detrimental to the survival of the species 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Currently both <i>Lamna nasus</i> and <i>Squalus acanthias</i> have little management. Trade and catch statistics are incomplete. A more complete understanding of the numbers of these species caught and traded could indicate increased management of trade is necessary to ensure population levels do not continue to decline • The FAO and other experts, particularly RFMOs (Regional Fisheries Management Organizations), can provide valuable information that can contribute to a more complete understanding of trade in these two species. Collaboration between CITES authorities, experts, and management organizations can increase communication that can lead to better management policies

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>Vulnerable (IUCN 2006) and the Australasia and Southern African subpopulations are listed as Least Concern, but the population trend for the Southern African subpopulation is declining (IUCN 2006)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitat loss, target fisheries and incidental fisheries are the primary threats to the species Meat is the primary product in trade. Fins, teeth, and jaws are also traded to a lesser extent Catch and trade statistics for both the <i>Squalus acanthias</i> and <i>Lamna nasus</i> are incomplete 		
<p>Doc. 60.1</p> <p>Sturgeons and Paddlefish: Report of the Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions 13.44, 13.45, and 13.46 direct interested Parties to undertake an assessment of the technical and legal feasibility to establish a database concerning trade in sturgeon specimens subject to annual quotas as outlined in RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13), submit a proposal for a database pilot project for consideration by SC54, and report on the outcome at CoP14 Decision 13.47 directs the Secretariat, subject to the SC's support for a pilot project, to forward, on a regular basis, all relevant information and documentation to the relevant Party in charge UNEP-WCMC offered to adapt the CITES Trade Database so that information relating to sturgeon quotas and data collected from export and import permits and re-export certificates issued by the Parties for trade in caviar could be entered. This enables the database to track trade in caviar and identify anomalies in any permits or certificates that are issued SC54 noted the establishment of the database and encouraged Parties to submit copies of permits and certificates 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Secretariat notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> while this feature of the trade database is operational, the effectiveness of the database is completely dependent upon the regular submission of copies of export permits and re-export certificates issued to authorize trade in caviar; several Parties are complying with the recommendation in an exemplary fashion, but many more Parties that engage in trade in caviar have yet to submit any copies of permits or certificates; SC54 was provided a report on an international sturgeon enforcement workshop hosted by the European Commission, 27- 29 June 2006, to assist the combating of illegal trade in caviar; and SC54 established a working group to review issues related to the trade in caviar and the conservation of sturgeons and paddlefish 	<p>NOTED</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The adaptation of the CITES Trade Database will permit the Secretariat to track trade in caviar and the application of quotas for sturgeon. As sturgeon species are in serious decline and high levels of poaching and illegal trade continue, any trade in sturgeon products must be carefully monitored SSN is grateful to UNEP-WCMC for adapting the database and to the European Commission for funding this work SSN encourages the SC to recommend appropriate non-compliance mechanisms if Parties fail to submit copies of permits or certificates issued to authorize trade in caviar SSN also urges the Parties to address the Secretariat's approval of 2007 export quotas for wild beluga caviar in February of this year. The most recent range State survey shows a 45% decline in the Caspian beluga sturgeon population from 2004 to 2005 (Caviar Emptor 2007); quotas should not be approved for the species until it has recovered
<p>Doc. 60.2.1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) on Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish: 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is submitted on behalf of the SC Working Group on Sturgeons; contains 	<p>SUPPORT IN PART / OPPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN supports the following:

