

***Summary Report  
of the Plenary Meeting***

First Session: 7 November 1994: 10h00-11h10

Secretariat: I. Topkov  
Rapporteurs: C. Allan  
T. Inskipp

I/II Opening Ceremony by the Authorities of the United States of America and Welcoming Addresses

The Secretary General welcomed the participants and introduced the following speakers who gave speeches of welcome. He commented that 119 Parties were represented at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; this was 96% of all CITES Parties, the most comprehensive attendance in the history of the Convention. He stressed that it was the responsibility of the Parties to decide which issues were the most important priorities. He hoped that the extensive documentation would be reduced in the future, as a positive sign of progress in conserving species, as well as resources. The Secretary General declared the meeting open.

Ms M. Beattie, Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, thanked the organizers and corporate and private sponsors. She highlighted the two goals of CITES, the protection of wildlife and sustainable use. The CITES ban on trade in ivory had been effective but the loss of revenue for African range States was recognized, and additional support for enforcement and conservation initiatives has therefore been provided by the United States Government. However, she emphasized that additional funding is required from other CITES Parties. The United States Government was also developing and supporting programmes and projects to conserve tiger and rhinoceros populations in Asia. She concluded by welcoming and thanking participants on behalf of Mr B. Babbitt, Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior.

Ms S. Poitier, Chairman of the Broward County Board of County Commissioners, expressed the honour for Fort Lauderdale to be the location of the CITES meeting and welcomed participants to Florida and the United States. She formally announced that the period 6-18 November 1994 had been declared "Endangered

Species CITES Awareness Week" in Broward County, and the official proclamation was presented to the Secretary General.

Ms E. Dowdeswell, Executive Director of UNEP, emphasized that the recent Lusaka Agreement was a great achievement for co-operative initiatives and should be seen as a guide upon which to base similar agreements in the future. She stated that the development of the Biodiversity Convention had been successful but it would not supersede CITES as the former excludes references to international wildlife trade. She also stated that economic development and conservation are not inseparable and that the gap must be bridged. UNEP had sponsored the first meeting of the Global Tiger Forum and had also called upon the Global Environment Fund to give priority to projects to conserve the tiger, elephants and rhinoceroses. She expressed dismay that only one third of annual contributions to CITES from the Parties for the current year had been received and suggested that this might result in the Secretariat being forced to reduce its activities. She closed by thanking the United States of America for hosting and organizing the meeting and she wished the meeting success.

Mr M. Hosking, Chairman of the Standing Committee, welcomed those countries that had recently become party to the Convention. He stated that CITES was respected globally as a pragmatic convention. He also thanked the host country and welcomed the participants to the meeting.

Mr G. Furness and Ms G. Hemley, on behalf of the Conservation Treaty Support Fund, World Wildlife Fund US and TRAFFIC USA, together with Ms Mary Helsaple, presented a painting by Ms Helsaple to the US Department of the Interior. This was accepted with thanks by Ms Beattie.

The Secretary General closed the session at 11h10.

### Second Session: 7 November 1994: 14h15-17h35

Chairmen:	M. Hosking (New Zealand) and F. Loy (United States of America)
Secretariat:	I. Topkov J. Berney O. Menghi
UNEP:	E. Dowdeswell
Rapporteurs:	J. Caldwell L. Collins M. Haywood B. Perez

#### III Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

The Chairman of the Standing Committee opened the session and commented that document Doc. 9.3 contained the new Rules of Procedure to be considered for adoption. Before their adoption, the Rules of the previous meeting, contained in document Doc. 8.3, would apply.

The Secretariat pointed out that there were only two ways in which the newly proposed Rules of Procedure differed from those adopted at the last meeting. Both changes were in Rule 15, paragraph 3. The first change affected the election of officers or prospective host countries by secret ballot "when there is more than one candidate". The second changed section stated, "The Presiding officer may either refuse a request for a secret ballot or ask whether it is seconded. If the request is seconded by five Representatives the vote shall be by secret ballot." Secret ballots had been used in previous meetings although they were difficult to implement. The Standing Committee had therefore been requested to formulate a proposal for the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The Standing Committee at its 31st meeting had approved the text proposed in document Doc. 9.3.

The Chairman requested, under Rule 25, that news media representatives in the plenary session not make any recording until authorized to do so.

The delegation of Japan offered their suggestions, based on their experiences during the last meeting of the Conference. In particular they suggested that the discussions be based on the fundamental policy of "harmony between conservation and utilization of wildlife", which enables sustainable use, that scientific data should be considered as the primary basis for making sound decisions, and that there was a need to promote mutual understanding and respect between producer and consumer countries. They voiced no objection to the Rules of Procedure as proposed.

The delegation of the United States of America, supported by the delegations of Australia, Austria and Israel, did not agree that the proposal would make the procedures for voting by secret ballot any easier, and commented that each delegation was accountable to its own country, therefore there was no need to vote in secret. The delegation of the United States of America stated that any votes made by them would be made public.

The delegation of the United Kingdom, supported by the delegations of Argentina, Liechtenstein, Namibia, the Sudan and Zimbabwe, agreed with the principal of openness, but also agreed with the proposed change, except for the proposal to allow the Presiding Officer

the sole responsibility for refusing a secret ballot vote. The delegation of the United Kingdom recommended that, in place of allowing the decision for a secret ballot to be determined by the Presiding Officer, a minimum of ten delegations should be required to second the request.

The Secretariat suggested that a vote be taken on the second amendment to Rule 15, paragraph 3. This initiated a debate between the Chairman, the Secretariat and several delegations, including those of Australia, France, Panama, Portugal, Senegal, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, the United States of America and Zimbabwe on the clarification of voting order, procedural points of order and concerns over which Rules of Procedure were to be implemented. A final vote on this matter was postponed until the report of the Credentials Committee had been received.

#### IV Election of the Chairman and Vice-Chairmen of the Meeting and of Chairmen of Committees I and II and of the Budget Committee

The Chairman read out the nominations prepared by the Standing Committee at its 32nd meeting.

Chairman	F. Loy (United States)
Vice-Chairmen	S. C. Dey (India) G. Doungoubé (Central African Republic)
Committee I	E. Ezcurra (Mexico)
Committee II	V. Lichtschein (Argentina)
Budget Committee	R. Sharp (United Kingdom)

There were no objections and the nominees were elected.

Following the election of the Officers, the Chairman of the Standing Committee handed over the Chair to the Chairman of the meeting. The latter expressed his appreciation for the honour of representing his country as Chairman, and expressed his commitment towards achieving the goals of the Convention.

#### V Adoption of the Agenda and Working Programmes

The Secretariat introduced documents Doc. 9.1 (Rev.), Doc. 9.2 (Rev.), Doc. 9.2.1 (Rev.) and Doc. 9.2.2 (Rev.). The Secretary General proposed that the Working Programmes be amended to introduce a plenary session beginning at 09h00 on 10 November, to enable the Secretary of the United States Department of the Interior to address the meeting. Committees I and II would temporarily adjourn to attend the Secretary's address.

The delegation of Pakistan commented that the Conference should adopt the Rules of Procedure from

the last meeting in order to proceed and suggested that the Credentials Committee must report to the Conference.

The Secretary General reaffirmed that, in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 5, the Rules of Procedure of the previous meeting were in effect and that the Credentials Committee and the Secretariat needed time to do their work.

The delegation of Japan pointed out that, in document Doc. 9.1 (Rev.), under Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention, item 16 should deal instead with trade in shark parts and derivatives rather than the management of sharks. They added, however that the Agenda item should be deleted as there were many other international fishery organizations that were more appropriate than CITES to collect data on sharks.

The delegation of the United States of America, supported by the delegations of Ecuador, the Gambia and Germany, stated that CITES had competence to regulate trade in shark products and believed that the Parties should discuss this important issue.

The delegation of Japan concluded that if the general consensus of the meeting was that the trade in sharks should be discussed, they would not request a vote to amend the provisional Agenda but they would like to elaborate their position on this issue under the relevant Agenda item. Without further discussion, the provisional Agenda in document Doc. 9.1 (Rev.) was adopted.

The Secretariat introduced documents Doc. 9.2 (Rev.), 9.2.1 (Rev.) and 9.2.2 (Rev.) pointing out that, since document Doc. 9.1 (Rev.) had already been adopted, comments should be limited to points other than matters concerning Agenda item III. Documents Doc. 9.2 (Rev.) (as amended) and Doc. 9.2.1 (Rev.) were adopted.

The delegation of Cameroon proposed that documents not be adopted until the Credentials Committee had reported and suggested that decisions made prior to that time be ratified in a later plenary session. The delegation of Switzerland, supported by the delegation of the United Kingdom and the Secretariat, pointed out that Rule 3, paragraph 3, of the Rules of Procedure did not preclude adoption by consensus. The delegation of Cameroon therefore was prepared to withdraw its suggestion but proposed that the Secretariat be asked to investigate how other conventions overcome the issue of voting before credentials have been established. The Chairman requested the Secretary General carry out this investigation and to report to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Document Doc. 9.2.2 (Rev.) was then adopted.

#### VI Establishment of the Credentials Committee

The Secretary General advised the participants that the Bureau had proposed the delegations of Costa Rica, France, Malaysia, South Africa and the United States of America to serve on the Credentials Committee. This was agreed. The Secretariat invited those delegations to designate representatives to start work immediately after the plenary session.

#### VIII Admission of Observers

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 9.4, which listed the bodies and institutions that had requested observer status, and announced a number of amendments. A revised list would be submitted for approval. It was also noted that the Secretariat had not received approval for the participation of several NGOs

from the governments concerned, and asked that the respective Parties attend to this matter.

