

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



Sixteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties
Bangkok (Thailand), 3-14 March 2013

Summary record of the fifth session of Committee II

6 March 2013: 14h15 - 17h20

Chair: R. Gabel (United States of America)
Secretariat: J. Scanlon
J. Barzdo
H. Okusu
M. Silva
J.C. Vasquez
M. Yeater
Rapporteurs: P. Cremona
J. Gray
M. Jenkins
A. Madhur

Strategic matters

19. CITES and livelihoods

Humane Society International supported the comments made by Canada and the United States in the previous session. It did not believe that a Resolution was necessary, drawing attention to the limited resources available to CITES and expressing the view that the Convention should retain its specific focus. It was willing to participate in a working group.

IUCN believed that it was important that livelihoods were addressed under CITES, in particular to help ensure that CITES and other multilateral instruments and processes were coherent and mutually supportive, as called for in Goal 3 of the Strategic Vision. It noted that reference to human-wildlife conflicts in the text of the draft resolution in Annex 1 of document CoP16 Doc. 19 (Rev. 1) was proposed for deletion. IUCN and Ecuador were opposed to this.

Safari Club International agreed that the working group should be small and restricted to Parties, but noted that it would like to participate if the working group were opened to observers. The Chair reiterated his view that participation should be restricted to Parties, but stated that the group should take into account the comments made by observers.

The Chair established a working group comprising Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Ireland, Mexico, Peru (chair), South Africa, the United States and Zimbabwe. The Chair suspended further discussion on this agenda item, pending the outcomes of the working group.

20. Wildlife trade policy reviews

The Secretariat introduced document CoP16 Doc. 20 and its annexes, which represented the culmination of a long series of activities, and, it was hoped, would be of use to Parties. It reported that the CITES website forum referred to in Paragraph 9 of the document had recently been moved to a more secure platform and would be re-launched. In celebration of the 40th anniversary of the Convention, a compilation of materials entitled "Law, policy and livelihoods" had been prepared in English, French and Spanish, with

some materials also in Portuguese, and would be available on a USB stick during the course of the meeting.

Uganda, which had participated on a voluntary basis in the review process, considered it to have been a valuable exercise, with a number of lessons learned, and urged the Committee to agree to the draft decisions in Annex 1. It was supported in this by Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, which looked forward to the final publication of the reviews and their widest possible dissemination.

The Committee agreed to the draft decisions and to delete Decision 15.8. Document CoP16 Doc. 20 was noted.

21. Capacity building

The Secretariat introduced document CoP16 Doc. 21, observing that capacity building lay at the heart of the Convention and outlining the extensive country-driven activities carried out by CITES in partnership with others. It drew particular attention to the European Commission-funded project that had started in 2009 and to the CITES Virtual College, hosted by the International University of Andalusia in Spain.

India and Suriname described their domestic and regional capacity building efforts, the latter with particular reference to the development of e-permitting systems and training of Customs officers. New Zealand reported that it had provided training in CITES implementation to a number of Parties and non-Parties in the Pacific region and that it would be providing such training to others, at their invitation, in 2013. Japan had carried out similar activities in Southeast Asia in collaboration with partners in the East and Southeast Asia Biodiversity Initiative. China reported that in 2012 it had organized a two-week seminar attended by participants from a number of African countries, and stated it was willing to organize more such seminars in future.

In response to a question from the Bahamas regarding participation in the European Commission-funded project, the Secretariat explained that not all countries had been eligible for funding. Madagascar urged expedition in the disbursement of funds and the Democratic Republic of the Congo underlined the need for training materials in French.

Ireland, on behalf of the Members States of the European Union and Croatia, in common with other speakers, commended the Secretariat on its efforts in capacity building. They applauded all those who had supported capacity building both financially and practically, encouraged further such support, and urged countries to translate training materials into their own languages.

The Kingdom of Bahrain stressed the particular needs of new Parties. The Bahamas and Sao Tome and Principe stressed those of small island developing States. In response, the Secretariat suggested inserting the phrase particularly in new Parties and small island developing States at the end of paragraph c) of the draft decision directed to the Secretariat in the annex to the document. In the same draft decision, the Secretary-General proposed deleting the words "subject to the availability of financial resources" in paragraphs d) and e) and appending the words subject to the availability of external funding where needed in the chapeau. In the draft decision directed to Parties, Japan proposed changing the phrase "Parties are urged" to Parties are encouraged. With these amendments, these draft decisions were accepted, as was the deletion of Decisions 14.12, 14.13, 15.21 and 15.22. Document CoP16 Doc. 21 was noted.

22. Proposal concerning a needs assessment for strengthening the implementation of CITES in developing countries

Ghana introduced document CoP16 Doc. 22 (Rev. 1), highlighting the many challenges faced by developing countries in implementing the Convention and the need to prioritize capacity-building efforts. It stated that it did not agree with the draft decisions presented in the Secretariat's comments on the document, because they did not sufficiently reflect the full scope of the original proposed text, such as the need to develop a process whereby the outcomes of the assessment would be taken into account. It suggested incorporating a modified version of the draft provided by the Secretariat into the draft decisions in the Annex to the document.

Sierra Leone, as a co-proponent of the document, echoed Ghana's comments that capacity-building efforts should address specific needs, which must be identified and prioritized.

Bahamas, Burkina Faso, the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sao Tome and Principe expressed their support for the original decisions in the annex to the document, while Japan inclined to prefer the Secretariat's suggested text. The Bahamas expressed their concern that further support to Parties in completing the questionnaire would be necessary, while Sao Tome and Principe agreed with Ghana that more work would be needed after the needs assessment to take the outcomes into account.