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Sturgeons and Paddlefish: Amendment of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13), Proposal of the Standing Committee's Working Group on Sturgeons</p> <p>Islamic Republic of Iran</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recommends that Parties not accept the import of any specimen of Acipenseriformes species from stocks shared between different range States unless the Secretariat has confirmed that catch and export quotas have been agreed by all relevant range States ▪ requires that from 2006 onward, all caviar must be exported before the end of the quota year in which it was harvested and processed. From 2006 onwards, Parties should not import caviar harvested or processed in a preceding year ▪ permits range States intending to authorize exports from shared stocks that were obtained in a preceding year to inform the Secretariat of the nature and quantities of the specimens by 31 January and export the caviar by 31 March at the latest ▪ urges range States to cooperate with the Secretariat to implement an evaluation of the implementation of the regional conservation strategy and monitoring regime for stocks of Acipenseriformes species ▪ contains CITES guidelines for a universal labeling system for the trade in and identification of caviar 	<p>amendments to RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13), including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a reduction in the personal exemption for caviar from 250 grams to 125 grams per person ▪ an extension in the length of time to export caviar from a preceding year, upon notifying the Secretariat, from 3 months (31 March) to 6 months (30 June) ▪ suggested wording from Russia that caviar and meat processed in the current year from sturgeon caught in the preceding year be permitted to be imported before the end of the year in which it has been processed ▪ a reduction in the period, from 18 months to 12 months, for which caviar can be re-exported after the date of issuance of the original export permit ▪ a one month deadline, after the (re-) export, for Parties to supply copies of all export permits and re-export certificates, for inclusion in the UNEP-WCMC database for sturgeon specimens in trade ▪ a requirement that Parties consult the UNEP-WCMC database prior to the issuance of import and re-export certificates ▪ suggested wording from Bulgaria, Kazakhstan, and Russia that if range States for a shared stock cannot reach consensus on catch and export quotas, the proposed quotas be approved with a majority of range States (not less than 2/3) approval ▪ a recommendation that export quotas be established taking into account domestic markets of caviar and meat and factor in illegal catch ▪ a recommendation that range States provide the scientific data used to establish the catch and export quotas to the Secretariat ▪ a recommendation that if quotas have not been communicated to the Secretariat and by the Secretariat to the Parties by the deadlines, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a reduction in the personal exemption for caviar to no more than 125 grams of caviar per person ▪ maintenance of text that all caviar must be exported before the end of the quota year in which it was harvested and processed. Parties should not import caviar harvested or processed in a preceding year ▪ maintenance of the current text requiring that “the Secretariat <i>has confirmed</i> (emphasis added) that catch and export quotas have been agreed by all relevant range States”(RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13). Article XII (2) (d) and (i) of the Convention give the Secretariat full authority to request information on implementation from the Parties and to insure that the conditions required by RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) for trade in caviar are fulfilled before quotas are accepted ▪ a reduction in the period for which caviar can be re-exported after the date of issuance of the original export permit ▪ a deadline of one month to supply copies of export permits to UNEP-WCMC. A concrete deadline will insure that documents are provided in an expeditious manner ▪ a recommendation for range States to provide to the Secretariat the scientific data used to establish catch and export quotas and for the Secretariat to make all the information available to Parties upon request. The availability of information on which quotas are established will assist the Parties in evaluating the effectiveness of the regional conservation strategies and the non-detrimental nature of the quotas ▪ the requirement that Parties consult the UNEP-WCMC database ▪ the recommendation that export quotas be established while taking into account domestic markets of caviar and meat and factor in illegal catch; domestic trade in these species is significant and should be considered in the establishment of catch and export quotas ▪ a zero quota for those Parties that have not met the established deadlines enhances implementation of RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) by specifying what action the Secretariat should take if one or more range States with shared stocks of Acipenseriformes species fail to