The delegation of Venezuela asked for the following declaration to be included in the record:

"I would like to present a brief declaration on this item, which has the support of the following Parties: Botswana, China, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Malawi, Namibia, Panama, South Africa and Zimbabwe.

Article XI states that any organization technically qualified in protection, conservation or management of wild fauna and flora shall be admitted as an observer unless at least one-third of the Parties present objects. On the other hand, in relation to the admission of NGOs, their participation must be approved by the State in which they have their headquarters. This State must declare whether the NGOs are technically qualified to participate as observers in these important meetings.

The fact that certain NGOs abuse these privileges has been a matter of concern to us. They have claimed to be technically and professionally qualified within the meetings and have presented, at the same time, false, misleading documentation without any scientific basis in order to influence the debates within the plenary session or in the committees of the Conference. We can give examples of this behaviour and provide the relevant facts.

It is not our intention to blame the States that have authorized the participation of these dishonest NGOs, nor to ask that these organizations be excluded from this meeting. However, we want to remind the Parties of their responsibilities under Article XI and we request that they take this matter seriously. Therefore, even if it is almost impossible to distinguish between dishonesty and ineptitude, we urge the Parties that participate in this Conference and the chairmen of the committees to bear in mind the conduct of some NGOs during this meeting."

The delegation of the Netherlands called attention to one Dutch NGO that had not been approved by their government but that was listed in document Doc. 9.4. The Secretariat promised to investigate. The delegation of the United States of America explained that they needed more time to check the status of some of the NGOs that were identified by the Secretariat as not having proper approval. Document Doc. 9.4, as amended, was adopted.

#### IX Matters Related to the Standing Committee

##### 1. Report of the Chairman

The Chairman of the Standing Committee introduced document Doc. 9.5, outlining the work the Committee had completed since the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and the problems encountered. Several delegations expressed concern about translation and interpretation, both having financial implications. The delegations of France, Spain and Senegal expressed their thanks to the outgoing Chairman and indicated their concern that the lack of adequate translation of documents and simultaneous interpretation prevented some members from participating fully. The Secretary General pointed out that the Standing Committee budget had been correctly estimated but that problems had arisen from Parties failing to make their contributions on time. Furthermore, one French and one Spanish translator had recently

been appointed, paid from the Trust Fund. However, should the attendance at meetings of the Committee increase then these additions to the Secretariat staff might not be sufficient. It was suggested that this matter might be included in the discussion of document Doc. 9.7. The Secretary General also thanked the members of the Standing Committee and the Chairman for their active participation.

In reference to paragraph 3.2 of document Doc. 9.5, the delegation of China commented that presentations of NGOs to members of the Standing Committee had been an extra burden on resources and suggested that the provisions of Resolution Conf. 6.1 be adhered to. There being no further comments, document Doc. 9.5 was adopted.

## 2. Regional Representation on the Standing Committee

The Chairman invited the delegation of Malawi to introduce document Doc. 9.7, containing a draft resolution that their country had been requested to prepare on regional representation. Their basic tenet, which was fully supported by the delegations of China, Japan and Malaysia, was that regions with many countries were inadequately represented in the Standing Committee. The delegation of China further suggested that paragraph c) should specify actions to relieve communication problems.

The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago recognized the budgetary constraints affecting this issue but supported the principle of increased representation for some regions. They suggested that both the regional representative and the alternate from each region attend meetings. This view was broadly supported by the delegations of Germany and the United Kingdom although the latter preferred North America and Oceania to be represented by only one representative each. The delegations of Panama and Spain believed that greater participation would enrich debate but it was

important that priorities should be established for limited budgetary resources. They suggested that interpretation be given priority over increased representation.

The delegation of Germany was concerned that there was an imbalance in attendance at meetings caused by inadequate finance. They believed this problem would not be alleviated by altering the composition of the Committee on a regional basis, but that adequate funding should be provided to finance the attendance of the alternate regional representatives at Committee meetings. The delegation of the United Republic of Tanzania, in support of the draft resolution, expressed the view that money was not necessarily the main issue.

The delegation of Switzerland asked for clarification of paragraph b) of the draft resolution and raised a technical point with regard to the addition of countries to a region between meetings of the Conference of the Parties. They further requested that this proposal be discussed in the Budget Committee before decisions were taken in plenary session. As the Chairman of the Budget Committee, the Delegate of the United Kingdom asked for guidance from the plenary session on the options it should be deliberating.

The number of technical and financial considerations raised in the debate prompted the delegation of Canada to propose that a working group be set up to provide advice. This suggestion was accepted by the delegation of Malawi, and the delegation of the United States of America suggested that the working group might also consider similar implications for the Animals Committee, as outlined in document Doc. 9.49. The Chairman asked that the working group report back to the next plenary session.

After some announcements from the Secretariat the session was closed at 17h35.

## Third Session: 8 November 1994: 14h20-17h20

Chairman:	F. Loy (United States of America)
Secretariat:	I. Topkov J. Berney O. Menghi J. Barzdo
Rapporteurs:	J. Caldwell H. Corrigan R. Gabel J. Gray

Following various announcements by the Secretary General and the Chairman, the Chairman stated that approval of document Plen. 9.2 would be deferred until the fourth plenary session.

### VII Report of the Credentials Committee

The Chairman of the Credentials Committee reported that the credentials of the representatives of 100 Parties had been fully accepted. Those of the representatives of two additional Parties had been provisionally accepted.

### III Adoption of the Rules of Procedure

The Chairman reported that the Bureau had recommended adoption of document Doc. 9.3, with replacement of the second and third sentences in Rule 15, paragraph 3, with The Presiding Officer shall ask whether the request is seconded. If it is seconded by ten Representatives the vote shall be by secret ballot., as proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom.

The delegation of Colombia suggested that voting by secret ballot should be the norm. However, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago stated that the majority of Parties in their region supported the amendment proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom. The delegation of Senegal on behalf of the African region also supported the amendment, and the delegation of the United States of America withdrew their proposal to retain the Rules of Procedure from the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties after obtaining clarification from the Chairman that the Bureau clearly expected that secret ballots would be used only in exceptional circumstances. Following further expressions of support for the general principle of voting by secret ballot by the delegations of Singapore and Argentina, document Doc. 9.3 was adopted with the revision proposed by the delegation of the United Kingdom.

The delegations of Australia, the United States of America and Zimbabwe stated that their votes would always be made public. The delegation of Ecuador reiterated their opposition to any secret ballot.

### IX Matters Related to the Standing Committee

#### 2. Regional Representation on the Standing Committee

The Chairman granted a request by the delegation of Malawi to postpone reporting the recommendations of the working group on this issue.

### X Report of the Secretariat

The Secretary General presented document Doc. 9.6 as self-explanatory, but noted the increased workload of the Secretariat and that the proportion of unpaid contributions from Parties had increased acutely since the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The delegation of Germany urged Parties to refrain from overburdening the Secretariat, drawing particular attention to the large number of permits verified. The Secretary General reminded the Parties that Resolutions directing activities to the Secretariat oblige the Secretariat to perform additional duties, whereas for the Parties the Resolutions are merely recommendations.

Document Doc. 9.6 was adopted.

### XII Committee Reports and Recommendations

#### 1. Animals Committee

##### a) Report of the Chairman

The Chairman of the Animals Committee introduced document Doc. 9.13. He stressed the desirability of consultation between the CITES Secretariat and the Interim Secretariat of the Biodiversity Convention regarding the subject dealt with in section 4.5 of the document. The Secretariat informed the Parties that the Interim Secretariat of the Biodiversity Convention had been contacted on this issue and further discussions were expected. The Chairman of the Animals Committee also emphasized the importance of field studies in the implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9.

The delegation of the United States of America, after expressing support for implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9, suggested that corals be considered in the review of significantly traded species.

Following discussion of whether to refer Annex 2 to Committee I, document Doc. 9.13, including Annex 2, was adopted.

##### b) Regional Representation on the Animals Committee

The Chairman recommended that this agenda item be deferred until the similar issue of regional representation on the Standing Committee had been resolved.

#### 2. Plants Committee

The Chairman of the Plants Committee introduced document Doc. 9.14, outlining the work carried out by the Committee since the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. This included contributions to development of the new criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II, the important issue of trade in medicinal plants and the listing of tropical timber including the relationship between CITES and the International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO). The Chairman of the Plants Committee also highlighted some of the continuing problems, such as a lack of an

appropriate scientific authority or designated plant expert in some party States.

While praising the Committee for its efforts, the delegation of the United States of America expressed one concern, namely that the process of validating the new criteria was only carried out on selected species, and they pointed out that adopting the report of the Plants Committee does not constitute any endorsement for particular listing criteria.

The delegation of the Netherlands also complimented the Committee for its work and stressed that efforts to establish a relationship with ITTO should be continued. The delegations of Japan and Malaysia expressed the view that the report did not accurately reflect the efforts made by ITTO to improve the co-operation between CITES and ITTO. The delegation of Brazil reported that ITTO had prepared studies on sustainable use of tropical timbers, which should be considered when amendments to the appendices are tabled. They further commented that, in relation to paragraph 5 of document Doc. 9.14, authorities in importing countries should strive to improve their enforcement of the Convention.

The delegation of Switzerland pointed out that ITTO, like CITES, is an international body and many countries are party to both. They therefore suggested that delegations liaise closely with their counterparts currently attending the ITTO meeting in Japan.

There being no further comments, document Doc. 9.14 was adopted.

