

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

Twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Santiago (Chile), 3-15 November 2002

Committee I meeting

Fifth session: 7 November 2002: 14h10-17h05

Chairman: D. Morgan (United Kingdom)

Secretariat: W. Wijnstekers
T. De Meulenaer
M. Lindeque

Rapporteurs: A. Bamford
J. Gray
T. Inskipp
C. Lippai

Consideration of proposals for amendment of Appendices I and II

66. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

The delegation of Switzerland, as the Depository Government, stated that they would withdraw proposal Prop. 12.1 to amend annotation 607 and draft a new one on the subject for submission at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The delegation of Switzerland introduced proposal Prop. 12.2 relating to colour morphs of certain parrot taxa. Concerns about the proposal were voiced by the delegations of Australia, Hungary, Israel, New Zealand and the United States of America, drawing attention to potential implementation and identification problems but also recognizing the potential value of such an amendment. They said there was a clear need for detailed identification materials but noted that these would need to be frequently updated to include newly emerging colour morphs. Another problem highlighted was that some of these morphs exist in the wild, albeit rarely, and these would have to be distinguished from captive-bred individuals. Although some colour morphs were distinctly different from wild forms others were more similar and in some cases there was complete intergradation of forms. In the opinion of the delegation of the United States there was no provision under Article I of the Convention to exempt colour morphs. The delegation of Zimbabwe suggested that an alternative method of control would be the annotation of export permits relating to colour morph individuals.

The delegation of Denmark, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union (EU), expressed support for the proposal, but requested that adequate identification materials be produced prior to implementation.

The delegations of Chile, Costa Rica, India, Mexico, Peru and Saudi Arabia, and the observer from the Eurogroup Against Bird Crime Germany, felt unable to support the proposal because of perceived implementation problems. The observer from the International Wildlife Coalition drew attention to the problem with *Cyanoramphus malherbi*, which was variously treated as a colour morph of *C. auriceps* or

as a valid species. If treated in the former way it would need to be excluded from this proposal because the wild population was very small.

The Chairman summarized the discussion and charged the delegation of Switzerland with presenting a revised proposal to the next session.

Regarding proposal Prop. 12.3, relating to the transfer of *Tursiops truncatus ponticus* from Appendix II to I, the delegation of Georgia introduced the proposal and noted that recent DNA studies showed that the Black Sea population of this species was distinctly different from the Mediterranean population. This was disputed by the Chairman of the Animals Committee, who clarified the as yet unpublished results of the DNA study. He noted that the mitochondrial DNA evidence indicated that there was no difference between these two populations. The microsatellite DNA evidence did show some differences between the animals tested from different areas, however this reflected differences in individuals rather than populations and was not relevant to the proposal. The delegation of Georgia stressed that scientists have agreed that the population is depleted and that ACCOBAMS made a thorough scientific review of the status of the Black Sea bottle-nosed dolphin before it made its request to CITES to transfer the species to Appendix I.

The delegations of Bulgaria, Hungary, India, Israel, Monaco, Qatar and Tunisia and the observer from the Whale and Dolphin Conservation Society expressed their support for the proposal. The delegation of the United States of America noted that the status of this population was a cause for conservation concern.

The delegations of Canada, Cuba, Japan, Norway, the Russian Federation, St Kitts and Nevis, and Ukraine did not support the proposal, because of the lack of adequate population data, and the fact that international trade was an insignificant threat compared with habitat degradation and incidental catch, and that the population did not meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix I.

The delegation of Denmark on behalf of the Member States of the EU suggested that further debate be deferred to the next session.

The Chairman called for a vote by roll call and the proposal was rejected, 40 Parties voting in favour, 31 against and 39 abstaining.

The delegation of Bolivia introduced proposal Prop.12.13, to transfer those of their vicuña populations that were in Appendix I to Appendix II, with the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in products made from wool sheared from live animals and bearing the label 'VICUÑA – BOLIVIA'. They drew attention to the fact that this proposal was supported by the Convenio para la Conservación y Manejo de la Vicuña (Vicuña Convention) and to the benefits that would accrue to local communities and vicuña populations if this proposal were accepted. The delegation of Argentina supported the proposal, as did the delegations of Chile, Ecuador and Peru, noting their membership of the Vicuña Convention. The delegation of Japan, also in support of the proposal, highlighted that this was a good example of sustainable trade contributing to species conservation and community development. The delegation of Denmark on behalf of the Member States of the EU supported the proposal and noted that it was consistent with the criteria in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24. The proposal was accepted.

The delegation of Argentina introduced proposal Prop. 12.12, to transfer from Appendix I to II the population of *Vicugna vicugna* in the province of Catamarca, for the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in wool sheared from live animals, in cloth, derived manufactured products and other handicraft artefacts bearing the label 'VICUÑA - ARGENTINA'. The delegations of Australia, Bolivia, as secretary of the Vicuña Convention, Chile, Denmark on behalf of the Member States of the EU, Ecuador, Paraguay, Peru and the United Republic of Tanzania supported the proposal, which was accepted.

In introducing proposal Prop. 12.14 to transfer the population of *Vicugna vicugna* of the Primera Region of Chile from Appendix I to II through a modification of annotations -106 and +211, the delegation of Chile stressed that annotation °606 would apply if the proposal were accepted. The delegation of

Bolivia, as secretary of the Vicuña Convention, supported by the delegations of Kenya and Peru, supported the proposal. The observers from the Comité Nacional pro Defensa de la Fauna y Flora and from TRAFFIC were concerned that captive-breeding operations might not benefit local communities and could have a detrimental effect on wild vicuña populations. They appealed to range States to concentrate more on benefiting local communities and wild vicuña populations. This last concern was echoed by the observer from Fauna Australis and by the Secretariat, which urged Chile and other range States to harmonize conservation strategies for vicuñas in the wild. The delegation of Chile clarified that no more than five per cent of the wild vicuña population was intended for capture. Proposal Prop. 12.14 was accepted. The Chairman made a plea for interested parties to follow up on some of the useful points raised during the debate.

The delegation of Chile introduced proposal Prop.12.15 to transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II the Chilean population of *Rhea pennata pennata*, stating that they believed that the current listing required updating. They explained that they only planned commercial use of derivatives of second-generation captive-bred specimens and reminded the Committee that a similar proposal from Argentina had been accepted unanimously at CoP11. The delegation of Denmark on behalf of the Member States of the EU was concerned that Chile planned to introduce the species to areas where it had never been recorded. The delegation of Switzerland raised concerns about the problem of differentiating specimens such as feathers, meat and skins derived from captive-breeding operations from those taken from wild populations. The delegation of Chile assured the Committee that a strict control regime applied to the captive-breeding operations, that exports would be monitored through permitting requirements and that they would not introduce any individuals of the subspecies to new areas. The proposal was accepted.

The session closed at 17h05.