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<p>the relevant range States have a zero quota</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provides two draft options for the resolution of zero quotas (no consensus within the working group): a) until such time as they communicate their quotas in writing to the Secretariat and the Secretariat in turn informs the Parties; b) until such time as the Secretariat has reviewed any further information in consultation with the Chairman of the AC and has in turn informed the Parties ▪ directs the Secretariat to provide to the AC a written report on the implementation of the regional conservation strategy and monitoring regime for stocks of Acipenseriformes species 	<p>comply with the Resolution's provisions within the agreed time-frames. Such zero quotas should be maintained until range State(s) communicate their quotas in writing to the Secretariat and the Secretariat in turn informs the Parties. All range States should be held to the same requirements for quota establishment rather than making some subject to consultation with the AC</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a written report by the Secretariat for the AC on the outcome of the evaluation of the implementation of the regional conservation strategy and monitoring regime will allow the AC to monitor the implementation of the regional conservation strategy ● <u>SSN opposes the following:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ any extension of the length of time that caviar from the previous year can be traded, including Russia's proposal to permit export of caviar and sturgeon meat from fish captured in the previous year. Such extensions will make it increasingly difficult to distinguish between caviar harvested one year to the next, and thereby increase the possibility of exceeded quotas and laundering of illegally obtained caviar into the legal trade ▪ approval of quotas with a majority vote on the part of range States. There must be consensus on range State approval of catch and export quotas; otherwise, a majority of the States might unfairly vote themselves unsustainable quotas and/or a disproportionate share of the harvest and export quotas
<p>Doc. 60.2.2</p> <p>Sturgeons and Paddlefish: Amendment of Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13), Proposal of the Russian Federation</p> <p>Russian Federation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) on Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ recommends that Parties not accept the import of any specimen of Acipenseriformes species from stocks shared between different range States unless the Secretariat has confirmed that catch and export quotas have been agreed by all relevant range States ▪ requires that from 2006 onward, all caviar must be exported before the end of the quota year in which it was harvested and processed. From 2006 onwards, Parties should not import caviar harvested or 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● If range States for a shared stock cannot reach consensus on catch and export quotas, the proposed quotas can be approved with a majority of range States (not less than 2/3) ● Would make the following changes under Recommends, (a)(iv)): "the Secretariat has confirmed <u>informed the Parties</u> that catch and export quotas have been agreed by all relevant range States..." The document states that the Russian Federation, Kazakhstan, Azerbaijan, and Iran support this change as they believe the current text and the approval of quotas by the Secretariat, exceeds the Secretariat's mandate under the Convention 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● There must be consensus on range State approval of catch and export quotas; otherwise, a majority of the States might unfairly vote themselves unsustainable quotas and/or a disproportionate share of the harvest and export quotas ● There is a continued need for oversight of the development of caviar quotas by the CITES Secretariat as sturgeon species are in serious decline and high levels of poaching and illegal trade continue ● Article XII (d) and (i) of the Convention give the Secretariat full authority to request information on implementation from the Parties and to insure that the

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>processed in a preceding year</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪permits range States intending to authorize exports from shared stocks that were obtained in a preceding year to inform the Secretariat of the nature and quantities of the specimens by 31 January and export the caviar by 31 March at the latest ▪urges range States to cooperate with the Secretariat to implement an evaluation of the implementation of the regional conservation strategy and monitoring regime for stocks of Acipenseriformes species ▪contains CITES guidelines for a universal labeling system for the trade in and identification of caviar 	<p>(Article XII)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would extend to 31 December, the time that caviar harvested and processed in the proceeding year can be traded • Would expand Annex 2 of RC 12.7 to include identification codes for breeds of sturgeon from the Russian Federation 	<p>conditions required by RC 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) for trade in caviar are fulfilled before quotas are accepted. The current text recommending that the Secretariat <i>confirm</i> that catch and export quotas has been agreed by all relevant range States and should be maintained</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A significant extension of the length of time that caviar from the previous year can be traded will make it increasingly difficult to distinguish between caviar harvested one year and the next, thereby increasing the possibility of exceeded quotas and laundering of illegally obtained caviar into the legal trade