### 3. Identification Manual Committee

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 9.15, commenting that the Committee had been non-existent since the resignation of the Chairman at the sixth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, and requested advice on the future of the Committee. The delegation of the Netherlands regretted that they had been unable to produce their contributions to the Identification Manual but stressed that they would be doing so very soon. They added that they were looking for funding to enable other countries to produce data sheets and were committed to financing data sheets on three species of tropical timber.

The delegation of Switzerland announced that they had contracted two consultants to produce sheets for the remaining species of snake and expected to produce sheets covering 50 species of raptor next year. They believed that, although the Editor of the Identification Manual had performed most of the functions of the former Chairman, they hoped to be in a position to nominate a new Chairman in the near future. This was strongly appreciated by the delegation of the Netherlands. The Secretariat, supported by the delegation of Canada, asked that the question of the future of the Committee be passed to the Standing Committee for resolution if the proposed Chairman were unable to accept the position.

The delegation of the United Kingdom pointed out an error on page 2 of the report, as they had produced all of the data sheets that were expected from them. This being noted, document Doc. 9.15 was adopted.

### 4. Nomenclature Committee

#### a) Report of the Chairman

The Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee introduced document Doc. 9.16 but stressed that it was not proposed that it be adopted at this time as he was inviting comments after the end of the present session. The delegation of Switzerland

expressed some disquiet about some of the proposed nomenclatural changes, particularly in paragraphs 2, 3 and 8 on pages 4 and 5 of the document, but agreed to discuss these later. Noting this, the Chairman of the meeting thanked the Committee and its Chairman for their efforts.

## XIV Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

### 1. Review of the Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties

Document Doc. 9.19 was introduced by the Chairman of the Standing Committee who reported that it had been agreed at the eighth meeting of the Conference of the Parties that the Secretariat should initiate a consolidation of existing Resolutions so that they could be more easily understood and implemented. He explained that this process was still in progress and that document Doc. 9.19 contains guidelines to ensure that the Resolutions do not again become more difficult to manage than they need be. There being no comments, document Doc. 9.19 was adopted.

#### a) Deletion of Resolutions that Are out of Date

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 9.19.1 (Rev.), which lists the Resolutions and parts of Resolutions that it considers to be defunct. A draft of this document had been sent to the Parties with a Notification to the Parties in July 1994, with a request for comments but only the United States of America had responded. As a result of these comments, the Secretariat suggested that the repeal of Resolutions Conf. 2.7, Conf. 2.8 and Conf. 3.13 be discussed when Agenda item XIV.15, on Illegal Trade in Whale Meat, is dealt with. In addition the Secretariat wished to delete Resolution Conf. 4.24 from the document and to consider this Resolution in the discussion of document Doc. 9.19.2.

The Secretariat further pointed out that a correction was necessary relating to Resolution Conf. 6.12 where paragraph a) should only refer to sub-paragraphs i) to iv) and paragraph "b)" should read d).

The delegation of Japan explained that they had fully considered the document in the Standing Committee and supported it fully. However, the delegation of Switzerland explained that, if new criteria for amending the appendices were not agreed during the current meeting of the Conference of the Parties, deletion of Resolution Conf. 2.23 would make it impossible to remove taxa listed in the appendices before the Berne Criteria were established. The delegation of the United States of America, supported by the delegation of Ghana, felt that some aspects, particularly in Annex 2, needed closer examination and therefore proposed that a working group be established.

The observer from Safari Club International further suggested that a simple set of guidelines to the Resolutions could replace the procedure of repealing Resolutions. The delegation of Germany expressed the view that it was premature to adopt the document prior to the debate on listing criteria and believed that such a decision should not be made until the end of the meeting.

There was no objection from the Secretariat to the idea of forming a working group and, after comments from the observer from the African Elephant Foundation International, the Chairman asked the delegation of Switzerland to establish an open working group. The delegation of Botswana,

supported by the delegation of the United States of America, suggested that the working group should also consider document Doc. 9.19.2. This was agreed by the delegation of Switzerland, who

requested that any comments on the two documents should be submitted to the Secretariat.

After some announcements from the Secretariat the session was closed at 17h20.

### Fourth Session: 10 November 1994: 09h15-09h50

Chairman: F. Loy (United States of America)  
Secretariat: I. Topkov  
Rapporteurs: J. Caldwell  
M. Haywood

The Chairman announced that it had been decided that a special plenary session could take place, to allow the Secretary of the Interior of the United States of America, as head of the delegation of the host country, to make a presentation. The Chairman added that the Department of the Interior was the body responsible for conservation, natural resource management and the implementation of CITES in the United States of America and, as head of this body, Secretary Babbitt was well qualified for the tasks involved.

Secretary Babbitt expressed his gratitude, on behalf of the host country, for the hard work of the Secretary General, the Chairman and Ms M. Beattie Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

He recalled that it was twenty years since CITES had been established in Washington, D.C., amongst general scepticism that such a multilateral institution could be effective. However, during the intervening period the sceptics had been proven wrong and CITES had flourished - an extraordinary idea matched by extraordinary accomplishments. He believed that the most important of these had been the measures taken for the protection of the African elephant and the prohibition of commercial trade in ivory. This species was once again due for review as a result of a thoughtful proposal from South Africa for trade in hides and meat only and the delegation of the United States of America considered that a full discussion, and careful hearing of facts and advice from the range States, was essential before any decisions were taken.

Using the examples of the tiger and the black rhinoceros, he explained that practical enforcement of the Convention was one of the key issues. Protection of these species needed a change where the trade was driven by a culturally based demand and not simply fashion.

Further important issues involved adequate training of enforcement personnel and the establishment of good management plans for sustainable use of wildlife. In particular, managed trophy hunting in Africa could provide a valuable source of income whilst instilling a sense of conservation awareness in local communities.

Finally he underlined the importance of public support for CITES and its achievements and reminded the assembly of the need for constant efforts to maintain this support.

The Chairman thanked the Secretary and invited Mr A. Kochen and Mr S. Federovisky from CITES/C&M International Magazine to make a presentation. They thanked the Government of the United States of America for the opportunity to present their magazine, which was published in English and Spanish and covered issues of wildlife conservation and management.

#### VII Report of the Credentials Committee

The Chairman of the Credentials Committee reported that the credentials of a further seven delegations had been approved, bringing the total number of delegations with approved credentials to 109.

After some announcements from the Secretariat, the Chairman closed the session at 09h50.

### Fifth Session: 14 November 1994: 09h20-10h35

Chairman:	F. Loy (United States of America)
Secretariat:	I. Topkov J. Berney A. Beyene M. Astralaga
UNEP:	E. Ortega
Rapporteurs:	H. Corrigan G. Furness

The Chairman opened the meeting at 09h20 and noted the need to approve the minutes of the four previous sessions, in documents Plen. 9.1, 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4 (Rev). The Secretary General noted that, in document Plen. 9.2, on page 2, the reference to the meeting of the Standing Committee should be changed from 31st to 32nd and the name of the Vice-Chairman representing the African region should be G. Doungoubé (Central African Republic); on page 5, in the first paragraph, tenth line, the text should be amended to indicate that the French and Spanish translators were funded from the Trust Fund.

The delegation of the United States of America stated that they had already provided to the Secretariat corrections to statements made by their delegation in the plenary sessions. The Chairman noting no further objections, the minutes of the first four plenary sessions were approved.

#### VII Report of the Credentials Committee

At the request of the Chairman, the Chairman of the Credentials Committee announced that the Committee had approved the credentials of El Salvador, bringing the number of accredited delegations to 110. The Committee was still examining the credentials of several other delegations.

#### IX Matters Related to the Standing Committee

##### 2. Regional Representation on the Standing Committee

The delegation of Malawi introduced document Com. 9.2, containing a draft decision of the Conference of the Parties on regional representation on the Standing Committee. They noted that the following delegations had participated in the working group: Malawi as chairman, Australia, Benin, Botswana, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Cuba, France, India, Indonesia, Kenya, Namibia, New Zealand, Romania, the Russian Federation, Switzerland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the United Kingdom and Zimbabwe. Document Com. 9.2 contained draft decisions and draft amendments to Resolution Conf. 6.1 Annex 1, on which the working group had agreed.

There being no objection, document Com. 9.2 was adopted.

In response to a question from the Chairman, the delegation of Malawi stated that the working group had not taken up the issue of the composition of the Animals and Plants Committees as this was not in their terms of reference. The delegation of France congratulated the delegation of Malawi as chairman of the working group and mentioned two points: i) the need for the enlarged committee to benefit from interpretation and translation, which should be reflected in the budget; and ii) the question as to whether the expansion should also be reflected in the Animals and Plants Committees. The delegation of France did not

think that expansion of the latter Committees was necessary as they were technical committees.

The Chairman made clear that provision for one meeting a year of the expanded Standing Committee, with interpretation and translation, had been provided for in the budget. With regard to document Doc. 9.49, submitted by Kenya, concerning regional representation on the Animals Committee, the Chairman noted that the budget had not included funds for expansion of either the Animals or Plants Committee. The delegation of Kenya felt that the principles that applied to the Standing Committee should also apply to the Animals and Plants Committees and said that they would like to maintain their proposal. The delegation of Kenya agreed to revise their document to cover the Plants Committee and would not call on the Trust Fund for funding. The delegation of Australia indicated support in principle, and the Chairman, hearing no objection, asked the delegation of Kenya to revise their draft resolution and to present it at the next plenary session.

##### 3. Election of New Members and Alternate Regional Members

The Chairman asked the regional representatives to indicate the nominations for the expanded Standing Committee:

The delegation of Senegal, representing Africa, announced the following:

- Representatives: Senegal, Namibia, Sudan
- Alternates: Burkina Faso, South Africa, United Republic of Tanzania

The delegation of Thailand, representing Asia, indicated that the region would decide on its representation that day and would inform the Secretariat.

