

# TRAFFIC Report of the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES

*J. Gray*

## OPENING OF THE MEETING

The 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP14) to CITES took place in The Hague, the Netherlands, from 3 to 15 June 2007 and was attended by 844 representatives from CITES Parties and 400 observers from inter-governmental, international and national organizations. The following is a summary of the most salient features of the meeting from TRAFFIC's perspective. Unless otherwise stated, amendments to the Appendices adopted at CoP14 enter into force 90 days after the meeting, that is on 13 September 2007. Official proceedings of CoP14 will be published by the CITES Secretariat.

The Minister of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality, Ms Gerda Verburg; the Deputy Mayor of The Hague, Mr Rabin Baldewsingh; the Deputy Executive Director of UNEP, Mr Shafqat Kakakhel; the Chairman of the CITES Standing Committee, Mr Cristián Maquieira; and the Secretary-General of CITES, Mr Willem Wijnstekers, welcomed participants to the meeting. Following a ceremony with a laser display and a live performance to the popular song the "Circle of Life", the meeting was declared open.

## ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

### *7. Financing and budgeting of the Secretariat and of meetings of the Conference of the Parties*

The meeting adopted the Secretariat's report on its resources and their use since the 13th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP13) as set out in **document CoP14 Doc. 7.1 (Rev. 1)** and its estimate of expenditures for the year 2007 (**document CoP14 Doc. 7.2**), including a drawdown of USD85 670 from the CITES Trust Fund to cover an increase in staff costs. The Secretary-General explained the reasons for an increased budget for the work of the Secretariat for the years 2009–2011, as outlined in **document CoP14 Doc. 7.3 (Rev. 1)**. This document included the costed programme of work for the triennium, linked directly to tasks specified in the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008–2013, and proposed creation of new timber, fisheries and other posts in the Secretariat. A Budget Working Group, chaired by Ireland, was established to consider the financing of the Secretariat's work for this triennium. It reported back to Committee II, offering for consideration alternatives of a 21.56% and a 0% increase in the budget financed by Parties' contributions to the Trust Fund, as detailed in **document CoP14 Com. II. 31**. Subsequent to discussion, however, proposals for a 15%, 10% and 3% increase were all rejected in Committee II, but an increase of 6% was adopted by the meeting's final plenary session after protracted debate. Pending the specification of contributions from the Parties to the budget in line with this increase, text of a draft resolution on the costed programme of work for the Secretariat for 2009–2011 (set out in **document CoP14 Com. II. 32\***) was adopted (*Resolution Conf. 14.1 Financing and the costed programme of work for the Secretariat for the triennium 2009–2011*). Among other things, it instructs the Secretariat to seek funds proactively from external sources and instructs the Standing Committee to establish a Finance and Budget Subcommittee. Australia announced that it would be providing AUD250 000 (USD210 974) to the CITES Secretariat to fund a timber officer (see **document CoP14 Plen. Rep. 6**).

### *8. Committee reports*

The recommendations of the Nomenclature Committee contained in its report **document CoP14 Doc. 8.5**, which were to change the list of standard references, were adopted, together with a draft decision directing the Secretariat to continue to consider ways of harmonizing taxonomy and nomenclature between CITES and other multilateral environmental agreements. The general support for a proposal from the Secretariat to rearrange the listing of animal species in the Appendices in order to present them in alphabetical order at the order, family and generic levels was noted.

Other significant items from discussion of committee reports are recorded under subject-specific sections of this summary.

---

\*from which the third operative paragraph was accidentally omitted—see p. 5, **document CoP14 Plen. Rep. 4**

## STRATEGIC MATTERS

### 11. CITES Strategic Vision: 2008–2013

The Vice-Chairman of the Strategic Plan Working Group, which had been established by CoP13 via *Decision 13.1*, reported on the work of that Group, referring to **document CoP14 Doc. 11** on the CITES Strategic Vision: 2008–2013. In the light of discussion in Committee II revolving around the legitimate extent of change within CITES in response to international environmental priorities, the Chairman of Committee II set up a working group, chaired by Canada, to redraft the Strategic Vision to reflect some of the points raised from the floor. The working group reported back to Committee II on the penultimate day of the meeting, providing revised text for the Vision, and a draft resolution (*Resolution Conf. 14.2 CITES Strategic Vision 2008–2011*) to adopt it, in **document CoP14 Com. II. 20**. It had not been able to complete its task, however, and the document therefore also included two draft decisions directing the Standing Committee and Secretariat to assist in the development of any outstanding indicators for the Vision's Objectives. This fact notwithstanding, after agreement to delete an indicator relating to evaluation of unlisted species under Objective 1.4 and a few minor corrections (see **document CoP14 Com. II. Rep. 15**), the Strategic Vision in document CoP14 Com. II. 20 was adopted.

### 13. Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity

Responding to a mandate from CoP13, the Animals and Plants Committees reported to Committee II on their work to bring CITES more in line with these Principles and Guidelines of the Convention on Biological Diversity (**document CoP14 Doc. 13**) and on the Committees' resulting recommendations. There being no consensus on these recommendations, the Chairman of Committee II asked interested Parties to form a drafting group to formulate text for amendment of *Resolution Conf. 10.4 Cooperation and synergy with the Convention on Biological Diversity*, as proposed in document CoP14 Doc. 13. Reporting back to Committee II, the group said that there had been a counter-proposal to amend *Resolution Conf. 13.2 Sustainable use of biodiversity: Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines*. Following a vote, amendments to the latter, as set out in **document CoP14 Com. II. 17**, were adopted. The principal amendment comprised the incorporation as Annex 2 to the Resolution of recommendations from the Animals and Plants Committees (as contained in document CoP14 Doc. 13) guiding applicability of the Principles and Guidelines to CITES.

### 14. CITES and livelihoods

Committee II considered the draft decisions in **document CoP14 Doc. 14**. These had built on recommendations from the CITES and Livelihoods Workshop (5–7 September 2006), which had discussed how implementation of CITES listing decisions should take into account potential impacts on the livelihoods of the poor, in line with the amendment to *Resolution Conf. 8.3 Recognition of the benefits of trade in wildlife* made by CoP13. A mixture of support and concern was voiced from Parties in reaction to the draft decisions, so the Chairman of Committee II requested that South Africa convene a working group to identify a way to take the matter forward. The resultant draft decisions in **document CoP14 Com. II. 12** were eventually agreed by consensus and adopted. They direct the Standing Committee, subject to the availability of external funding, to initiate a process to develop tools for Parties to use voluntarily for assessing the impacts of CITES decisions on livelihoods.