<p>Doc. 61</p> <p>Toothfish: Report of CCAMLR</p> <p>Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR)</p> <p>--</p> <p>Inf. 3</p> <p>Implementation of Resolution 12.4 on Cooperation between CITES and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources Regarding Trade in Toothfish</p> <p>Australia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC12.4, on Cooperation between CITES and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) regarding trade in toothfish, "<i>ENCOURAGES CCAMLR to maintain a permanent flow of information to the Parties to CITES through the Conference of the Parties and requests that the Secretariat in turn transmit to the Secretariat of CCAMLR any information available on illicit trade in these species</i>" • Decisions 12.57 to 12.59, on Trade in toothfish, direct the Parties to report to the Secretariat their use of the <i>Dissostichus</i> Catch Document used by CCAMLR, and their verification requirements for such Catch Documents and direct the Secretariat to compile this information and send it to the Parties and to CCAMLR annually. These Decisions also direct the Secretariat to invite CCAMLR to consider how further cooperation between CITES and CCAMLR could be progressed • At CCAMLR-XXI held in 2002, the Commission concluded that the CCAMLR Catch Documentation Scheme for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. (CDS) is the appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reports that the overall coverage of the CDS now extends to more than 90 % of the global trade in toothfish • The overall level of Illegal, Unreported and Unregulated (IUU) fishing in the CCAMLR Convention Area has been reduced to about one-tenth of the level in 1996/97 but notes a small but persistent level of IUU fishing • CCAMLR notes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Vessels flagged to Equatorial Guinea and Togo are currently involved in IUU fishing in the CCAMLR Convention Area ii) Singapore continues to implement the CDS only partially iii) Hong Kong SAR has stated that it has no authority to control landings, import and export of toothfish since the species is not covered by CITES iv) Indonesia has not yet decided to implement the CDS • CCAMLR recommends that CoP14: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) request the CITES Parties mentioned above to report their position in respect of implementing RC. 12.4 and that such reports be made available to CCAMLR for consideration at its next meeting in 2007 	<p>Doc. 61 and Inf. 3: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN recommends that the Parties support adoption of Australia's draft Decisions urging Parties to implement RC 12.4 and the CDS, and to adopt reporting deadlines for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪Equatorial Guinea, Togo and other Parties involved in IUU fishing of <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. ▪those countries that are not fully implementing the CDS. ▪The partial participation of Singapore in the CDS and continued non-participation in the CDS of Indonesia and Hong Kong SAR represent a potential loophole for IUU operators because their ports and territories could be used for landings and/or trade in undocumented toothfish <p>REGARDING the Secretariat's Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN encourages the Parties to invite a CoP15 proposal to list <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. in CITES Appendix II in order to engage CITES more fully in management of international trade in these species

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>trade documentation for the trade of toothfish and urges CITES Parties to require a CCAMLR CDS document on all toothfish imports (CCAMLR, 2002, paragraph 10.73). The CDS is applicable globally; it is not restricted only to the Convention Area and to CCAMLR Contracting Parties</p>	<p>ii) draw the attention of Flag States that are Parties to CITES and whose fishing vessels are engaged in IUU fishing for toothfish in the CCAMLR Convention Area that their actions undermine the attainment of CCAMLR's objectives</p> <p>iii) request that all Flag and Market States that are Parties to CITES and that capture or trade in toothfish to adhere to CCAMLR and cooperate with the CDS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat notes that the implementation of RC 12.4 is seriously hampered by the fact that the species concerned are not included in CITES Appendix II • Inf. 3 recommends that CoP14 adopt Decisions directing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the Parties to request Cambodia, Equatorial Guinea, Togo, Singapore and Honk Kong SAR, and Indonesia to report their position in respect of implementing RC 12.4 by 30 September 2007 ▪ all CITES Parties whose fishing vessels are engaged in IUU fishing for toothfish in the CCAMLR Convention Area to ensure such activity ceases immediately ▪ all CITES Parties which are flag, port and market States that capture toothfish or that trade in toothfish products, and which have not yet done so in accordance with RC 12.4, to adhere to CCAMLR ▪ the Secretariat to make the reports requested above available to CCAMLR for consideration at its next meeting in 2007 	