The delegation of Sweden, representing Europe, announced the following:

- Representatives: United Kingdom, the Russian Federation
- Alternates: France, Bulgaria

The delegation of Canada, representing North America, announced the following:

- Representative: Mexico
- Alternate: Canada

The delegation of New Zealand, representing Oceania, announced the following:

- Representative: Papua New Guinea
- Alternate: New Zealand

The delegation of Trinidad and Tobago, representing South and Central America and the Caribbean, announced the following:

- Representatives: Trinidad and Tobago
- Alternates: Panama

The delegation also indicated that Argentina had been provisionally designated as a representative and Saint Lucia as alternate, subject to confirmation by a regional meeting that day.

There being no objection, the Chairman noted that the election of the regional representatives had been agreed by consensus, congratulated the new members, and noted that the tasks of the Standing Committee were steadily increasing.

XI Financing and Budgeting of the Secretariat and of Meetings of the Conference of the Parties

The Chairman turned to the question of financing and budgeting and called on the Chairman of Committee II to report. She highlighted a point made previously, that Parties should make their contributions as soon as possible and preferably at the beginning of the calendar year. She also noted that the budget for 1996-1997, proposed in document Com. 9.5, was less than the budget proposed by the Secretariat in document Doc. 9.10 by CHF 2 million, but still the annual contributions of the individual Parties would be increased by 14.5 per cent over their annual contributions for the triennium 1993-1995. She noted, that if the Conference of the Parties approved new expenditures, the budget would have to be amended. The draft resolution on financing and budgeting, the Terms of Reference for the Administration of the Trust Fund, and the scale of contributions based on the 1996-1997 biennial budget, appeared in document Com. 9.8.

The delegation of Japan announced that it fully supported the announced budget and that it would provide a substantial amount out of the USD 100,000,

which would be set aside for CITES special assistance projects, for the proposed study on improving the effectiveness of the Convention (document Doc. 9.18).

The Chairman of Committee II noted that Switzerland would provide CHF 10,000 towards the work of the Nomenclature Committee.

The Secretariat noted that, in document Com. 9.5, the dollar amount given in line 2104 (Identification Manual - animals) should be USD 57,971. The Chairman noted that the financial documents had been fully debated in the Budget Committee and Committee II.

The delegations of Panama, Spain and Uruguay referred to the concern of the delegation of France about interpretation for the Standing Committee. The Secretary General pointed out that the budget presented in document Com. 9.5 provided for interpretation for one four-day meeting of the Standing Committee a year. The delegation of Uruguay asked whether voluntary contributions would be appropriate for this. The Chairman noted that such contributions, if not from governments or international governmental organizations, must be approved by the Standing Committee but, in principle, seemed appropriate.

The Chairman, seeing no objection, declared as adopted the draft resolution in document Com. 9.8, the budget in document Com. 9.5, and documents Doc. 9.8, 9.9, 9.11 and 9.12. The Chairman noted that, if subsequent decisions required additional funds it could be necessary to increase the level of contributions. The Secretary General thanked the Parties, the Chairman of Committee II, the Chairman of the Budget Committee and the rapporteur of the Budget Committee. He wished he could thank everyone, and reiterated the invitation to all Parties, in the Resolution on financing and budgeting, to support requests for funding of CITES projects by the Global Environment Facility.

After several announcements, the session was closed at 10h35.

Sixth Session: 16 November 1994: 20h40-21h10

Chairman: F. Loy (United States of America)  
 Secretariat: I. Topkov  
 J. Berney  
 J. Barzdo  
 Rapporteurs: C. Allan  
 T. Inskipp

The Chairman expressed gratitude to the Chairman of Committee I for his dedicated endeavours. He then asked for comments on document Plen. 9.5, the summary report of the fifth plenary session. The Secretary General proposed the following amendments: the third sentence in the first paragraph, under item XI, should read "She also noted that the budget for 1996-1997, proposed in document Com. 9.5, was less than the budget proposed by the Secretariat in document Doc. 9.10 by CHF 2 million, but still the annual contributions of the individual Parties would be increased by 14.5 per cent over their annual contributions for the triennium 1993-1995." In the second sentence in the fifth paragraph, before "Standing Committee" insert four-day meeting of the. In the fourth sentence in the same paragraph, after "contributions" insert ,if not from governments or international governmental organizations. Document Plen. 9.5 was adopted as amended.

IX Matters Related to the Standing Committee

2. Regional Representation on the Standing Committee

The Chairman requested that the Regional Representative for South and Central America and the Caribbean should name the recently appointed representatives on the Standing Committee. The Regional Representative, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago, listed them as follows:

- Representatives: Argentina and Trinidad and Tobago
- Alternates: Panama and Saint Lucia.

The Chairman requested that the Regional Representative for Asia should name the recently appointed representatives on the Standing Committee. The Regional Representative, the delegation of

Thailand, listed them as follows: the representatives were Japan and Thailand; the alternates were India and Pakistan.

XII Committee Reports and Recommendations

1/2. Animals and Plants Committees

b) Regional Representation on the Committees

The Chairman introduced document Com. 9.27, regarding the regional representation on the Animals and Plants Committees. The Secretary General stated that the title of the document should read, "Regional Representation on the Animals and Plants Committees". He also proposed the following amendments. The fifth paragraph should read, "AWARE that there are only three Parties in the North American region, but more than 40 in Africa, more than 25 in South and Central America and the Caribbean, and 20 or more in Asia, which, in addition, stretches from Israel in the West to Japan in the East;". In the first operative paragraph, after "two persons each", insert for the Animals and Plants Committees. In the second operative paragraph, replace all text following the words "elected alternate" with ; and. Add a new paragraph at the end, as follows: CONFIRMS that the two operative paragraphs above shall not have any new financial implications for the Trust Fund in addition to those agreed prior to the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The draft resolution in document Com. 9.27 was approved as amended.

The Chairman requested the Regional Representatives to name the recently appointed representatives and alternates on the Animals and Plants Committees. These are detailed below.

**Africa**

Animals

Representatives: Jonathan Hutton (Zimbabwe)  
 Alternates: Emmanuel L.M. Severre (Republic of Tanzania)

Jean Ngog Nje (Cameroon)  
 Bihini Won Wa Musiti (Zaire)

Plants

Representatives: Christine Kabuye (Kenya)  
 Alternates: James Seyan (Malawi)

Rejdali Moh (Morocco)  
 A. Cunningham (South Africa)

**Asia**

Animals

Representatives: Giam Choo Hoo (Singapore)  
 Alternates: M. Muzammel Hussain (Bangladesh)

Tonny Soehartono (Indonesia)  
 P.W. Seneviratne (Sri Lanka)

Plants

Representatives: Zulmuksar Shaari (Malaysia)  
 Alternates: Wichar Thitiprasert (Thailand)

Hong De-yuan (China)  
 Dwiatmo Siswomartono (Indonesia)

## Europe

### Animals

Representative: Rainer Blanke (Germany)  
Alternate: Jan Kucera (Czech Republic)

### Plants

Representative: Margarita Clemente Muñoz (Spain)  
Alternate: Bertrand von Arx (Switzerland)

## North America

### Animals

Representative: Charles Dauphiné (Canada)  
Alternate: Humberto Salgado y Bonilla (Mexico)

### Plants

Representative: Bruce MacBryde (United States of America)  
Alternate: Wilfrido Márquez Ramirez (Mexico)

## Oceania

### Animals

Representative: Robert Jenkins (Australia)  
Alternate: Rod Hay (New Zealand)

### Plants

Representative: Jim Armstrong (Australia)  
Alternate: Janet Owen (New Zealand)

## South and Central America and the Caribbean

### Animals

Representatives: Mirna Quero de Peña (Venezuela) Oscar Francisco Lara (Guatemala)  
Alternates: Roberto Ramos Tangarona (Cuba) Sixto Inchaústegui (Dominican Republic)

### Plants

Representatives: Jorge Hernandez Camacho (Colombia) Lúcia Helena de Oliveira (Brazil)  
Alternates: Dora E. Mora (Costa Rica) Federicó Bascopé (Bolivia)

After some announcements the session was closed at 21h10.

## Seventh Session: 17 November 1994: 09h15-12h00

Chairman:	F. Loy (United States of America)
Secretariat:	I. Topkov J. Berney J. Barzdo
UNEP:	R. Olembo
Rapporteurs:	J. Boddens-Hosang L. Collins R. Gabel J. Gray

The Chairman opened the session by announcing that Romania had become the latest Party to the Convention, after which the delegation of Romania gave a short statement about the biological diversity of their country.

The Secretariat listed recently distributed documents, including summary reports of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth sessions of Committees I and II. These were approved.

### XIV Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

#### 1. Review of the Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties

##### a) Deletion of Resolutions that are out of Date

##### b) Consolidation of Valid Resolutions

The Chairman introduced these agenda items, and called upon the chairman of the working group to introduce the documents Com. 9.14 and Com. 9.20. The delegation of Switzerland, as chairman of the working group, gave a brief review of the work of the group and recommended approval of both documents by the Conference. Since there were no objections, they were adopted.

#### 2. Establishment of a List of the Other Decisions of the Conference of the Parties

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. 9.20, containing a list of current decisions from the seventh and eighth meetings of the Conference of the Parties that are not recorded in the Resolutions. If the list in the Annex were adopted, the Secretariat would, in accordance with the decision already made, after this meeting amend the list: to include decisions that are recorded in the proceedings of the first six meetings and that remain current; to remove decisions that have been implemented or become redundant; and to include decisions that had been made at this meeting. The list of the other decisions in the Annex to document Doc. 9.20 were offered for the approval of the Conference. Since there were no objections, document Doc. 9.20 was adopted.