### 15. National wildlife trade policy reviews

In **document CoP14 Doc. 15**, the Secretariat provided information on progress with the implementation of *Decisions 13.74* and *13.75* concerning review of Parties' national trade policies with a view to analysing the impacts of these in terms of socio-economic benefits. In the light of this, it had certain recommendations, encapsulated in four draft decisions, revised text of which was drafted by the Secretariat in consultation with certain Parties, to take account of discussions in Committee II. The new text, in **document CoP14 Com. II. 1**, which stressed that Parties' undertaking of reviews was voluntary and that the Secretariat's participation was dependent on external funding, was adopted.

### 16. Capacity building

**Document CoP14 Doc. 16** provided information on the capacity-building activities of the Secretariat and a plan for the development of a CITES Virtual College for CITES-related training. The document contained draft decisions relating to this and to Master's degree courses on CITES, for which there was broad support. A revision

of these reflecting comments in session (**document CoP14 Com. II. 4**) was adopted. The decisions authorize the seeking of financial assistance for Master's courses, the Virtual College, and an enforcement-based, capacity-building workshop and regional meeting for the Oceanian region before the 58th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC58).

### **18. Co-operation with other organizations**

The Secretariat presented **document CoP14 Doc. 18.1**, in which it had outlined co-operative activities with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) since CoP13, in particular the signing of the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) between FAO and CITES, in 2006. The document also contained draft decisions and, while Committee II essentially supported that directed to the Secretariat to enhance co-operation over forestry matters, it could not support that directed to the Standing Committee to create a Fishery Working Group. The final text of the draft decisions reflecting this (**document CoP14 Com. II. 7**) was adopted. FAO and the Secretariat each noted concern over the fact that their respective recommendations regarding proposals to list commercially exploited aquatic species in the CITES Appendices were not in harmony (see *Sharks: ad hoc* Expert Advisory Panel).

Co-operation between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO) was addressed by **document CoP14 Doc. 18.2** and its draft resolution, submitted by the USA. Most Parties were supportive of the proposed co-operation, but amendments put forward by the USA and others led the Chairman to request a revised text for consideration. This text (**document CoP14 Com. II. 5**), which specifies close co-operation between the CITES and ITTO Secretariats and urges consultation of ITTO over listing proposals, was adopted (*Resolution Conf. 14.4 Cooperation between CITES and ITTO regarding trade in tropical timber*). ITTO welcomed such strengthened collaboration.

## **INTERPRETATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONVENTION**

### **Review of Resolutions and Decisions**

#### **20. Review of Resolutions**

In line with *Decision 13.21* relating to the consolidation of Resolutions concerning Appendix-I species, the Secretariat presented draft consolidated resolutions relating to hunting trophies for Appendix-I species, and to rhinoceroses, Tibetan Antelope, Asian big cats and great apes in **document CoP14 Doc. 20.1**. There being minimal support voiced for these consolidations, they were rejected by consensus. The Secretariat also reported on its review of Resolutions in general and presented proposed amendments to several of these in **document CoP14 Doc. 20.2**. After discussion in Committee II, versions of these amendments as set out in **document CoP14 Com. II. 9** and a draft decision in document CoP14 Doc. 20.2 permitting correction of non-substantive errors found in Resolutions were adopted.

#### **22. Review of Decisions**

The Secretariat regularly reviews the validity of Decisions and its report on this process for CoP14 was delivered in **document CoP14 Doc. 22**. It was noted that any Decision not listed in Annex 1 to the document would cease to be in effect after CoP14, unless the Conference had decided otherwise under a separate agenda item of the meeting.

### **Compliance and enforcement issues**

#### **23. Guidelines for compliance with the Convention**

The Chairman (Norway) of the Working Group on Compliance, which had been established at the 50th meeting of the Standing Committee, provided his update to Committee II on the work of this group since CoP13 in **document CoP14 Doc. 23**. The Working Group subsequently reconvened to complete its draft guidelines for compliance with the Convention, which were then presented to the Committee as the *Guide to CITES Compliance Procedures* in **document CoP14 Com. II. 21**, together with a draft resolution for their adoption. The resolution was adopted, after the latter had been amended to state that the Conference of the Parties noted, rather than adopted, the Guide (*Resolution Conf.14.3 CITES Compliance Procedures*).

## **24. National laws for implementation of the Convention**

*Decision 13.83* was the basis for the Secretariat's report in **document CoP14 Doc. 24** on the status of the CITES National Legislation Project, initiated after the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES. In introducing the report in Committee II, the Secretariat announced that half of all Parties had now achieved Category 1 status under the Project. The document included draft decisions connected with advancement of the Project. Comments on the draft decision directed to the Parties revolved mainly around its practicability within the specified time frame, but comments on the decisions directed to the Standing Committee and the Secretariat related to the appropriateness of issuing compliance measures and of assisting with training, respectively. Following discussion and various votes in Committee II, the decision directed to the Standing Committee was adopted unamended and those directed to the Parties and to the Secretariat were adopted after amendment, as presented in **document CoP14 Com. II 8**.

## **25. Enforcement matters**

In accordance with *Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13) Compliance and enforcement*, requiring a report on enforcement matters at each regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties, the Secretariat presented **document CoP14 Doc. 25**. The report reviewed inter-sessional consideration of enforcement matters by the Standing Committee; alerts and records regarding illicit trade; national enforcement action plans; designation of Scientific Authorities; measures for combating smuggling; and capacity within Interpol. With reference to the last-mentioned item, the Secretariat noted that Interpol had not appointed a criminal intelligence officer on a permanent basis and so the text in *Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13)* urging it to do so should stand. The Secretariat informed Committee II that, since the report had been written, the number of Parties having submitted contact details for enforcement authorities as directed by *Decision 13.84* had increased from 59 to 64. Nigeria acknowledged that, as stated in the Secretariat's report, it had been remiss in some respects regarding its obligations to implement the Convention, but declared that draft CITES legislation was proceeding through its National Assembly.

The Secretariat urged Parties to adopt the draft decisions in document CoP14 Doc. 25, which directed the Standing Committee to consider endorsement of relevant recommendations from the Secretariat's report prior to the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to CITES (CoP15) and directed the Secretariat to reconvene the CITES Enforcement Experts Group in order to identify measures to improve collection of data on illicit trade. The USA called for better linking of enforcement items for discussion by Parties, in view of the fact that draft decisions to reconvene the CITES Enforcement Experts Group were contained also in document CoP14 Doc. 26<sup>#</sup>. Amendments to the draft decisions stipulating that future meetings of the Enforcement Experts Group should be contingent on the availability of external funding and that the Secretariat should report to CoP15 on enforcement matters were agreed and final text of the decisions, as adopted, was issued in **document CoP14 Com. II 27**.