<p>Doc. 62 Sea Cucumbers Animals Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 13.48 directs the AC to review the proceedings of the international technical workshop on the conservation of sea cucumbers in the families Holothuriidae and Stichopodidae (March 2004, Kuala Lumpur), as well as those of the forum on Advances in Sea Cucumber Aquaculture and Management (ASCAM) convened by the Food and Agriculture Organization 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the final version of the discussion paper called for in Decision 13.48 • Proposes that CoP14 adopt Decisions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ directing range States to develop and implement national adaptive management plans for species of high conservation concern, develop regional management strategies and a standardized approach for data collection and reporting, encourage greater communications 	<p>AC Recommendations: SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN recommends that the Parties adopt the draft Decisions recommended by the AC directed to the range States, Parties and the AC • Overexploitation is the main threat to sea cucumbers; the rising demand has prompted declines in many Holothurian populations worldwide. <p>Secretariat's Recommendations: SUPPORT IN</p>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>(FAO) in 2003; and to prepare, for consideration at CoP14, a discussion paper on the biological and trade status of sea cucumbers in the above families to provide scientific guidance on the actions needed to secure their conservation status</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Decision 13.49 directs the Secretariat to assist in obtaining funds to support the preparation of an AC discussion paper on sea cucumbers in the families Holothuriidae and Stichopodidae ● AC22 reviewed a draft of this discussion paper 	<p>and cooperation between fisheries and national CITES authorities, increase basic biological and ecological research and stock assessments, enhance enforcement capacity, explore the potential of mariculture, and consider listing species of concern in Appendix III</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ encouraging Parties engaged in trade in sea cucumbers to support the development of harmonized codes and identification guides ■ directing the Secretariat to promote greater cooperation between CITES and FAO particularly in the area of capacity building ■ directing the AC to evaluate the outcomes of an FAO Workshop on Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumbers fisheries, to be conducted in 2007, and recommend follow-up actions at CoP15 ● The Secretariat: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ notes that draft Decisions relate mostly to non-CITES listed species, that <i>“there are already insufficient resources for ... the management and conservation of species included in the CITES Appendices”</i>, that it remains challenging for CITES authorities to comply with Decisions concerning unlisted taxa, and that monitoring the implementation of such Decisions is often difficult ■ recommends amending the draft Decisions to include training in sea cucumber identification and a socioeconomic evaluation of the fisheries; suggests that the Secretariat and FAO should help raise funds; recommends that range States involved in sea cucumber fishing should consider including their species in the CITES Appendices, and share examples of best practices ■ notes that the draft Decision directed to the Secretariat is not specific to sea cucumbers, and recommends that it be amended or deleted 	<p>PART/OPOSE IN PART</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN recommends that the Parties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ adopt the recommendation of the Secretariat to amend the draft Decisions to include training, fundraising and a recommendation that range States consider the inclusion of their sea cucumber species in the CITES Appendices ■ reject the recommendation of the Secretariat that the Decisions be amended to include proposals for a socioeconomic evaluation of sea cucumber fisheries ■ amend the draft Decision directed to the Secretariat to focus on issues involving sea cucumbers in the families Holothuriidae and Stichopodidae
Doc. 63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trade in traditional medicines is presently 	This document notes that more needs to be done to prevent illegal trade in endangered	SUPPORT

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
