



# CITES 2002

Analysis of Species Proposals to be Discussed at the 12<sup>th</sup> COP to CITES · Santiago, Chile, 3-15 November 2002 · Prepared by the Species Survival Network

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 12.1</p> <p><b>Switzerland</b> Amendment of Annotation ° 607 to read: The following are not subject to the provisions of the Convention: a) synthetically derived DNA that does not contain any part of the original; b) urine and faeces; c) synthetically produced medicines and other pharmaceutical products such as vaccines that do not contain any part of the original genetic material from which they are derived; and d) fossils</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal prepared under direction of the Standing Committee as part of issue of trade in time-sensitive biological samples</li> <li>• Fossils of stony corals are currently not subject to the provisions of the Convention</li> </ul>	<p><b>TENTATIVELY SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SSN approves the general concept of this proposal, but is concerned as to how customs authorities will be able to ensure that only synthetically derived DNA is being traded</li> <li>• Language is preferable to that proposed by Standing Committee [SC46 Doc 12] which included "metabolic secretions such as urine and feces" and could therefore have applied to commercially-valuable secretions such as musk</li> <li>• Term "fossils" should be defined within the context of CITES</li> </ul>
<p>Prop. 12.2 Lovebirds (<i>Agapornis</i> spp.), Australian Rosellas (<i>Platycercus</i> spp.), Australian Ringneck Parrots (<i>Barnardius</i> spp.), New Zealand Yellow-crowned Parakeets (<i>Cyanorhamphus auriceps</i>), New Zealand Red-fronted Parakeet (<i>C. novaezelandiae</i>), Alexandrine Parakeet (<i>Psittacula eupatria</i>), Ringnecked Parakeet (<i>P. krameri</i>) and Java Sparrow (<i>Padda oryzivora</i>)</p> <p><b>Switzerland</b> Annotation with the following text: Colour morphs produced by captive breeding are considered as being of a domesticated form and are therefore not subject to the provisions of the Convention</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All taxa addressed in the proposal on Appendix II are under a higher taxon listing (<i>Psittaciformes</i> spp.) except: <i>C. novaezelandiae</i>, on Appendix I; <i>Psittacula krameri</i>, on Appendix III (Ghana); <i>Cyanorhamphus auriceps</i>, on Appendix II (except for <i>C. a. forbesi</i>, on Appendix I); and <i>Padda oryzivora</i>, on Appendix II</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal does not state how customs agents are to distinguish between specimens that are "colour morphs produced by captive breeding" and specimens exhibiting natural colour variations; in addition, colour of birds in trade is easily manipulated for illegal trader through the application of paints or dyes; this may create enforcement difficulties</li> <li>• Only some taxa addressed in the proposal are traded exclusively as captive-bred specimens (i.e. <i>Cyanorhamphus auriceps</i> and <i>C. novaezelandiae</i>); wild-caught specimens of the other taxa are in trade</li> <li>• Unclear how annotation will be applied, as some species in proposal are included in a higher taxon listing and some are listed on their own</li> <li>• In any case, <i>C.a. forbesi</i>, which is on Appendix I, and <i>C.a. malherbi</i>, which some consider a colour morph, should be specifically excluded</li> </ul>
<p>Prop. 12.3 Black Sea Bottlenose Dolphin <i>Tursiops truncatus ponticus</i></p> <p><b>Georgia</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Black Sea (Bulgaria, Georgia, Romania, Russia, Turkey, Ukraine)</li> <li>• Population: no reliable data exist on current population size; inferred to be depleted by over-exploitation (until 1980s species was hunted for human consumption and industrial products); vulnerable to over-exploitation due to low reproductive output (females mature at 5-12 years of age, bear single calves, and have long inter-birth intervals (2-6 years))</li> <li>• Threats: habitat degradation (including chemical pollution); incidental mortality (fishing nets, boat strikes); reduced food base; disease; capture for public display</li> <li>• Trade: at least 120 live animals traded internationally 1990-2001; 52 of these are confirmed dead; additional 25-50 are removed annually to replace those that die in public display facilities in Range States and elsewhere</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Competent international body, Agreement on the Conservation of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Areas (ACCOBAMS), which entered into force in June 2001, prohibits the deliberate taking and export of cetaceans, including live specimens (Parties are: Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Spain, Georgia, Malta, Morocco, Monaco, Romania, Syria, Tunisia)</li> <li>• In 2002, first meeting of Parties to ACCOBAMS endorsed CITES Appendix I listing because it would compliment ACCOBAMS efforts to conserve the species (even though capture and trade are not the main threats to the species)</li> <li>• Secretariat of the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) commented in February 2000 that Appendix I listing "would be consistent with the degree of protection intended by the contracting parties of CMS, and especially ACCOBAMS, for this species"</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • restricted distribution • high vulnerability due to species' biology (low reproductive output) • declining wild population • habitat degraded • threatened by extrinsic factors (toxins and pollutants)</p>