## **26. Compliance and enforcement**

**Document CoP14 Doc. 26 (Rev. 1)**, submitted by the European Union (EU), also related to *Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13)* on compliance and enforcement. Besides a draft amendment to the Resolution, it contained two versions of draft decisions directing the Standing Committee and Secretariat to reconvene the CITES Enforcement Experts Group<sup>#</sup>. In introducing the document, the EU advised Committee II that it should favour the Secretariat's version of these draft decisions. In the light of discussions in session, a drafting group was formed to generate revised text for the draft decisions and amendments to *Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13)*. This revised text, presented in **document CoP14 Com. II. 23**, was adopted. The decisions require the Experts Group, contingent upon external funding, to assess progress with its own recommendations made at its meeting in Shepherdstown in 2004 and with the national action plans to enhance enforcement of CITES specified in *Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP13)*, and to report to SC58. That Committee is directed to review the report with a view to further action by CoP15. The amendments to the Resolution urge greater inter-agency co-operation and recommend Parties to join the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime and the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

---

<sup>#</sup>The Secretariat had undertaken to consolidate the draft decisions in documents CoP14 Docs 25 and 26 relating to reconvention of the CITES Enforcement Experts Group if both were accepted. However, timing of the production of documents CoP14 Com. II. 23 and 27 precluded this during CoP14.

### **28. Internet trade in specimens of CITES-listed species**

The EU submitted **document CoP14 Doc. 28**, containing two versions of draft decisions directed to the Secretariat and to the Standing Committee regarding evaluation, including through the convening of a workshop, of Internet-based illegal wildlife trade and formulation of recommendations for its containment. In introducing the document, the EU advised Committee II that it should favour the Secretariat's version of these draft decisions and, with an amendment specifying that a suitably qualified consultant should be contracted to do the work, these were adopted. Final text was made available in **document CoP14 Com. II. 6**.

### **29. National reports**

Intersessional activities in response to decisions taken at CoP13 regarding Parties' national reports were summarized by the Secretariat in **document CoP14 Doc. 29**. Two draft decisions in the document's Annex 2 were adopted by consensus. The first directs the Standing Committee to review recommendations to Parties to provide special reports under the Convention, with a view to assessing whether special reports can be incorporated effectively into Parties' annual or biennial reports, while the second directs the Secretariat, *inter alia*, to continue to identify ways to reduce the reporting burden on Parties.

### **32. Incentives for implementation of the Convention**

A vote was needed to ascertain Committee II's approval for the draft decisions in **document CoP14 Doc. 32** on incentives for the effective implementation of the Convention. While the EU, Switzerland, Senegal and Uganda all supported elements of the decisions, Argentina, Australia, Brazil, the USA and Venezuela were not in favour of further CITES work on incentives, stating, for example, that economic incentives were the prerogative of individual Parties. Debate on the decisions was reopened in plenary session by Brazil, who proposed amendments, which were agreed. The final text adopted encourages Parties to consider practical ways to enhance stakeholder engagement in the implementation of the Convention and directs the Secretariat to review fees for CITES permits and related administrative services, and to continue its co-operation with the BioTrade Initiative of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), subject to the provision of external funding.

## **Trade control and marking issues**

### **33. Introduction from the sea**

The workshop on introduction from the sea mandated by *Decisions 13.18* and *13.19* took place in late 2005, in Geneva. In **document CoP14 Doc. 33**, the Secretariat presented a draft resolution with alternative definitions of "the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State", as decided by the workshop on the one hand, and by a working group established at the 54th meeting of the Standing Committee (SC54), on the other. The document also contained a summary of the efforts of the working group; the report of the workshop held in Geneva in 2005; comments on that report; and a draft decision directing the Standing Committee to establish a working group on introduction from the sea to consider issues identified for consideration in the final report of the workshop, notably a definition for "transportation into a State" and clarification of the term "State of introduction". There was support in session for harmonization between CITES and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), for the definition of "the marine environment not under the jurisdiction of any State" proposed by the SC54 working group, and for the setting of a more precise time-frame for the draft decision. Texts of the draft resolution (*Resolution Conf. 14.6 Introduction from the sea*) and decision reflecting these preferences (**document CoP14 Com. II. 26**) were adopted.

### **35. International expert workshop on non-detriment findings**

The proposal for such a workshop, articulated in three draft decisions in **document CoP14 Doc. 35**, was put forward by Mexico, seconded by Canada. Mexico told Parties that the workshop should result in enhanced guidance for making non-detriment findings, including guidelines specific to eight major groups of taxa subject to trade. The decisions were adopted by consensus. The results of the workshop, which is funding-dependent, are due to be submitted to CoP15.

### **37. Appendix-I species subject to export quotas**

Three proposals for amending export quotas for Appendix-I species, from Mozambique, Uganda and Kenya, were considered by Committee I. Uganda's **proposal CoP14 Prop. 3**, originally tabled under agenda item 68, was adjusted to request a quota for 28 Leopards, as opposed to 50. The proposal, as amended, and Mozambique's proposal to increase its export quota for Leopard hunting trophies and skins from 60 to 120 (**document CoP14 Doc. 37.1**) were supported by almost all Parties who spoke in session. Amendments to *Resolution Conf. 10.14 (Rev. CoP13) Quotas for leopard hunting trophies and skins for personal use* were adopted accordingly, to adjust the quota for Mozambique and to provide a new one for Uganda (**document CoP14 Com. I. 6**).

Through presentation of **document CoP14 Doc. 37.2**, supported by **document CoP14 Inf. 39**, Kenya sought a repeal of *Resolution Conf. 13.5 Establishment of export quotas for black rhinoceros hunting trophies*, which sets an annual export quota of five Black Rhinoceroses *Diceros bicornis* from Namibia and five from South Africa. Namibia and South Africa countered Kenya's proposal, citing **document CoP14 Inf. 43** and maintaining that the quotas were sustainable. Following a vote, Kenya's proposal in document CoP14 Doc. 37.2 was rejected, with 15 votes in favour and 65 against, and 11 abstentions.

### **Exemptions and special trade provisions**

#### **45. Personal and household effects**

In order to assist with the implementation of *Decision 13.71* (regarding setting quantity limits for specimens of personal and household effects of Appendix-II species), the Standing Committee had established a Working Group on Personal and Household Effects at its 53rd meeting. The Group's recommendations for a revision of *Resolution Conf. 13.7 Control of trade in personal and household effects* and adoption of a draft decision to extend the life of the Group (and replace *Decision 13.71*) were set out in **document CoP14 Doc. 45**, presented in Committee II. At the suggestion of the Chairman of Committee II, a working group was set up to address the recommendations. The working group returned to Committee II with proposals contained in **document CoP14 Com. II. 16**. In session, the EU suggested adding three extra paragraphs to the version of the draft decision in the document, in order to specify concentration on the interpretation of Article VII, paragraph 3 b) of the Convention text; to assess whether there are any categories of personal and household effect that required different treatment under *Resolution Conf. 13.7*; and to monitor Parties' implementation of the Resolution. With these amendments and some clarifications, the draft amendment to the Resolution and draft decision were adopted and final text was distributed in **document CoP14 Com. II. 34**.