<p>Trade in Traditional Medicines</p> <p>Australia</p>	<p>regulated by RC 10.19 (Rev. CoP12) which provides various measures to prevent illegal trade in endangered species for traditional medicine including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the development of public education and awareness programs ▪the development of techniques to identify parts and derivatives used in traditional medicines ▪the use of substitutes for specimens of threatened species in use in traditional medicine ▪the use, in certain circumstances, of captive-breeding and artificial propagation where appropriate and with sufficient safeguards, to provide for the needs of traditional medicine 	<p>species used for traditional medicines and recommends amendments to RC.10.19 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of three new paragraphs in the preamble which: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪note that the positive and negative effects of artificial propagation and captive breeding on wild populations vary according to biological, social and economical considerations ▪note that the volume of traditional medicines traded as personal effects under Article VII (3) may be detrimental to the conservation of certain species ▪recall RC 9.14, 10.8, 11.7 and 12.5 which detail measures to be taken for the conservation of taxa commonly used for traditional medicines • Deletion of one paragraph in the preamble that acknowledges the adoption of RC.9.19 in which the CoP recognizes that pressure on wild populations may be relieved by captive-breeding and artificial propagation • Revision of operative paragraph RC 10.19 © (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough): “<i>c) investigate the potential for, <u>facilitate and encourage further use in traditional medicines of substitutes for specimens of threatened wild species alternative ingredients to specimens of threatened wild species, such as synthetic compounds and derivatives of less threatened species, ensuring that this does not lead to other species becoming threatened; and</u>”</i>” • Inclusion of four new operative paragraphs to ensure that Parties: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪develop and use alternative ingredients in preference to the breeding in captivity for commercial purposes of Appendix I species used for traditional medicines ▪clearly mark traditional medicines intended for domestic use and prevent them from being exported 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The continued use of several highly endangered CITES-listed species, such as tigers, rhinos and certain bear species, for traditional medicine significantly drives illegal taking, killing and trading of these species • Trade in CITES-listed specimens for traditional medicine is a considerable threat, and additional measures are required to bring it under strict control and to secure implementation of CITES • Captive-breeding of tigers for the production of traditional medicine will provide opportunities to launder illegally-acquired products from wild specimens into international trade. At a recent gathering at East China Normal University, Traditional Chinese medicine experts from China’s universities, the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and traditional medicine associations spoke out against captive breeding of tigers as a means of conservation • The large volume of traditional medicines traded as personal and household effects is detrimental to the conservation of CITES listed species. These include products made from wild-caught specimens of species listed in Appendix I • Stricter domestic measures may be needed to provide appropriate national actions to secure the implementation of CITES Article VII(3) for traditional medicines • SSN encourages the Parties to also adopt a Decision directing the AC to explore changes to RC 13.7, on Control of trade in personal and household effects, in order to deal with the large volume of products traded without accompanying non-detriment findings

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪guarantee proper implementation of Article VII, paragraph 3 and prevent the export of traditional medicines containing Appendix I ingredients by tourists and visitors unless accompanied by appropriate documentation ▪recognize that the application of stricter domestic measures may be warranted 	
<p>Doc. 65</p> <p>Report of the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group</p> <p>Secretariat</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 13.102 encourages the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group to report through the Secretariat to CoP14 on progress made in implementing national action plans and other initiatives; no report was received by the end of January 2007 • Decision 13.103 directs the Secretariat to contact: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), which responded that its liaison group on non-timber forest resources was preparing a report for publication on “Reducing wild meat (bushmeat) hunting in tropical forests to sustainable levels” ▪the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) regarding convening an international workshop to facilitate development of an action plan to develop a coordinated approach to tackling the issues of poverty, habitat degradation, human population growth and utilization of natural resources associated with the unsustainable trade in bushmeat; however, the FAO stated that they had not been able to raise funds for such a workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Secretariat notes that a new Decision would be required to extend the mandate of the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group • The Secretariat recommends that if CoP14 extends the mandate then the Working Group