In response to a suggestion by the United States, supported by Ireland on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, the Chair asked Ghana, Sierra Leone, Senegal and the Secretariat to work together to bring a revised text before the Committee at a later session.

23. Capacity-building programme for science based establishment and implementation of voluntary national export quotas for Appendix-II species – Report of the Animals and Plants committees

The Chair of the Animals Committee introduced document CoP16 Doc. 23 (Rev. 1), drawing attention to Decisions 12.91 and 15.24, and stated that the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP 15) would allow the Animals and Plant Committees to take a permanent role in providing scientific advice on training materials related to non-detriment findings. He urged Parties to adopt the draft decision in the Annex, which invited Parties to share their experiences in the making of non-detriment findings. This, and the proposed changes to Resolution Conf. 11.1 (Rev. CoP15) and the consequential amendments to Decisions 15.24 and 12.91, as set out in document CoP16 Doc. 23 (Rev. 1), were accepted.

Administrative matters

8. Financing and budgeting of the Secretariat and of meetings of the Conference of the Parties

The Chair of the Budget Working Group (Switzerland) stated that the group was close to being able to present its findings to the Committee.

9. Arrangements for meetings

Document CoP16 Doc. 9 (Rev. 1) was withdrawn. Rwanda, a co-proponent of the document, explained that, following discussion with the Secretariat, it was satisfied that concerns regarding the organization of special meetings could be addressed by way of submission of suggestions for organizing such meetings to the 65th meeting of the Standing Committee. The Secretariat clarified that it would draft a document to this effect in consultation with Rwanda and the Central African Republic, and that the suggestions would be non-binding.

Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

Review of Resolutions

25. Proposals of the Secretariat

The Chair introduced document CoP16 Com. II. 1 relating to proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.5 (Rev. CoP15) on *Trade with States not Party to the Convention* and Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP15) on *Compliance and enforcement*.

Ireland, speaking on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, while supporting the document in principle, was not in favour of the deletion of recommendation f) of Resolution Conf. 10.3 on *Designation and role of Scientific Authorities* referred to in document CoP16 Doc. 25, Annex 7. As no Party objected, the Secretariat confirmed that the paragraph would be retained if document CoP16 Com. II. 1 were accepted.

Canada, although generally in support of document CoP16 Com. II. 1, proposed revising paragraph c) of Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP15) to delete "if necessary" and to replace "appropriate" with they see fit.

The proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 9.5 (Rev. CoP15) and Resolution Conf. 11.3 (Rev. CoP15) contained in document CoP16 Com. II. 1 were accepted with this amendment, noting the clarification from Ireland and an observation from the Secretariat that Resolution Conf. 11.8 was now defunct.

The Chair introduced document CoP16 Com. II. 2, related to amendments to Resolution Conf. 12.3 (Rev. CoP15) on *Permits and certificates*. The Secretariat noted that, in subparagraph iv), and needed to be inserted before “the type of CITES specimen”.

Canada, supported by the United States, expressed concern regarding the proposed deletion of text from subparagraph iv), stating the importance of knowing the quantity of specimens for which permits were issued. The Secretariat proposed amending subparagraph v) to take into account the request by Canada by inserting specimens of each type of, between "number of" and "manufactured products". Botswana suggested slightly modified text for subparagraph v). Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, and supported by Indonesia, favoured the amendments to subparagraph iv) as set out in the original document from the Secretariat. The Chair proposed that Canada, the United States and Ireland work together on revised wording, and report back to the Committee the next day.

The Chair introduced document CoP16 Com. II. 3, related to the proposed amendments to Resolution Conf. 13.6. This was accepted.

Trade control and marking

42. Physical inspection of timber shipments

The United States introduced document CoP16 Doc. 42 (Rev. 1), which reported on the progress of the Standing Committee Working Group on Physical Inspection of Timber Shipments. It recommended adoption of the draft decision in paragraph 11, directing the Secretariat to obtain and publish information from Parties on procedures for the identification and measurement of CITES-listed tree species. The Secretariat proposed replacing "Compile" with Publish at the start of subparagraph b) of the draft decision. With this change the decision was accepted.

34. Electronic permitting

The Secretariat introduced document CoP16 Doc. 34 (Rev. 1), explaining that it reported on intersessional work on electronic permitting (e-permitting), especially regarding updating of the electronic toolkit, and contained a draft decision directing the Standing Committee to extend the mandate of its Working Group on Information Technologies and Electronic Systems.

Switzerland, supported by Brazil; Canada; China; Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia; the Philippines and the United States, urged the adoption of the draft decision. Brazil and China expressed their intentions to promulgate uptake of the latest electronic permitting technologies at regional level. Canada, Mexico, the Philippines, Thailand and the United States voiced their wish to be included in the Working Group, should the decision be accepted.

Indonesia posed three questions, namely, how countries using e-permitting could transact with countries using paper systems, how security with e-permitting could be vouchsafed, and when e-permitting would be implemented. In response, the Secretariat noted that the transition to e-systems would take place at different rates globally, necessitating the operation of hybrid electronic and paper systems, for example via a central registry of e-permits, until such time as there was worldwide functionality with the former. It assured the Committee that e-documentation was inherently more secure than paper equivalents, but noted that security remained an issue for some Parties.

Replying to a plea from the Humane Society International that no Party should be left behind in conversion to e-permitting, Switzerland drew attention to its side event on paperless permitting the following week, and the Secretariat stated it was possible it would have funds for translation of the electronic toolkit into French and Spanish.

The draft decision in the Annex to document CoP16 Doc. 34 (Rev. 1), and the Secretariat's recommendation to delete Decisions 15.54 and 15.55 were accepted.

The meeting was adjourned at 17h20.