#### **48. Relationship between ex situ production and in situ conservation**

*Decision 13.78* was the most recent in a series of Decisions of the Conference of the Parties to identify the appropriate way to continue consideration of this relationship. **Document CoP14 Doc. 48 (Rev. 1)**, produced by the Standing Committee as part of this process, was discussed in Committee II. Its salient recommendation was for an independent study to assess the relationship between *ex situ* production and *in situ* conservation. There being no consensus over the merits of such a study in Committee II, the Chairman proposed a vote, which resulted in rejection of the proposal to undertake a study, with 48 votes in favour, 31 against and five abstentions.

### **Species trade and conservation issues and Amendment of the Appendices**

#### **51. Cetaceans**

Japan submitted its case for re-evaluation of Appendix-I cetacean listings in **document CoP14 Doc. 51**, which contained two draft decisions. The first of these directed the Animals Committee to review these listings and propose amendments to *Resolution Conf. 11.4 (Rev. CoP12) Conservation of cetaceans, trade in cetacean specimens and the relationship with the International Whaling Commission*, while the second directed the Secretariat to write to the Secretariat of the International Whaling Commission (IWC) conveying concern that the Revised Management Scheme was still incomplete. While Japan considered that review of these listings was apt because the taxa had been included in Appendix I before Parties developed scientific criteria to guide decisions on amending the Appendices—and were supported in their view by China, Greenland, Norway and Saint Kitts and Nevis—Australia, the EU and several Latin American countries were opposed to Japan's draft decisions. The decisions were put to a vote and were rejected, with 26 votes in favour, 54 against and 13 abstentions.

Following a vote (with 60 in favour, 22 against and 13 abstentions), CoP14 also decided (**document CoP14 Com. I. 7**) that no periodic review of any great whale, including the Fin Whale *Balaenoptera physalus*, should occur while the IWC moratorium was in place.

## **52. Asian big cats**

The Secretariat's report providing background and updated information on Asian big cats and CITES was in **document CoP14 Doc. 52**. It concluded that, in general, the Convention was not being properly implemented with regard to this group of species. Reports from China, India, Kazakhstan, Malaysia, Myanmar and Thailand on their implementation of *Resolution Conf. 12.5 Conservation of and trade in tigers and other Appendix-I Asian big cat species* and the Secretariat's report on its verification and assessment mission to China in 2007 were also contained in the document. Committee II noted the document. In a following session of Committee II, India introduced draft decisions in **document CoP14 Com. II. 19**, that it had drawn up with China, Nepal and the Russian Federation on the basis of the Committee's earlier discussion of document CoP14 Doc. 52. These decisions sought to renew Parties' efforts to implement *Resolution Conf. 12.5*, called for improved international and regional co-operation, and stipulated that operations breeding Tigers on a commercial scale should restrict the captive population to a level supportive only of wild Tiger conservation. They also directed the Secretariat to convene a Tiger trade enforcement meeting within 12 months of CoP14, external funding permitting; to co-operate in the development of a conservation strategy workshop, to be facilitated by The World Conservation Union (IUCN) and Global Tiger Forum; to assist with technical enforcement issues; and to establish a mechanism via the CITES Tiger Enforcement Task Force and Enforcement Experts Group for regular evaluation of illegal trade in Asian big cats. The decisions received wide support in Committee II and, after some amendments, notably one to specify that operations breeding Tigers on a commercial scale should not breed them for trade, they were adopted, as set out in **document CoP14 Com. II. 33**.

## **53 Elephants**

### 53.1 Trade in elephant specimens

**Document CoP14 Doc. 53. 1** comprised the Secretariat's report on its intersessional tasks relating to trade in elephant specimens. Specifically, it provided an update on its activities pursuant to *Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12) Trade in elephant specimens*; on its verification of potential ivory trading partners; on its mission to assess Zimbabwe's ivory trade controls; on implementation of the *Action plan for the control of trade in African elephant ivory*, adopted at CoP13; and noted that illegal trade in ivory continued to occur at serious levels. The document concluded that, if the Action plan were to continue, its continuance would need to be mandated by a Decision of CoP14. Kenya proposed an alternative action plan, as explained in **document CoP14 Inf. 56**, but many Parties supported the original Action plan, as updated in document CoP14 Doc. 53.1 Addendum, and this was duly adopted.

### 53.2 Monitoring of illegal trade in ivory and other elephant specimens

The document for this agenda item (**document CoP14 Doc. 53.2**) was the report to CoP14 from TRAFFIC, the manager of ETIS (the Elephant Trade Information System). The report highlighted the fact that: it was based on nearly 3000 more records than the equivalent report to CoP13; that illicit trade in ivory was once again increasing; that the five countries most heavily implicated in that trade were Cameroon, China, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria and Thailand; that CITES discussions did not appear to give "signals" conducive to stimulating illicit ivory trade and that, in contrast, the trade was most directly related to tangible market forces and the degree of law enforcement; that large-scale seizures, indicative of the involvement of organized crime operations, had become more frequent; and that unless national governance issues were firmly addressed, the implementation of the CITES *Action plan for the control of trade in African elephant ivory* would be severely jeopardized. Eight recommendations based on the report, several centred on implementation of the renewed Action plan, were included in the document. The Secretariat noted that the ETIS report reinforced many of its observations in document CoP14 Doc. 53.1.

After raising various concerns and queries, to which TRAFFIC responded, the Parties noted the ETIS report.

### 53.3 Monitoring of illegal hunting in elephant range States

This document was the Secretariat's report, pursuant to *Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP12)*, on progress made in implementing the MIKE (Monitoring Illegal Killing of Elephants) programme since CoP13. The Secretariat updated the report orally in session, stating that the MIKE baseline information was now complete for all 45 sites in Africa and all 18 in Asia, as had been agreed at the 55th meeting of the Standing Committee. It continued that rates of illegal killing of elephants were highest in Central Africa, that development of MIKE in Asia remained problematic and that the MIKE approach could be applied to other species. Several range States wished to see MIKE sustainable in the long term. The EU noted the importance of sustained funding and announced that France would be providing USD50 000 for the MIKE South Asian sub-region. **Document CoP14 Doc. 53.3** was noted.

### 53.4 Illegal ivory trade and control of internal markets

**Document CoP14 Doc. 53.4 (Rev. 1)**, issued in support of proposal CoP14 Prop. 6 submitted by Kenya and Mali, was superseded by the African consensus proposal for elephants (see below) and was withdrawn.