### XIII Evolution of the Convention

#### 1. Strategic Plan of the Secretariat

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.17 and Com. 9.1. These were adopted.

#### 2. How to Improve the Effectiveness of the Convention

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.18 and Com. 9.10. The latter was adopted.

### XIV Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

#### 3. Report on National Reports under Article VIII, Paragraph 7, of the Convention

The Chairman of Committee II introduced document Doc. 9.21, drawing attention to table 3 of this document, and the desirability of improving upon results presented in this record in future. Document Doc. 9.21 was adopted.

#### 4. Review of Alleged Infractions and Other Problems of Implementation of the Convention

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.22, as well as documents Com. 9.3, Com. 9.6 and Com. 9.7 (Rev.), which had been produced as a result of discussions of the original document. The last three documents were adopted.

#### 5. Implementation of the Convention in the European Union

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.23 and Com. 9.29 and recommended approval of the latter document. The delegation of Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union, referring to document Com. II 9.5, item 5, last sentence, noted that the proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 8.2 had been approved and that document Doc. 9.23 and its recommendations had been noted. Therefore, a proposal to adopt document Com. 9.29 could not proceed and was deferred to the eighth plenary session, to allow further discussion.

#### 6. National Laws for Implementation of the Convention

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.24 and Com. 9.15 (Rev.). The Secretariat requested that complementary information on national laws be submitted to the Secretariat by 15 January 1995 or as soon as possible. Document Com. 9.15 (Rev.) was adopted.

#### 7. Enforcement of the Convention

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.25, Doc. 9.25.1 and Com. 9.16 (Rev.), and the last was adopted.

#### 8. Trade in Hunting Trophies of Species Listed in Appendix I

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.50 and Com. 9.21, and the latter was approved.

#### 9. Exports of Leopard Hunting Trophies and Skins

The Chairmen of Committees I and II introduced documents Doc. 9.26 and Com. 9.13 (Rev.). The

Chairman of Committee I drew attention to the agreement to Botswana's request for its quota for leopard hunting trophies and skins to be increased from 100 to 130, which had been approved by Committee I. Document Com. 9.13 (Rev.) and the increase in Botswana's quota were then adopted.

10. Interpretation and Application of Quotas

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.51 and Com. 9.19. The Secretariat noted that the second operative paragraph of the French text needed amending to correspond to the English text. The delegation of the United States of America requested that a note be made in the proceedings that, when their country as an importing country has concerns about export quotas, they feel they have a duty to discuss these concerns with the range States at the meetings of the Conference of the Parties, and if they can not resolve their concerns in this manner, then their concerns should be noted in the summary reports of the meetings. The delegation of the United States of America stated that this could also apply for other importing countries. The Chairman assured them that this note would be made. Document Com. 9.19 was then adopted.

11. Trade in Specimens of Species Transferred to Appendix II Subject to Annual Export Quotas

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.27, drawing attention to the proposed amendment to Resolution Conf. 7.14. Adoption of the document had been recommended by Committee I and it was adopted.

12. Trade in Rhinoceros Specimens

13. Conservation of Rhinoceros in Asia and Africa

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.28, Doc. 9.35, and Com. 9.28 (Rev.), noting document Doc. 9.28.1 - Doc. 9.29.2 from the Republic of Korea. Attention was drawn to document Doc. 9.35 Annex 2, which gave rise to document Com. 9.28 (Rev.). The delegation of Namibia moved to re-open the debate to alter the wording of document Com. 9.28 (Rev.) and this was seconded by the delegation of Zimbabwe. This motion was opposed by the delegations of Germany and India, resulting in a vote. The motion failed and document Com. 9.28 (Rev.) was adopted.

14. Trade in Tiger Specimens

The Chairman of Committee II referred the meeting to documents Doc. 9.29, Doc. 9.29.1, Doc. 9.28.1 - Doc. 9.29.2, Doc. 9.29.3 and Doc. 9.29.4, explaining that the draft resolution contained in the annex of document Doc. 9.29.3 had been revised by a working group, resulting in document Com. 9.30. Committee II had recommended adoption of this document. The Chairman of Committee II urged the Parties to take action before the species reached the brink of extinction. Document Com. 9.30 was then adopted.

The delegation of the United Kingdom announced that it had approved grants for tiger, rhinoceros and elephant conservation activities, for which the delegation of India expressed their thanks on behalf of the Global Tiger Forum. They further encouraged other countries to join and support the Global Tiger Forum.

15. Illegal Trade in Whale Meat

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.57, Doc. 9.57.1 and Doc. 9.57.2. Document Doc. 9.57.1 contained a draft resolution, which had been revised in Committee II. These revisions were reflected in document Com. 9.26 (Rev.). Committee II

had recommended adoption of the draft resolution and document Com. 9.26 (Rev.) was adopted.

16. Management of Sharks

The Chairman of Committee I introduced documents Doc. 9.58 and Com. 9.18 and noted that this topic had been a source of controversy in Committee I. A working group had developed a revised draft resolution, which resulted in document Com. 9.18. This document had been approved by Committee I, and was adopted.

17. Trade in Plant Specimens

a) Nursery Registration for Artificially Propagated Appendix-I Species

The Chairman of Committee II introduced document Doc. 9.30 and noted that the draft resolution contained therein had been revised, and these revisions were reflected in document Com. 9.23 (Rev.). Committee II had approved the revisions and document Com. 9.23 (Rev.) was adopted.

b) Revision of the Consolidated Resolution

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.31 and Com. 9.31, noting that approval of document Com. 9.31 had been contingent upon approval of document Com. 9.23 (Rev.). Since this had been done, and Committee II recommended adoption of document Com. 9.31, there were no objections and the document was adopted.

The Secretariat noted that there were two words missing from the French version of the document and suggested a correction, which was accepted.

c) Standard Reference for Orchidaceae

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.32, noting that this was merely a reference document and contained no resolutions. This document had been approved by Committee I. The document was adopted.

d) Implementation of the Convention for Timber Species

The Chairman of Committee I introduced documents Doc. 9.52 and Com. 9.32. Document Com. 9.32 contained a draft decision that had arisen from amendments to the recommendations contained in section 9 on page 2 of document Doc. 9.52. These amendments had been approved by Committee I and document Com. 9.32 was adopted.

The delegation of Ecuador noted that there was an error in the Spanish translation of document Com. 9.32. This was noted by the Secretariat.

e) Ramin (*Gonystylus bancanus*)

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.53 and stated that this document encountered vehement opposition in Committee I and had not been approved. The delegation of the Netherlands requested that further consideration of this agenda item be postponed until the afternoon session, at which time they wished to make a statement without re-opening the debate. The delegation of Malaysia objected and called for consideration of this item to be concluded without delay. After some discussion, the Chairman called for a vote to determine whether to defer this Agenda item to the afternoon session. A majority of those voting opposed delay of this agenda item and discussion of this subject was closed.

18. Significant Trade in Appendix-II Species

a) Animals

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.33 and reported that it had been approved by consensus in Committee I. The delegation of Suriname commented that they had already taken action with regard to the recommendations for *Ara ararauna* and *Ara chloroptera*, listed on page 9 of the document, and they wished to have this noted in the proceedings. This was noted and the document was adopted.

b) Plants

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.34, noting that the delegation of Australia had suggested that the document include a recommendation for the Secretariat to undertake a study of medicinal plants. Committee I recommended adoption of the document, including the delegation of Australia's amendment. The document and amendment were adopted.

After announcements by the Secretary General, the session was closed at 12h00.

Eighth Session: 17 November 1994: 14h15-17h10

Chairman:	F. Loy (United States of America)
Secretariat:	I. Topkov J. Berney O. Menghi
Rapporteurs:	J. Caldwell H. Corrigan M. Haywood B. Perez

XIV Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

5. Implementation of the Convention within the European Union

The Chairman noted that there had been some confusion about the conclusion reached by Committee II. However, after discussions between the Secretariat, the Chairman of Committee II and the delegation of Germany (representing the Member States of the European Union), the record in document Com.II 9.5 would remain unchanged. In response, the delegation of Germany, representing the European Union, noted that they had taken the Secretariat's recommendations seriously. New legislation would soon be introduced to ensure harmonized implementation of the Convention throughout the European Union and this should help to implement all the relevant recommendations.

Document Com. 9.29 was adopted without objection.

XV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other Proposals

*Swietenia* spp. (inclusion in Appendix II)

The chairman of the working group reported that no consensus had been reached on whether the original proposal should be amended to exclude certain populations, despite great efforts by the participants in the group. The proposal therefore remained unchanged for consideration by the Conference.

After thanking the chairman of the working group, the delegation of the Netherlands submitted the following annotation to their proposal: only for logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets, including plywood sheets.

The delegations of Costa Rica, El Salvador, Germany, on behalf of the European Union, Honduras and the United States of America and the observers from WWF, IUCN and TRAFFIC supported this proposal.

The delegations of Bolivia, Brazil and Peru opposed the proposal, the last of these stating that they would only support the proposal if certain populations were excluded.

The delegation of Colombia stated that they would prefer the inclusion of *Swietenia* spp. in Appendix II if all the countries of the region would agree. In the absence of a regional consensus they would prefer that *Swietenia* spp. not be listed. They suggested that, alternatively, the countries with endangered populations of *Swietenia* spp. could include these in Appendix III. They added that split-listing would contradict the agreement of the Amazonian Co-operation Treaty.