should collaborate with the CBD liaison group on non-timber resources 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The illegal, commercial bushmeat trade in Central Africa is threatening the immediate future of many populations of wildlife, including an estimated 30 species listed in CITES Appendices I and II. A portion of this trade has been confirmed as occurring across both international and intercontinental borders, necessitating the involvement of CITES • SSN recommends that the CoP adopt a Decision to extend the mandate of the Working Group to CoP15 • SSN agrees that the Working Group should collaborate with the CBD liaison group on non-timber resources • SSN encourages the Parties to provide contributions towards an international workshop on the unsustainable trade in bushmeat in Central Africa
<p>Doc. 66</p> <p>Periodic Review of the Appendices</p> <p>Animals and Plants Committees</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 11.1 (Rev. CoP13), on Establishment of Committees, states that the AC and PC shall undertake a periodic review of the Appendices by: establishing a schedule for reviewing the biological and trade status of these species; identifying problems or potential problems concerning the biological status of species being traded; consulting the Parties on the need to review specific species, working directly with the range 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doc. 66 recognizes that the present procedure for the conduct of the periodic review of the Appendices is “<i>complex and impractical</i>” and that a simpler procedure is desirable • The document contains the AC22 / PC16 proposed amendments to the SC51 recommendations for conducting the periodic review and recommends that they form the operative part of a resolution on the procedure 	<p>CONDITIONALLY SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the procedure for conducting periodic reviews proposed in Doc. 66 but encourages Parties to consider three amendments, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪<u>Make the procedure for conducting periodic reviews compulsory</u>, as follows (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions strikethrough): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “c) <i>The Animals and Plants Committees shall are-encouraged to follow the guidelines and rapid assessment technique in Annexes 1 and 2 of</i>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>States in the selection process, and seeking their assistance in such reviews; and preparing and submitting amendment proposals resulting from the review, through the Depositary Government, for consideration at meetings of the CoP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SC 51 adopted recommendations for conducting the periodic review (SC51 Doc. 16 and CoP13 Doc.7.1). These recommendations include standardized guidelines that were developed and agreed upon by the AC and PC. The SC51 guidelines require that the AC and PC, in consultation with the SC, review comments from the Parties on the species proposed and finalize the selection of species to be reviewed ● PC16 (PC16 Sum. 3) and AC22 (AC22 Sum. 3 (Rev. 1)) agreed to propose to SC54 amendments to the recommendations of SC51, potentially as a draft resolution for CoP14 ● SC54 “noted the intention of the Animals and Plants Committees to make proposals for consideration at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties” (SC54 Sum. 9 (Rev. 1)) 	<p>for conducting a periodic review of the Appendices</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The document contains the views of the Secretariat which agrees with the need of a simpler procedure for periodic review but declares that “<i>more work is required on the text, in particular on the selection of the taxa to be reviewed and the responsibility for the actions at each stage.</i>” The Secretariat recommends the creation of a working group at CoP14 to finalize the text proposed by the AC and the PC 	<p><i>document SC51 Doc. 16 and their updates when selecting species and conducting the periodic review.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ <u>Include criteria for selection of taxa</u> (in a new Paragraph d) in the draft resolution) Following CoP13, the AC and PC initiated the periodic review in accordance with the SC51 recommendations and standardized guidelines developed by the AC and PC. In support of this process, the Secretariat requested UNEP-WCMC to produce trade data for consideration by the Committees and, in accordance with the standardized guidelines, instructed UNEP-WCMC to exclude data on the following taxa (AC21 Doc. 11.1 (Rev. 1) and PC15 Doc. 11): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Species that were subject of proposals to amend the Appendices at the previous two CoPs, whether or not the specific proposals were adopted;</i> - <i>Species that were effectively included in the Appendices after CoP10 because taxa to be considered for the reviews should have been listed prior to the adoption of Resolution Conf. 9.24 at the 9th meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 1994; and</i> - <i>Species subject to other reviews such as those targeted by valid Decisions and Resolutions of the Parties (including African and Asian rhinoceros, elephants, leopards, markhor, Cetaceans, vicuna, Musk deer, Tibetan antelope, tortoises and freshwater turtles, Appendix-I Asian big cat species, sharks, sturgeons and paddlefish, great apes, Saiga antelope, marine turtles, medicinal plants included in Appendix II, bigleaf mahogany and agarwood producing taxa)."