Four proposals to amend the Appendices for elephants were submitted for CoP14:

- **Proposal CoP14 Prop. 4**, submitted by Botswana and Namibia, sought to replace the annotation governing trade in Appendix-II African Elephant specimens with one that would allow an annual commercial export quota for raw ivory.
- **Proposal CoP14 Prop. 5**, submitted by Botswana, sought to replace the annotation governing trade in Appendix-II African Elephant specimens, in this case with one that would allow, for the elephant population of Botswana, non-commercial trade in hunting trophies; commercial trade in hides, leather goods, live animals to appropriate destinations, and raw ivory from registered stocks to certified trading partners; and a one-off sale of raw ivory from registered stocks to certified trading partners.
- **Proposal CoP14 Prop. 6**, submitted by Kenya and Mali, sought to replace the annotation governing trade in Appendix-II African Elephant specimens with one that would effect a 20-year moratorium on trade in raw or worked ivory, with exceptions made for the one-off sale approved at CoP12 and for hunting trophies from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa.
- **Proposal CoP14 Prop. 7**, submitted by Tanzania, sought to transfer the Tanzanian population of elephants from Appendix I to Appendix II, with an annotation allowing certain trade in raw ivory, live specimens and hunting trophies. This proposal was withdrawn before the start of CoP14.

The first of these proposals, CoP14 Prop. 4, was introduced by Namibia in Committee I on 12 June. Namibia stressed the need to find a better process for making decisions on elephant trade issues in CITES, as the current one was lengthy, expensive and to the detriment of other issues. At Namibia's behest, South Africa offered its compromise suggestion, contained in **document CoP14 Inf. 53**, for a combined amendment to all three elephant proposals. Additionally, the EU referred to its draft amendment to document CoP14 Prop. 4 in **document CoP14 Inf. 54** and Kenya and Mali to their **document CoP15 Inf. 55**, produced in support of their proposal. In order to allow proper consideration of inter-linked elephant documents, their discussion was referred to a group of interested Parties, chaired by Chile, and continued outside Committee I. The resulting draft replacement of the annotation governing trade in Appendix-II African Elephant specimens, and several associated draft decisions, were set out in **document CoP14 Inf. 61** and introduced to Committee I on the penultimate day of the meeting, by Chad and Zambia, on behalf of Africa. As there was consensus to accept this all-African proposal, pre-existing proposals for amending the annotation were withdrawn or did not need to be formally considered and document CoP14 Inf. 61 was adopted.

The new annotation authorizes trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; restricted trade in live animals; trade in hides and hair; trade in leather goods (for non-commercial purposes only in the case of Zimbabwe); trade in *ekipas* as already approved at CoP13 for Namibia and in ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes for Zimbabwe; strictly controlled trade in registered raw ivory, including the amounts approved at CoP12, to certified trading partners in single sales per destination, the proceeds from which must go to elephant conservation or community programmes. The annotation also states that no further proposals to allow trade in ivory from elephants already in Appendix II may be submitted until at least nine years after the conditional sales of raw ivory.



Any eventual proposals would need to be in accordance with the conditions set out in the draft decisions which direct the Standing Committee to establish a new decision-making process for ivory trade proposals by the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties and to conduct a rolling review of the status of the African Elephant and the impact of trade on its status. Other draft decisions in document CoP14 Inf. 61 direct the African Elephant range States to develop an overall *African Elephant Action Plan*, aiming at implementation of the CITES *Action plan for the control of trade in African elephant ivory*, improved resources for enforcement and reduction of human–elephant conflicts; direct the Secretariat to establish an African Elephant Fund for the *African Elephant Action Plan*; and call on Parties, international governmental organizations and non-governmental organizations and others to contribute to the Fund.

#### **54. Rhinoceroses**

Acting on *Decisions 13.23 to 13.25* to share collection of information on rhinoceroses with the IUCN/SSC African and Asian Rhinoceros Specialist Groups in the interests of efficiency of effort, and to provide a summary of the information at CoP14, the Secretariat presented **document CoP14 Doc. 54**. It contained a summary report by the IUCN/SSC Specialist Groups and TRAFFIC on the status, trade and management of rhinoceroses, a draft amendment of *Resolution Conf. 9.14 (Rev. CoP13) Conservation of and trade in African and Asian rhinoceroses*, as this had links to collection of information on rhinoceroses, and draft decisions to address threats posed by illegal trade and inadequate management of rhinoceros horn stockpiles. These were adopted by consensus, following an amendment proposed by the EU, to require that a report on progress with the Decisions be given by the Secretariat at the 57th and 58th meetings of the Standing Committee and at CoP15. The final texts were presented in **document CoP14 Com. I. 2** (in which an error was subsequently noted, namely that “this Decision” in paragraph d) of the decisions should read “these Decisions”).

#### **55. Tibetan Antelope**

**Document CoP14 Doc. 55 (Rev. 1)** had been prepared in fulfilment of *Resolution Conf. 11.8 (Rev. CoP13) Conservation of and control of trade in the Tibetan Antelope*, which directs the Standing Committee to provide an update at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties on enforcement measures to counter the illegal trade in Tibetan Antelope products. The Secretariat had expressed concern at SC54 regarding weaknesses in the provisions of Thailand’s domestic legislation for dealing with such trade, and had asked Thailand to report to CoP14 on the subject. Thailand’s report formed the Annex to document CoP14 Doc. 55 (Rev. 1). While praising progress in Thailand, the EU still had concerns regarding enforcement in India and Thailand. The document was noted by the meeting.

#### **56. Saiga Antelope**

Interconnected *Decisions 13.27 to 13.35* on Saiga Antelope were intended to address grave concerns over the continuously deteriorating conservation status of the species, despite its inclusion in Appendix II since 1995. **Document CoP14 Doc. 56**, produced by the Secretariat, reported on the implementation of the Decisions and concluded that good progress had been made, as a consequence of which, of all the threatened antelope species, the Saiga Antelope was arguably receiving the most concerted and substantial conservation support. In the light of this, the Secretariat proposed that the Parties prolong elements of *Decision 13.28*, concerning funding and other support for Saiga conservation, and adopt a number of further decisions. There being strong support for these recommendations, the seven draft decisions in document CoP14 Doc. 56 were adopted, as set out in **document CoP14 Com. I. 5** after one small amendment. Among other things, the new Decisions urge range States to implement the *Medium-Term International Work Programme for the saiga antelope (2007–2011)*; call on the Russian Federation to sign the MoU concerning Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use of the Saiga Antelope; direct the Secretariat to co-operate with the Convention on Migratory Species on Saiga issues and report back to CoP15; encourage consumer and trading countries to co-operate to reduce and manage trade in Saiga products; and extend the call for assistance made in *Decision 13.28*. The Russian Federation had announced earlier in the meeting that it intended to sign the MoU concerning Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use in the near future.