The delegation of Venezuela moved that the decision on adoption of this proposal be taken by a secret ballot. This motion was seconded by more than ten delegations and a secret ballot took place.

With 50 votes in favour and 33 against, the proposal as annotated was rejected.

Following this result, the delegations of Costa Rica, El Salvador and Honduras said that their populations would be included in Appendix III. The Secretariat outlined the procedures necessary for including species in Appendix III.

XIV Interpretation and Implementation of the Convention

19. Standardization of CITES Permits and Certificates

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.38 and Com. 9.24. The latter was adopted.

20. Non-commercial Samples of Skins

The Chairman of Committee II announced that document Doc. 9.37 had been withdrawn.

21. Marking of Crocodylian specimens

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.36 and Com. 9.12. The latter was adopted.

22. Transport of Live Specimens

The Chairman of Committee II introduced documents Doc. 9.39 and Com. 9.7 (Rev.). The latter was adopted. The Secretariat noted that, as a result of the recommendations just adopted, the Transport Working Group no longer existed, and they thanked all the participants in that Group, particularly the Chairman, for their past work.

23. Implementation of Article XIV, Paragraphs 4 and 5

The Chairman of Committee II reported that document Doc. 9.40 had been submitted by the United States of America. However, after some debate in the Committee the document had been withdrawn. The delegation of the United States of America announced that they would continue to work on the issue and invited Parties to submit information to them before the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

24. Disposal of Confiscated Live Animals

Document Com. 9.4 (Rev.) was introduced by the Chairman of Committee I. The Secretariat pointed out that the three tables at the end of the document would be translated into French and Spanish on final publication and, in response to a question from the delegation of the United States of America, stated that the "References" at the end of the document were not part of the draft resolution. The delegation of Colombia emphasized that they would like to have any seized specimens, including derivatives, originating in Colombia returned.

There being no objections, document Com. 9.4 (Rev.) was then adopted.

25. Disposal of Skins of Illegal Origin

The Chairman of Committee II reported that the Committee had recommended that document Doc. 9.54, submitted by Italy, be rejected. The document was rejected.

26. New Criteria for Amendment of Appendices I and II

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Com. 9.17 (Rev.), which had been unanimously approved by Committee I. The importance of implementing the new criteria was stressed by the delegation of France, who said that their country planned to help to provide funds for regional meetings on these issues, particularly in Africa. The delegation of New Zealand emphasized the necessity of continued review of these criteria. There being no opposition, document Com. 9.17 (Rev.) was adopted.

The delegation of the United States of America, reported that although they supported the document, they remained deeply concerned that the unnecessary fourth sentence in the definition of "decline" (on page 12 of the English text) could be misinterpreted or misused to weaken the treaty. They expected that the Parties would limit the use of that sentence, if any, to scientifically rigorous and successful harvesting programmes that had been diligently implemented according to the precautionary principle.

27. Inclusion of Species in Appendix III

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Com. 9.11, a draft resolution produced by a working group of Committee I, chaired by the delegation of Zimbabwe. This document had been approved by consensus in Committee I and was therefore adopted without opposition.

The delegation of Germany requested clarification of when a Resolution of the Conference of the Parties entered into force. After a discussion involving the delegations of Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, the Netherlands, Singapore, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America and Zaire, and the Secretariat, the Chairman suggested that the Secretariat prepare a short

proposal to address this issue and present it at the next plenary session.

28. Guidelines for Evaluating Marine Turtle Ranching Proposals

The Chairman of Committee I reported that document Com. 9.25 (Rev.) had been drafted by a working group chaired by the delegation of Australia. The document had been approved by consensus in Committee I. After minor editorial changes were noted by the Secretariat, document Com. 9.25 (Rev.) was adopted.

Noting that there had been numerous interventions in Committee I concerning the migratory nature of marine turtles, the delegation of Australia reported that at its last meeting, the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species had agreed to treat marine turtles as priority species. Australia was taking a lead role in that initiative, and would urge all Parties wishing to pursue the sustainable use of marine turtles through commercial ranching to work actively towards achieving regional co-operation among range States sharing the resource, either through the Convention on Migratory Species or through some other regional arrangement.

29. Proposals to Register the First Commercial Captive-breeding Operation for an Appendix-I Animal Species

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.43, and recommended it for approval. After interventions from the delegations of Malaysia and the United States of America and the Chairman of Committee I, it was unclear what had been proposed for submission to the plenary session. The Chairman deferred final action on document Doc. 9.43 until the next session, pending further clarification.

30. Standard nomenclature

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Com. 9.9. This was adopted.

The session was closed at 17h10.

Ninth Session: 18 November 1994: 09h25-12h20

Chairman: F. Loy (United States of America)  
Secretariat: I. Topkov  
J. Berney  
O. Menghi  
UNEP: R. Olembo  
Rapporteurs: C. Allan  
J. Barzdo  
L. Collins  
R. Gabel  
T. Inskipp

#### XIV Interpretation and implementation of the Convention

##### 29. Proposals to Register the First Commercial Captive-breeding Operation for an Appendix-I Animal Species

Recalling the discussion of this subject in the previous session, the Chairman reported that the Chairman of Committee I had confirmed that document Com.I 9.5 did not reflect the conclusion reached by the Committee. To correct this, he proposed the following amendments to that document: in the last sentence under agenda item 29, delete "and the document was adopted with the above statement"; at the end of the same section, insert It was decided to ask the Secretariat to take the administrative steps necessary to allow Malaysia to trade in captive-bred specimens of the red variety. There being no objections, this amendment was approved.

The delegation of the United States of America stated that they had already submitted to the Secretariat a note to further clarify a statement that they had submitted and that had been included in document Com.I 9.5.

The Chairman reported that, as a result of the discussions in the previous session on the date of entry into effect of Resolutions, the Secretariat had drafted a decision of the Conference of the Parties, which was contained in document Com. 9.34. The delegation of Germany stated that they had no problem with the draft decision but the words "Entry into Force" in the title should be changed since these words should be reserved for reference to obligations. They added that, for Parties represented at a meeting of the Conference of the Parties, Resolutions should come into effect as soon as they are adopted, but for other Parties they should come into effect as soon as they are notified by the Secretariat. Agreeing with this, the Secretary General proposed the inclusion of the words at the latest after "Notification to the Parties" in the first paragraph of document Com. 9.34. The delegation of the United Kingdom suggested that the appropriate title of the document would be Effective Date of Resolutions of the Conference of the Parties.

The delegation of Ecuador was concerned that there might be a long gap between the issuance of a notification by the Secretariat and its receipt by the Parties. They also felt that, in the second paragraph of the document, "legal" should be replaced by legislative. The delegation of Spain added that the equivalent word in the Spanish text was also the wrong one to use. The Secretariat sought to simplify the text, so that it referred only to "relevant national procedures", but this change was unacceptable to the delegation of Greece. The Secretary General therefore sought agreement to allow the Secretariat to select the appropriate word and amend the decision following legal advice.

The delegation of Greece also noted that one draft resolution adopted at the present meeting contained a deadline for action in January 1995 and that the Parties concerned might not be officially notified in time. In response, the Secretariat said that Parties not represented at this meeting would be informed by the Secretariat but those represented were of course aware of the recommendation.

There being no objections, document Con. 9.34 with the proposed amendments to the title and the first paragraph was adopted and it was agreed to give the Secretariat leave to correct the word "legal" in the second paragraph if this were considered necessary by its legal advisers.

#### XI Financing and Budgeting of the Secretariat and of Meetings of the Conference of the Parties

##### 3. Budget for 1996-1998 and medium-term plan for 1996-2000

The Chairman stated that document Com 9.5, regarding the budget for 1996-1997, had been approved in a previous plenary session and therefore the issue would only be re-opened if the decisions made at this meeting had any significant budgetary implications. No comments were forthcoming and document Com 9.5 and the budget were definitively adopted.

The Chairman of Committee II introduced document Com 9.22, about a subject not covered by the Agenda, the extension of the contract of the Deputy Secretary General until the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The document had been unanimously approved by Committee II. There were no objections and document Com 9.22 was adopted.

The Deputy Secretary General expressed his gratitude for the unanimous support of the Conference of the Parties in adopting this unusual decision, and stressed that he wished to continue his work for CITES. The delegation of Germany, on behalf of the European Union, reiterated the comments they had made in Committee II, in appreciation of the work of the Deputy Secretary General. They also offered their sincere apologies to the Scientific Co-ordinator of the Secretariat for an offensive document issued by a German NGO, distributed outside the meeting. The delegation of Venezuela, on behalf of the region of South and Central America and the Caribbean, also expressed their appreciation for the work of the Deputy Secretary General and the Scientific Co-ordinator of the Secretariat.

## XII Committee Reports and Recommendations

### 4. Nomenclature Committee

- a) Report of the Chairman
- b) Recommendations of the Committee

The Chairman called for adoption of document Doc. 9.16, regarding the report of the Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee, as approved by Committee I. The Chairman of Committee I introduced the report. Document Doc. 9.16 was adopted as amended.

### XV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

#### 1. Proposals Submitted Pursuant to Resolution on Ranching

The Chairman of Committee I reported on the discussions of document Doc. 9.44 and on the recommendations of the Committee. The Secretariat expressed concern that no provision had been made for quotas for Madagascar for 1997. They proposed that the 1996 quotas of 5,000 ranched specimens and 200 nuisance animals be carried over for 1997. The observer from IUCN concurred and stated that extension of the quotas was fitting with the spirit of the original proposal. The recommendations of Committee I were adopted with this amendment.