<p>Prop. 12.4</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: proposal covers Okhotsk Sea / West Pacific stock (8 Range States) and north Atlantic stocks (13 Range States); however, other</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES has recognised IWC's competence and responsibility for whales and</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>[Common] Minke Whale <i>Balaenoptera acutorostrata</i></p> <p><b>Japan</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of northern hemisphere populations (except the Yellow Sea, East China Sea and Sea of Japan populations) in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 4 with the following annotation: For the exclusive purpose of allowing trade between Parties that are also signatories to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and which have an effective DNA register system to monitor catches, introductions from the sea and imports from other States. To ensure that trade does not result in removals in excess of catch limits, the following additional measures shall be implemented: a) notwithstanding the provisions of CITES Article XIV, paragraphs 4 and 5, any trade shall be subject to the provisions of Article IV; b) calculation of a safe catch level using the IWC's Revised Management Procedure (RMP); c) establishment of export quotas that shall ensure that trade does not result in removals in excess of catch limits; d) indication on the trade documents of the number of animals involved when shipment of products are only parts of animals, and tracking of this number through DNA monitoring of imports; e) implementation of domestic legislation to ensure imports are from animals taken legally; and f) DNA registers to monitor catches, introductions from the sea and imports and a requirement that all imports be accompanied by certified DNA profiles</p>	<p>Northern hemisphere stocks exist</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population: approximately 25,000 (Okhotsk), 112,000 (Northeast Atlantic) and 28,000 (North Atlantic Central); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every one or two years); Okhotsk population consists of two distinct but visually indistinguishable stocks (J and O) which coexist in Japan's whaling grounds; endangered J stock and Northeast Atlantic stock classified by IWC as "Protection Stock"; proposal does not specifically address conservation status of other Northern Hemisphere stocks</li> <li>• Threats: by-catch (Japan catches a significant number of whales in fishing nets every year); long-term impacts of environmental changes are unknown</li> <li>• Trade: Norwegian officials announced start of trade under reservation with Iceland in June 2002 (Japan, Iceland and Norway have reservations); International Whaling Commission (IWC) has a moratorium on commercial hunting (Norway has an objection to the moratorium and the Protection Stock listing of NE Atlantic minke whale); 100 North Pacific minke whales taken annually by Japan for scientific research (to increase to 150 in 2002); over 4000 North Atlantic minkes taken by Norway 1990-2002 for domestic consumption; substantial illegal trade from Norway to Japan; over-exploited for commercial trade before IWC moratorium; Japan not adequately implementing CITES or IWC for Appendix I whale species; meat of Appendix I species barred from commercial whaling is found in Japanese markets</li> </ul> <p>SPECIAL NOTE: IWC's term "stock" is based on historical management areas, not biological criteria. "Stocks" proposed for downlisting are not necessarily biologically distinct units of population as CITES requires. IUCN concluded in 2000 that "using IWC defined stocks within the CITES framework is likely to result in enforcement difficulties"</p>	<p>whaling (RC. 11.4) and recommends that Parties prohibit trade in species protected by IWC from commercial whaling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IWC has not yet finalised the Revised Management Scheme (RMS), which includes a quota-setting mechanism, the Revised Management Procedure (RMP); RMP must be used with international supervision and control provisions to ensure compliance, but no such provisions are in place</li> <li>• IWC regularly criticises Norway for using a biased version of the RMP outside the framework of an approved management system</li> <li>• Majority of IWC Parties seek an open, internationally-held DNA database and documentation system under the RMS (not the national databases proposed here) to facilitate transparency</li> <li>• Japan has not explained how its proposed nationally-held database will prevent other Appendix I whale stocks, also hunted by Japan and entered into the database, from entering international trade</li> <li>• Japan has not agreed to stop "scientific" whaling in excess of any quota set using the RMP and without valid scientific