#### **57. Tortoises and freshwater turtles**

Decisions taken at CoP13 (*13.36 and 13.37*) required a summary of information submitted by Parties in biennial reports on their progress in implementing *Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP13) Conservation of and trade in*

*tortoises and freshwater turtles* to be provided to CoP14. They also required the Secretariat to report on its activities relating to these Decisions, including its liaisons with the World Customs Organization (WCO) to promote the use of harmonized tariff codes for tortoises and turtles. **Document CoP14 Doc. 57** contained these reports, as well as recommendations from the Secretariat regarding the continuation of work set in motion by the Decisions. In response, a drafting group of Committee I produced two draft decisions in **document CoP14 Com. I. 12**, to extend liaison with the WCO and the requirement for reporting on implementation of *Resolution Conf. 11.9 (Rev. CoP13)*. A further two draft decisions were added in session in Committee I (see **document CoP14 Com. I. Rep. 13**). These directed the Secretariat to contract the IUCN/SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group to undertake a study to assist in the implementation of the Resolution and directed the Animals Committee to review the resulting study. The USA and Conservation International pledged financial support for the study. All four decisions were adopted.

### **58. Hawksbill Turtle**

**Document CoP14 Doc. 58** reported on the poor progress made with Decisions taken at CoPs 12 and 13 in relation to this species, mainly regarding development of a regional conservation strategy for the wider Caribbean, standard protocols for monitoring of populations and measures to reduce illegal trade. In view of this, the Secretariat recommended no further CITES action be taken on the Hawksbill Turtle for the time being. Several Parties disagreed with this, whereupon the Chairman of Committee I established a working group with a mandate to draft new decisions for CITES involvement with Hawksbill Turtles in the wider Caribbean. The resultant **document CoP14 Com. I. 11** set out draft decisions to raise funds in collaboration with the Inter-American Convention for Protection and Conservation of Sea Turtles (IAC) and the Convention for the Protection and Development of the Marine Environment of the wider Caribbean region (Cartagena Convention) and its Protocol Concerning Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW Protocol) for a regional Hawksbill Turtle meeting, and to report on the meeting at CoP15. These decisions were adopted by consensus.

Cuba announced it had decided to declare a moratorium on marine turtle fisheries from 2008, allowing only a minimum level of catch, for scientific purposes.

### **59. Sharks**

The Chairman of the Animals Committee, which had established a working group on sharks at its 21st meeting, introduced the Committee's report and recommendations on CITES activities related to sharks contained in **document CoP14 Doc. 59.1**. The 14 draft decisions in the document had grown out of recommendations made by the working group. As Australia had prepared **document CoP14 Doc. 59.2** prior to availability of document CoP14 Doc. 59.1, there were several overlapping decisions between the two documents, such that the Chairman of Committee I established a working group with representatives from all CITES regions, tasked with consolidating, prioritizing and costing the draft decisions from the two documents, taking into account the comments from the Secretariat in document CoP14 Doc. 59.1. The working group returned to Committee I with 17 draft decisions presented in **document CoP14 Com. I. 16**. They covered implementation and effectiveness issues; commodity codes; species-specific reviews and recommendations; South American freshwater stingrays Potamotrygonidae; capacity-building; the *International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks* (IPOA-Sharks); and illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing. A suggestion from Japan to delete the last-mentioned decision was rejected after a vote (39 in favour, 48 against and 14 abstentions), but Argentina's proposal to build consultation with FAO into the decision was accepted by consensus, after which the draft decisions in document CoP14 Com. I. 16, with some further small amendments, were adopted by consensus.

**Document CoP14 Doc. 59.3** contained draft decisions related to the proposals to list the Porbeagle *Lamna nasus* and Spiny Dogfish *Squalus acanthias* in the Appendices. These were considered in Committee I (prior to consideration of the proposals themselves) and were rejected after a vote (58 in favour, 30 against and 16 abstentions).

Proposals to list two sharks—the Porbeagle *Lamna nasus* and Spiny Dogfish *Squalus acanthias*—in Appendix II were put forward to CoP14. The Porbeagle proposal (**CoP14 Prop. 15**) and the Spiny Dogfish proposal (**CoP14 Prop. 16**), both submitted by the EU, were rejected after votes (54 in favour, 39 against and 12 abstentions and 57 in favour, 26 against and 10 abstentions, respectively). Reasons stated for their rejection included a failure to meet the criteria for listing; identification difficulties; and a conflict with the MoU between CITES and FAO. The latter organization had provided the recommendations of its *ad hoc* Expert Advisory Panel regarding proposals to list commercially exploited aquatic species in the CITES Appendices in **document CoP14 Inf. 38**. Debate on the Spiny Dogfish proposal was reopened in plenary session, but the proposal again failed, this time after a secret ballot, with 55 votes in favour and 58 against.

A proposal to list sawfishes Pristidae in Appendix I was also put before CoP14. Australia, the sole Party exporting live sawfish specimens, put forward an amendment to the proposal (**CoP14 Prop. 17**) from Kenya and the USA, such that all Pristidae species would be listed in Appendix I except *Pristis microdon*, which would be in Appendix II with the annotation “For the exclusive purpose of allowing trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable aquaria for primarily conservation purposes”. After a vote with 67 votes in favour, 30 against and seven abstentions, the proposal, so revised, was adopted.

## **60. Sturgeons and paddlefish**

CoP 13 had adopted *Decisions 13.44, 13.45, 13.46 and 13.47* concerning the establishment of a database on trade in sturgeons. The Secretariat reported in **document CoP14 Doc. 60.1** that the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) had modified the CITES Trade Database so that information relating to sturgeon quotas and data collected from permits and certificates could be entered. It also reported that the proceedings of the international sturgeon enforcement workshop hosted by the European Commission in June 2006 had been distributed as CITES document SC54 Inf. 6 and that, at SC54, the Standing Committee had established a working group to review issues related to the trade in caviar and the conservation of sturgeons and paddlefish Acipenseriformes. Document CoP14 Doc. 60.1 was noted.

**Documents CoP14 Doc. 60.2.1 and CoP14 Doc. 60.2.2**, submitted respectively by the Standing Committee’s working group on sturgeons and the Russian Federation, contained proposals for amending *Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13) Conservation of and trade in sturgeons and paddlefish*. These were referred by Committee II to a working group, comprising the members of the Standing Committee’s working group on sturgeons, and Ukraine. The group returned to Committee II with **document CoP14 Com. II. 25** containing a draft amendment of *Resolution Conf. 12.7 (Rev. CoP13)* and six draft decisions.