#### 2. Ten-Year-Review Proposals

The Chairman of Committee I reported on the discussions of document Doc. 9.45 and on the recommendations of the Committee, and explained that three species listed in document Doc. 9.47 Annex 2, as proposals 26, 27 and 28, were incorrectly located and should have been included in document Doc. 9.45. With respect to the species listed under proposal 11, the Vice-Chairman of the Nomenclature Committee informed the participants that the Committee agreed that *Aloe vera* was the correct scientific name and had decided that several problems recognized in relation to the deletion should be referred to the Plants Committee. The recommendations of Committee I were adopted.

#### 3. Proposals Concerning Export Quotas

The Chairman of Committee I reported on the discussions of document Doc. 9.46 and on the recommendations of the Committee. As there were no objections or comments, the recommendations of Committee I were adopted.

#### 4. Other Proposals

The Chairman of Committee I introduced document Doc. 9.47 and briefly reviewed the first section, on Mammalia. The recommendations of Committee I for this section were adopted except those for proposals 15, 16, 17, 19 and 23, since further discussion of these had been requested.

On proposal 17, the delegation of South Africa noted that there had been revisions to the original proposal, and the Chairman of Committee I agreed and stated that the revised proposal was for "transfer of the South African population of southern white rhinoceros *Ceratotherium simum simum* from Appendix I to Appendix II for sale of live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations and hunting trophies only". The delegation of Germany asked for clarification with regard to hunted specimens. The delegation of South Africa clarified that these would be only sport-hunted specimens taken by foreign hunters. The recommendation of Committee I on this proposal was adopted.

The delegation of Switzerland noted that proposals 15 and 16, referring to the African elephant *Loxodonta africana*, had been withdrawn, but that these proposals raised issues that should be addressed by the Parties. They suggested that the Parties should direct the Standing Committee to: revisit, in close co-operation with the African region, the procedure for reviewing African elephant proposals; address concerns regarding stockpiles of African elephant ivory, regarding both producer and consumer States; and submit its recommendations to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The delegation of Zimbabwe agreed with these suggestions. The delegation of the United Kingdom noted the efforts of African range States to deal with elephant issues, for example at the meeting that had been held in Botswana in September 1994. The Chairman agreed to return to this subject at a later stage.

The delegation of Germany expressed reservations on proposal 19, relating to trade in stockpiled wool of vicuña *Vicugna vicugna* in Peru. The delegation of Peru indicated the quantities of wool involved: 2,640 kg from dead animals, 1,375 kg from authorized culls during the period 1977-1983, 248 kg of waste wool from animals that had died of natural causes from 1980 to 1992, 568 kg from seizures and 444 kg of wool left over from textile tests during the period 1988-1990. They further explained that the proposal was to allow a one-time export and that the proceeds from the sale of the stockpiled wool would be used by indigenous organizations for conservation of the species. The Secretariat explained that the proposed transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II would allow the export of any legal wool, and therefore that the legal status of exported material was the basic issue, regardless of the origin of the material. The delegation of Peru suggested that a committee be formed to monitor exports of the stockpiled wool, and that the committee include a representative of the Secretariat. The Secretariat suggested that this committee should also include a representative of the Camelidae Specialist Group of IUCN. The delegation of Germany asked that the annotation of the proposal be amended to reflect the quantities of stockpiled wool to be exported. The delegation of Peru confirmed that the total amount of stockpiled wool under consideration was 3,249 kg. It was therefore proposed to further amend annotation 502 to read: "to allow also the trade in wool sheared from live vicuñas and the extant stock of 3,249 kg of wool". The delegation of Germany accepted this amendment, and since there were no further comments or objections, this proposal was adopted.

In reference to proposal 23, on saiga antelope *Saiga tatarica*, the delegation of the United Kingdom noted that the reference to the separate listing of the Mongolian population, in document Doc. 9.47 Annex 2, had been amended in Committee I. They sought clarification that all populations of the species were to be included in Appendix II. The Secretariat confirmed that this was correct. This proposal was then adopted as amended with no objections.

Turning to the proposals relating to birds and reptiles, the Chairman of Committee I reported the following results of discussions in the Committee: proposals 24 and 25 had been rejected; proposals 26 to 28 had been approved within the context of the Ten-year Review; proposals 29 to 31 had been approved; proposals 32 to 36 had been withdrawn; proposal 37 had been approved; as proposal 39 had been approved, proposal 38 had been withdrawn; proposal 40 had been approved; proposal 41 had been

withdrawn because a draft resolution on the genus concerned, *Collocalia*, had been approved instead; proposals 42 to 46 had been approved; proposal 47 had been approved by Committee I with an annual quota of 1,000 crocodiles plus 100 sport-hunted crocodiles in 1995 and 1996, while for 1997 it was proposed that the quota be determined by the Secretariat in consultation with the IUCN/SSC Crocodile Specialist Group, on the basis of information to be submitted by the United Republic of Tanzania; proposals 48 and 49 had been approved; proposal 50 had been rejected; and proposals 51 to 57 had been withdrawn.

Taking first the proposals relating to birds (proposals 25 to 42), the Chairman sought endorsement of the decisions reached in Committee I. The delegation of New Zealand pointed out that they had withdrawn proposals 35 and 36, relating to species of *Cyanoramphus*, on the understanding that their status would be reviewed by the Animals Committee. This was noted.

The delegation of Zimbabwe noted with concern the withdrawal by the delegation of Indonesia of proposal 34, regarding *Cacatua goffini*. They regretted that this could not be discussed, believing that the withdrawal of the proposal was to the disadvantage of local people in Indonesia, where the species was considered to be a crop pest.

Recalling proposals 38 and 39, regarding *Psittacus erithacus*, the delegation of Zaire requested the Secretariat to undertake field studies of this species in Sao Tome and Principe and also in Cameroon and Zaire. The Secretariat noted this request.

There being no objections, the decisions of Committee I relating to proposals 25 to 42 were accepted, and the draft resolution in document Com. 9.33 was adopted.

Turning to the proposals relating to reptiles (proposals 43 to 57), the Chairman noted that there were no objections to the decisions reached by Committee I, and these were accepted.

The Chairman of Committee I then presented his report regarding consideration of the remaining proposals relating to animals (proposals 58 to 68). The results of the discussions in Committee I were as follows: proposal 58 had been approved; proposal 59 had been amended so as to include *Mantella aurantiaca* in Appendix II, making it the same as proposal 60, and these had been approved; proposal 61 had been withdrawn; proposals 62 to 65 had been approved; and proposals 66 to 68 had been withdrawn.

As there were no objections to the decisions of Committee I, these were accepted.

Moving on to plants, the Chairman of Committee I reported the following results of discussions: proposal 69 had been approved with a slightly revised wording; proposals 70 and 71 had been approved, the latter with an annotation that no export of adult plants would be allowed until the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; proposals 72 and 73 had been rejected; proposal 74 had been withdrawn; proposals 75 and 76 had been approved; proposal 77 had been withdrawn and referred to the Plants Committee; proposal 78 had been withdrawn; proposal 79 had been rejected; proposals 80 to 96 had been approved; proposal 97 had been withdrawn and referred to the Plants Committee; proposals 98 and 99 had been withdrawn; proposal 100 had already been dealt with in the plenary session; proposals 101 to 104 had been rejected; proposal 105 had been approved; proposals 106 to 110 had been withdrawn and referred to the Plants Committee; proposal 111 had been approved; proposal 112 had been withdrawn and referred to the Plants Committee; proposals 113 and 114 had been approved; proposal 115 had been withdrawn and referred to the Plants Committee.

The delegation of Zimbabwe noted that a meeting on proposal 78, relating to *Dalbergia melanoxyton*, was occurring concurrently, and that proposal 113 had been amended. Therefore further action on these proposals should be deferred. This was agreed by the Chairman.

The delegation of India requested that debate on proposal 79, relating to *Pterocarpus santalinus*, be reopened as the proposal had failed by only a narrow margin in Committee I. Before considering the reopening of the debate, the Chairman asked whether there were any objections to the acceptance of the decisions of Committee I, except those related to proposals 78, 79 and 113. There were no objections and the decisions were accepted. The delegation of India requested that proposal 79 relating to *Pterocarpus santalinus* be reconsidered with the amendments of the delegation of the United States of America. The request to re-open debate was supported by the delegation of Austria. There was no opposition to re-opening the debate but a vote was held at the request of the delegation of Germany. There were 27 votes in favour versus 50 against and the debate was therefore re-opened. The delegation of India said that the species was threatened with extinction in their country and that there was a great demand and much illegal international trade, mainly in logs and woodchips.

The Chairman deferred further discussion of proposal 79 until the following session and, after some announcements by the Secretary General, the session was closed at 12h20.

Tenth Session: 18 November 1994: 14h00-17h00

Chairman: F. Loy (United States of America)  
 Secretariat: I. Topkov  
 J. Berney  
 O. Menghi  
 UNEP: R. Olembo  
 Rapporteurs: J. Barzdo  
 J. Caldwell  
 H. Corrigan  
 M. Haywood

XV Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II

4. Other Proposals

*Pterocarpus santalinus* (inclusion in Appendix II)

The delegation of the United States of America supported the listing of the species in Appendix II and, having discussed this issue with the delegation of India and several delegations from Europe, and with several observers, recommended that the proposal should be amended to read "Inclusion of *Pterocarpus santalinus* in Appendix II excluding finished musical instruments, medicinals and derivatives". The delegation of India agreed to this amendment to their proposal.