</i> ■ <u>Retain and strengthen the role of SC in the selection of species.</u> SSN recommends that the role of the SC be strengthened by the creation of a consultation process whereby, if the SC cannot reach consensus on the inclusion of certain species recommended by the AC and PC in the periodic review, there will be no systematic delay in the inclusion of those species for which there is consensus among the SC members. SSN recommends inclusion of a revised Paragraph e) (new paragraph f) in the draft resolution as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> “<i>f) Taking these comments into account, the AC and</i>

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
			<p><i>PC will inform provide a written report to the SC about listing the finalized selection of species proposed for review. The SC will then have 45 days to make comments on the list of species selected proposed by the AC and PC, carrying out its consultations via postal procedure if necessary. For species deemed suitable for review by a consensus of SC members, the reviews will proceed after 45 days. For species for which there is no consensus among SC members, reviews will not proceed until the inclusion in the review will be considered for approval by the SC at its next meeting."</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN opposes the replacement of the word "species" by the words "taxon" or "taxa" throughout the proposed text. The SC51 recommendations use the word "species" as per CITES Article 1; furthermore, "taxon" (or "taxa") is not defined by CITES • SSN recommends that if a working group on periodic review is established, this working group be open to the participation of NGOs
<p>Doc. 67</p> <p>Use of Annotations for Plants in Appendix II and Animals and Plants in Appendix III</p> <p>United States of America, at the Request of the Animals and Plants Committee</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RC 9.25, Inclusion of species in Appendix III, notes that RC 1.5 (repealed in part by RC 9.25) "recommends that all readily recognizable parts and derivatives of species included in Appendix III be covered" • RC 11.21 deals with the use of annotations in Appendices I and II • At PC15, the USA submitted a document detailing inconsistent interpretations of plant listings in Appendix II and III when those listings are not accompanied by an annotation. The inconsistencies noted in this document also apply to animal listings in Appendix III. Both Parties and the Secretariat have inconsistently interpreted these listings, leading to confusion over their scope (e.g. some interpretations included all readily recognizable parts and derivatives in the listings while others limited the listings exclusively to whole live or dead specimens) • For animal species in Appendix III, and for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amends RC9.25 and RC11.21 to clarify that current and future listings of plants in Appendix II and plants and animals listed in Appendix III without an annotation shall be interpreted to include all readily recognizable parts and derivatives 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports bringing uniformity to interpretations of the listings of plants in Appendices II and III and animals in Appendix III • The draft amendments are consistent with the interpretation of Article I of the Convention adopted by the Parties in past resolutions (now repealed) • The Parties have a long history of <i>not</i> listing specific specimens for inclusion in Appendices II and III for plants and Appendix III for animals • The effect of an interpretation to the contrary would result in a tremendous amount of uncertainty and would also lead to the submission of numerous species proposals clarifying current listings • These proposals are in line with the conclusions of a working group established at PC15 and subsequent consultations with the AC at a joint AC/PC meeting in July 2006 • The recommended amendments to RC 11.21 (Rev. CoP13) and RC 9.25 will ensure consistent interpretation of CITES Article I in line with the Parties' longstanding interpretation

DOCUMENT	CURRENT STATUS	EFFECT OF DOCUMENT	SSN VIEW
	<p>plant species in Appendix II or III, Article 1 of the Convention defines “specimen” as “any ready recognizable part or derivative thereof specified in [the relevant CITES Appendix] in relation to the species”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nonetheless, in resolutions no longer valid, the Parties have interpreted listings of plants in Appendix II and plants and animals in Appendix III without annotations as including whole specimens, alive or dead, <u>and</u> any readily recognizable parts or derivatives 		



SPECIES SURVIVAL NETWORK

2100 L Street NW, Washington, DC 20037 USA Tel: +1-301-548-7769 Fax: +1-202-318-0891

E-mail: info@ssn.org Website: www.ssn.org