The amendment to the Resolution updated time-sensitive requirements and outlined the procedure for setting export quotas for caviar and meat from sturgeons and paddlefish, which specifies that: the quotas be based on an appropriate regional conservation strategy; that all relevant range States must agree quotas from a shared stock, or risk jeopardizing establishment of the said quotas; and that details of the scientific basis for quotas and of the quotas themselves be communicated to the Secretariat by 31 December of the year preceding intended export. It also directs the Animals Committee, in collaboration with others and on a three-year cycle, to evaluate the methodologies for assessing shared stocks of sturgeons and paddlefish, thereby bringing the Animals Committee into the review process for quotas.

The draft decisions urge that export quotas for 2008 should be no higher than those for 2007; direct the Secretariat to remind Parties of their duties regarding submission and recording of caviar permits and certificates and to communicate to the Parties the results of the workshop “Identification of Acipenseriformes Species in Trade” organized by the IUCN/SSC Sturgeon Specialist Group and others; and request Caspian Sea sturgeon range States to participate in FAO’s technical co-operation programme. In session, two further draft decisions were agreed by Committee II, as recorded in **document CoP14 Com. II. Rep. 15**.

The draft resolution and all draft decisions, including some small amendments, were adopted.

## **61. Toothfish: report of CCAMLR**

Committee II considered **document CoP14 Doc. 61** which was pursuant to *Resolution Conf. 12.4 Co-operation between CITES and the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources regarding trade in toothfish*, which encourages the Commission to maintain a “permanent flow of information” to CITES Parties. While the Republic of Korea and Norway said they thought that CITES was not the appropriate forum for dealing with toothfish, China and Singapore said they had made some effort to comply with the Resolution and Australia, the EU and the USA encouraged other Parties to follow suit. Document CoP14 Doc. 61 was noted, with appreciation.

## **62. Sea cucumbers**

In line with Decisions made by CoP13, the Animals Committee provided a discussion paper on the biological and trade status of sea cucumbers in **document CoP14 Doc. 62**, on the basis of which it recommended adoption of four draft decisions. Committee I was split in its opinion of the decisions. The Chairman established a working group comprising supporters and opponents to consider them. The group produced three draft decisions in

**document CoP14 Com. I. 1**, reflecting those in the original document and adding two additional elements. Norway continued to oppose acceptance, but the decisions in the working group's document were adopted following a vote (77 in favour, four against and 10 abstentions). The Decisions direct the Secretariat to bring to the attention of FAO the discussion paper presented in document CoP14 Doc. 62 and various Animals Committee recommendations relating to management plans for, and further research on, sea cucumbers. The Animals Committee is directed to evaluate the outcomes of the 2007 FAO Workshop on Sustainable Use and Management of Sea Cucumber Fisheries, in order to recommend appropriate follow-up actions at CoP15.

### **63. Trade in traditional medicines**

CoP14 agreed to amend *Resolution Conf. 10.19 Traditional medicines*, to urge Parties, *inter alia*, to pursue the development of medicinal alternatives in preference to captive-breeding programmes for Appendix-I species commonly encountered in traditional medicines and to consider the application of stricter domestic measures in relation to exports of personal medicines containing CITES-listed species. The proposed amendments were set out in **document CoP14 Com. II. 22**, in line with Australia's **document CoP14 Doc. 63**, despite the Secretariat's cautioning that the amendments appeared superfluous or unclear.

### **64 Bigleaf mahogany: report of the Working Group**

The Chairmen of the Plants Committee and of the Bigleaf Mahogany Working Group had jointly prepared **document CoP14 Doc. 64 (Rev. 1)**, an account of the Group's activities since CoP13, pursuant to Decisions taken at CoP13. Based on these, draft decisions for the adoption of an *Action plan for the control of international trade in bigleaf mahogany*, and regarding annotations and non-detriment findings for tree species in general, had been formulated in collaboration with the Secretariat and were set out in Annex 2 of the document. Following acceptance of text to harmonize the decision on non-detriment findings with that of a similar decision resulting from the Report of the Chairman of the Plants Committee (document CoP 14 Doc. 8.3), the draft decisions were adopted, as set out in **document CoP14 Com. I. 17**. In addition to instating the Action plan, the decisions set in motion development by the Plants Committee of principles, criteria and indicators for non-detriment findings for wild specimens of high-priority plant taxa; establish support for a workshop on non-detriment findings for tree species before CoP15; and direct the Plants Committee to review annotations to tree species listed in Appendices II and III.

### **65. Report of the Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group**

The Central Africa Bushmeat Working Group (formerly the CITES Bushmeat Working Group) had been given a mandate through *Decision 13.102* to continue its work and report via the Secretariat at CoP14. Its report was provided in **document CoP14 Doc. 65 (Rev. 1)**. In the same document, the Secretariat recommended that the Parties adopt a decision that the Working Group collaborate with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and other bodies involved with sustainable forest management, rather than CITES, as this seemed more appropriate. Committee I agreed with this recommendation and the EU proposed an additional recommendation, to encourage the Group to collaborate also with the CBD's Liaison Group on non-timber forest resources, and to report to the Standing Committee and to CoP15. Text of the ensuing draft decisions, which were adopted, was presented in **document CoP14 Com. I. 13**.

### **66. Periodic Review of the Appendices**

The guidelines for selecting taxa for this Review, established under *Resolution Conf. 11.1 Establishment of Committees*, had proved too complex and the Animals and Plants Committees therefore proposed a simplified procedure in the form of a draft resolution, set out in **document CoP14 Doc. 66**. At the request of the Chairman of Committee I, the USA led a working group to refine the draft resolution further. The resulting resolution text (in **document CoP14 Com. I. 14 (Rev.1)**) was adopted (*Resolution Conf. 14.8 Periodic Review of the Appendices*). It instructs the Animals and Plants Committees to establish a schedule for the Periodic Review and identify taxa proposed for review during the next two intersessional periods. It specifies that relatively recently-listed species, or those recently proposed for listing, as well as species that are the subject of other reviews, should not be considered for Periodic Review.

### **67. Use of annotations for plants in Appendix II and animals and plants in Appendix III**

Several inconsistencies over the years in the interpretation of unannotated plant listings in Appendix II and unannotated animal and plant listings in Appendix III had led the USA to submit **document CoP14 Doc. 67**, with

the support of the Animals and Plants Committees. As any CITES texts on interpretations of listings were in Resolutions now repealed, the intent of document CoP14 Doc. 67 was to remedy this situation by adding clarifications to *Resolution Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP13) Use of annotations in Appendices I and II* and *Resolution Conf. 9.25 (Rev.) Inclusion of species in Appendix III* and a clarification of the fact that unannotated listings included all parts and derivatives to the “Interpretation” section of the published Appendices. The Parties being in favour of these clarifications, document CoP14 Doc. 67 was adopted.