The delegation of Austria and the observer from TRAFFIC supported the proposal, drawing attention to the high demand for the valuable wood and to the continuing illegal trade. The delegation of the United Kingdom opposed the proposal because they were concerned that, should it be adopted, adequate implementation of the listing would not be possible. They suggested that the matter be referred to the Plants Committee and that in the meantime the appropriate action was to include the species in Appendix III, with the annotation suggested by the delegation of the United States of America. The delegation of India opposed the suggestion of the delegation of the United Kingdom. Reiterating their support for the proposal of the delegation of India, and noting that the International Wood Products Association had informed them of its own support, the delegation of the United States of America called for a vote.

In response to a request for clarification of the proposed annotation, the delegation of India said that the intention was to control only the trade in logs, wood-chips and unprocessed broken materials.

A vote was taken by role call and the proposal was adopted without objection.

Turning to proposal 113, regarding *Taxus wallichiana*, the Chairman recalled the intervention in the previous session to indicate that an agreed annotation had not been reflected in the oral report of the Chairman of Committee I. The Chairman of Committee I confirmed this, adding that the proposal had been approved with an amendment proposed by the delegation of the United States of America, and agreed by the delegation of India, to exclude finished pharmaceutical products. Noting that there was no objection to this proposal, it was adopted as amended.

Proposal 78, the Chairman noted, had previously drawn a comment from the delegation of Zimbabwe; however, as it had been withdrawn, there was nothing remaining to be discussed. The delegation of

Mozambique said that they had held meetings with interested parties after the proposal had been withdrawn and, as a result, a study group would meet in 1995 in Mozambique. There was therefore no need for further discussion here.

The Secretariat assumed that the usual exclusions for plants were applicable for the accepted proposals and sought clarification regarding the proposed annotations relating to proposal 69. The delegation of Spain reported that the text was similar to that proposed by the Secretariat, to which it had been passed.

The Secretariat also announced, for clarification, that the proposal from Madagascar on *Crocodylus niloticus* had been adopted but under the quota system rather than as a ranching proposal.

Regarding proposals 15 and 16, the delegation of Switzerland returned to the suggestion they had introduced in the previous session. They proposed the adoption of the following draft decision:

"The Conference of the Parties to the Convention DIRECTS the Standing Committee to:

- a) revisit, in close co-operation with the African region, the review procedure for African elephant proposals;
- b) address concerns regarding stockpiles of African elephant ivory, regarding producer and consumer countries; and
- c) submit its recommendations to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties; and

DIRECTS the Standing Committee to take into consideration the nature of any proposals submitted to the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, regarding the downlisting of African elephant populations, and to adapt the mandate of the Panel of Experts accordingly."

Regarding the last point, the delegation of Switzerland noted that a proposal had been submitted to the present meeting for trade in elephant hides but, strictly, the Panel of Experts had no mandate to consider this. Moreover, the Panel had now twice reviewed proposals from South Africa, and a degree of flexibility was desirable to avoid the necessity for the Panel to consider what it had already considered thoroughly.

The delegation of New Zealand agreed that there was a need for flexibility and supported the proposed draft decision.

The delegation of Germany, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union, supported the first paragraph of the draft decision but not the second. They said that it was not possible to pass a mandate to

the Standing Committee to go beyond the provisions of Resolution Conf. 7.9 and that, if a change in the mandate of the Panel were required, then a proposal to change it should be made for consideration at the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. The delegations of France and the United Kingdom supported this view, believing that Resolution Conf. 7.9 already allowed adequate flexibility.

The delegation of Switzerland said that there was of course no intention to circumvent the Resolution but noted that, if action were delayed until the tenth meeting, then there would be no flexibility to adapt the Panel's terms of reference for proposals submitted in the meantime. The Secretariat believed that the Conference of the Parties had the power to amend its own decisions taken in previous meetings and pointed out one way in which it had already done this at the previous plenary session, with respect to the maintenance in Appendix II of the population of Madagascar of *Crocodylus niloticus*.

The delegation of the United States of America also believed that the Conference did have the power to instruct the Standing Committee to take action to facilitate the work of the Conference at its next meeting. They supported the proposal of the delegation of Switzerland.

A vote was taken on the amendment proposed by the delegation of Germany to delete the second paragraph from the proposed decision. With 27 votes in favour and 28 against, this amendment was rejected.

There were no objections to the original proposed draft decision and this was adopted.

The Chairman of Committee I, Mr E. Ezcurra, stated that his country, Mexico, had only become a Party in 1987 and that since then it had been devoted to implementing the Convention well. Mexico has a rich fauna and flora, which it wished to protect against unsustainable and illegal trade. CITES was therefore very important for Mexico. Although it is in the North American region, it has strong cultural and friendship ties with the countries in South and Central America and the Caribbean. When offered the honour of chairing Committee I, Mr Ezcurra had had doubts about accepting because of his inexperience. But he was grateful to all the participants for their patience and co-operation. He also wished to thank the interpreters, the rapporteurs and all the Secretariat staff. Finally, he expressed his gratitude for this opportunity.

The Secretariat said that it had been a pleasure to work with Mr Ezcurra and wished to acknowledge his kindness and goodwill. They said that he had done well and expressed their thanks to him and to Mexico for enabling his participation and thanked all the participants in the sessions of Committee I.

The Chairman of Committee II, Ms V. Lichtschein, noted that the results of the Committee's deliberations had been very significant and that the consensus on the adoption of the new criteria had been the greatest achievement. She expressed great appreciation of the work of Committee II and thanked the delegations, observers, translators, interpreters, rapporteurs and the Secretariat for all their hard work. She thanked Mr J. Berney and Mr O. Menghi in particular for their support and stated that it had been a great honour to chair Committee II.

The Secretariat thanked the Chairman of Committee II for her kind words and said that it had been a privilege to work with her over the past two weeks. They were aware that there was a great sense of achievement resulting from the work carried out by Committee II. The Secretariat praised the efficiency of the Chairman of the Committee, particularly for the fact that it had finished its work early. These

comments were greeted with applause. The Secretariat then presented the Chairman of Committee II with a bouquet of flowers.

## XVI Conclusion of the Meeting

### 1. Determination of the Time and Venue of the Next Regular Meeting of the Conference of the Parties

The Chairman introduced document Doc. 9.48 (Rev. 2), which outlined the offers by Israel, Nigeria and Zimbabwe to host the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in 1997.

The delegation of Nigeria stated that their country had offered to host the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, with good intentions. However, they protested in the strongest terms about the negative comments contained in an unauthorized document that had been distributed at the current meeting, as a result of which they had decided to withdraw their offer.

The delegation of Zimbabwe declared that they were pleased to offer to host the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and that this had been formally supported at the highest level of government, with a memorandum of understanding agreeing to allow entry to the meeting for all Parties and observers. The proposal to hold the meeting in Zimbabwe was supported by the delegation of the Dominican Republic.

The delegation of Israel offered to host the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Jerusalem, stating that this would enhance and promote the work of CITES in the Middle East. The proposal to hold the meeting in Israel was supported by the delegation of India.

The Chairman closed the debate and put the two proposals to a vote by secret ballot. The proposal to host the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Zimbabwe was adopted by a clear majority.

The delegation of Zimbabwe stated that they greatly appreciated the support shown for their proposal and looked forward to the challenge of hosting the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. They also thanked the delegation of the United States of America for their warm hospitality during the current meeting.

### 2. Closing Remarks

The delegation of Germany, speaking on behalf of the Member States of the European Union, noted with satisfaction the consensus of the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to support the principle of sustainable use of natural resources, based on scientific and objective data. They noted that the achievements of the current meeting had been considerable, with key issues, including the new listing criteria, having been settled.

The delegations of Colombia, Senegal and Zaire, the observer from the Born Free Foundation, on behalf of the observers belonging to the Species Survival Network, and the observer from the International Wildlife Management Consortium expressed thanks to the Government of the United States of America, Broward County, the Chairman of the meeting and the Chairmen of Committees I and II and the Secretariat.

The Secretary General considered that the meeting had been a success. He stressed that most of the decisions had been made by consensus and noted, in particular, the adoption of the new listing criteria and the last part of CITES long-term plan. He thanked all those who had contributed to making the meeting a success, in particular the delegations of the 118 party and eight observer States, the Government of the United States of America for hosting the meeting, the

Secretariat staff and also the Government of Zimbabwe for its offer to host the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

The Deputy Director of UNEP noted that the meeting had been organized in an efficient manner by the Secretariat. He stated that there was a new culture in CITES, working on a good scientific basis in a spirit of openness and frankness, and he believed that a strong respect for the views of the range States was emerging. He pointed out that UNEP was responsible for the administration of six conventions and noted that CITES was providing an excellent example for the others in terms of procedure. He thanked all those who had contributed to the success of the meeting.

The incoming Chairman of the Standing Committee welcomed the new regional representatives and thanked the outgoing Chairman for all his hard work. The delegation of Sweden, as the representative of Europe on the Standing Committee, the delegation of Trinidad and Tobago, as the representative of South

and Central America and the Caribbean, and the delegation of Argentina as the second representative, echoed these sentiments and gave their support to Japan as the new Chairman. The delegation of Canada, as the outgoing representative for the North American region on the Standing Committee, congratulated Mexico as the new representative for that region.

The delegation of the United States of America extended their thanks to President Clinton and Secretary Babbit for the privilege of hosting the CITES meeting and said that it had been an honour for them to provide the venue. They expressed their gratitude to all the participants, the Secretariat and the support staff for all their hard work in contributing to the successful conclusion of the meeting.

The Chairman thanked all those who had eased his task in chairing his first CITES meeting and, with final thanks to the host country, he closed the meeting at 17h00.