*Other species (mainly relating to CoP14 agenda item 68. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II)*

**Proposal CoP14 Prop. 8** from Bolivia to amend the annotation for its population of **Vicuña** *Vicugna vicugna* to allow export of wool and wool products from the entire population was adopted.

**Proposal CoP14 Prop. 18** from the EU to include the **European Eel** *Anguilla anguilla* in Appendix II received emphatic acceptance in Committee I, as reflected by the 95 votes in favour of the proposal in contrast to nine against, and was subsequently adopted. An amendment to delay the listing’s entry into force by 18 months was put forward by the EU at the time the proposal was introduced.

**Proposal CoP14 Prop. 21** from the USA was to include all species of the genus **Corallium** in Appendix II. In session, the USA proposed an annotation to the proposal to delay its entry into force for 18 months and the EU suggested the proposal be further annotated to exclude fossil corals from the provisions of the Convention. After a ballot (62 in favour, 28 against and 13 abstentions), the proposal as amended by these two annotations was accepted by Committee I. The USA accordingly put forward wording for a draft amendment to *Resolution Conf. 13.7 Control of trade in personal and household effects*, in order to effect exemption of *Corallium* personal and household effects from the provisions of the Convention, and this was also accepted by Committee I. Draft decisions set out in **document CoP14 Com. I. 15** associated with the coral proposal were likewise accepted by Committee I. On the final day of the meeting, however, Tunisia achieved a reopening of debate on the listing proposal, with the result that a secret ballot rejected it with 65 votes in favour and 55 against. The linked draft decisions and Resolution amendment thus became redundant.

Proposals to list tree species at CoP14 comprised **proposals CoP14 Prop 30**, from Brazil, to include **Brazil Wood** *Caesalpinia echinata* in Appendix II and three proposals from the EU: **Prop. 31** to include **Black Rosewood** *Dalbergia retusa* and *D. granadillo* in Appendix II, **Prop. 32** to include **Honduran Rosewood** *Dalbergia stevensonii* in Appendix II and **Prop. 33** to include **Cedrela spp.** in Appendix II. In introducing its proposal to include Brazil Wood in Appendix II, Brazil also announced its intention to annotate the proposal. Following refinement of the wording by a drafting group, the Appendix-II listing with an annotation to exclude finished wood articles, notably bows for musical instruments, from the provisions of the Convention was adopted.

In the face of opposition to the *Cedrela* proposal from range States, but with support for the drafting of a decision for continued CITES focus on *Cedrela* species, the EU withdrew its cedar and rosewood proposals. It requested that the decision-drafting group also consider CITES involvement with the *Dalbergia* species. The drafting group accordingly produced a draft decision to adopt an action plan to continue to collect knowledge on *Cedrela odorata* and the three *Dalbergia* species; provided for follow-up on the action plan at the 17th and 18th meetings of the Plants Committee; and directed the Plants Committee to draw up recommendations regarding these species for CoP15. The decision, set out in **document CoP14 Com. I. 10**, was adopted.

CITES controls for **tree species already listed in the Appendices** were reviewed at CoP14. In addition to the decisions regarding non-detriment findings for tree species, annotations for high priority plant taxa and closer co-operation with ITTO (see *Co-operation with other organizations* and *Bigleaf mahogany* above), CoP14 decided to set up an electronic working group to review procedures for the inspection and identification of timber shipments (**document CoP14 Com. II. 18** as modified by **document CoP14 Com. II. Rep. 13**). It also adopted a number of tree-related decisions (**document CoP14 Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1)**) arising from the Report of the Chairman of the Plants Committee. These were to strengthen controls for agarwood-producing taxa and to amend the definition of “artificially propagated” and the guidelines on establishment of export quotas in *Resolution Conf. 10.13 (CoP13) Implementation of the Convention for timber species*. There were two proposals at CoP14 to amend the annotation for yew species in the Appendices: the USA withdrew its **proposal CoP14 Prop. 36** to amend the annotation for *Taxus cuspidata* in favour of a draft decision adopted to review the treatment of hybrids and cultivars under CITES (see **document CoP14 Com. I. Rep. 13**), while the Depository Government’s **proposal CoP14 Prop. 37** was adopted, following revision of the proposed amendment of the annotation to *T. cuspidata* to specify live specimens.

A draft decision directing range States to implement regional actions to promote the conservation of yew species *Taxus wallichiana* and other **medicinal plant species**—*Cistanche deserticola*, *Dioscorea deltoidea*, *Nardostachys grandiflora*, *Picrorhiza kurrooa*, *Pterocarpus santalinus* and *Rauvolfia serpentina*—pursuant to *Resolution Conf. 12.8 (Rev. CoP13) Review of Significant Trade in Appendix-II species* was adopted as set out in **document CoP14 Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1)**. The draft decision to promote development of principles, criteria and indicators on the formulation of non-detriment findings for *Prunus africana* and other medicinal plants, also in that document, was likewise adopted.

CoP14 adopted a draft decision arising from the Report of the Animals Committee (document CoP14 Doc. 8.2) regarding **giant clams** *Tridacnidae* spp. As presented in **document CoP14 Com. I. 3**, it directs the Secretariat to search for funding to enable a workshop in 2007 to initiate regional co-operation on sustainable fisheries for the species.

The annotations of **orchid listings**, acknowledged to be problematic, were addressed at CoP14. **Proposal CoP14 Prop. 35** from Switzerland as the Depository Government and **proposal CoP14 Prop. 34** from Switzerland were attempts to rationalize the existing annotation for the family Orchidaceae exempting artificially propagated hybrids from the provisions of the Convention. The latter proposal, which also sought to add *Miltonia*, *Odontoglossum* and *Oncidium* to the list of genera eligible for exclusion, was rejected, with 45 votes in favour and 40 against. Proposal CoP14 Prop. 35, an attempt to clarify shipping conditions for the exempted hybrids and the result of deliberations by the Plants Committee, was adopted by consensus. Committee I accepted draft decisions regarding annotations for Orchidaceae, amended to reflect its rejection of Proposal CoP14 Prop. 34. The final text adopted, as set out in **document CoP14 Com. I. 9 (Rev. 1)**, directs the Plants Committee to monitor possible problems arising from the implementation of the annotation for Orchidaceae species in Appendix II, to report to CoP15, and to consider recommendations for further exemptions for artificially propagated orchid hybrids.

## CONCLUSION OF THE MEETING

### 69. Determination of the time and venue of the next regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties

The Parties accepted an offer from Qatar to host CoP15, in 2010. Exact dates are to be determined.

*Report by Julie Gray, Reports Editor, TRAFFIC International*

---

*TRAFFIC is grateful for the support of WWF; Council of Agriculture, Taiwan; the Rufford Maurice Laing Foundation; and Lufthansa towards its work in relation to CITES CoP14.*