justification</li> <li>• Endangered J stock whales mix seasonally with Okhotsk stock; meat from both is sold in Japanese markets; split-listing will create enforcement and implementation problems</li> <li>• Unclear if proposed annotation can override Article XIV paragraphs 4 and 5, which exempt Parties from CITES requirements for Appendix II marine species taken in accordance with a older treaty; Norway's exports may not be subject to proposed restrictions</li> <li>• Although Japan has agreed to withdraw its reservation for the stocks addressed in the proposal, Japan has not done so for the entire species, as recommended in RC 9.24; as it is not a proponent, Norway does not have to agree to withdraw its reservation, and could trade under the reservation</li> <li>• Similar proposals were defeated at COP9, COP10 and COP11</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: would be internationally traded if not on Appendix I • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation • long-term impacts of environmental changes on this species are unknown</p>
<p>Prop. 12.5 Bryde's Whale <i>Balaenoptera edeni</i></p> <p><b>Japan</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of the western North Pacific population in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 4 with the following annotation: For the exclusive purpose of allowing trade between Parties that are also signatories to the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling and which have an effective DNA register system to monitor catches, introductions from the sea and imports from other States. To ensure that trade does not result in removals in excess of catch limits, the following additional measures shall be implemented: a) notwithstanding the provisions of CITES Article XIV, paragraphs 4 and 5, any trade shall be subject to the provisions of Article IV; and b) calculation of a safe catch level using the IWC's Revised Management Procedure (RMP); c) establishment of an export quota that shall ensure that trade does not result in removals in</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: western North Pacific Stock Range States are Japan, China, Federated States of Micronesia, Indonesia, Papua New Guinea, Kiribati, Palau, Philippines, Nauru, Marshall Islands, Republic of Korea, Viet Nam, Russian Federation, USA</li> <li>• Population: IWC has not completed its assessment of Bryde's Whale populations; low reproductive output (females produce one calf every one or two years)</li> <li>• Threats: by-catch; long-term impacts of environmental changes are unknown (proposal alleges no threats exist)</li> <li>• Trade: no legal international trade (Appendix I) (Japan has a reservation); International Whaling Commission (IWC) has a moratorium on commercial take; Japan took 93 Bryde's whales in 2000 and 2001 as part of its whale research program in the western North Pacific; over-exploited for commercial trade before IWC moratorium</li> </ul> <p>SPECIAL NOTE: IWC's term "stock" is based on historical management areas, not biological criteria. "Stocks" proposed for downlisting are not necessarily biologically distinct units of population as CITES requires. IUCN concluded in 2000 that "using IWC defined stocks within the CITES framework is likely to result in enforcement difficulties"</p>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CITES has recognised IWC's competence and responsibility for whales and whaling (RC. 11.4) and recommends that Parties prohibit trade in species protected from commercial whaling by IWC</li> <li>• IWC has not yet finalised the Revised Management Scheme (RMS), which includes a quota-setting mechanism, the Revised Management Procedure (RMP); RMP must be used with international supervision and control provisions to ensure compliance, but no such provisions are in place</li> <li>• Japan's proposed controls for hunting Bryde's Whales do not meet standards sought by majority of IWC Parties for RMS</li> <li>• IWC has not agreed on a mechanism for applying the RMP to Bryde's Whale</li> <li>• Majority of IWC Parties seek an open, internationally-held DNA database and documentation system under the RMS (not the national databases proposed here) to facilitate transparency</li> <li>• New information reported to IWC in 2001 and 2002 reveals significant falsification of catch data, including of Bryde's whales, in the 1960s and 1970s</li> <li>• Japan has not agreed to stop "scientific" whaling in excess of any quota and without valid scientific justification</li> <li>• Unclear if proposed annotation can override Article XIV, paragraphs 4 and 5, which exempt Parties from CITES requirements for Appendix II marine species taken in accordance with a older treaty</li> <li>• Similar proposals were defeated at COP9, COP10 and COP11</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>excess of catch limits; d) indication on the trade documents of the number of animals involved when shipment of products are only parts of animals, and tracking of this number through DNA monitoring of imports; e) implementation of domestic legislation to ensure imports are from animals taken legally; and f) DNA registers to monitor catches, introductions from the sea and imports and a requirement that all imports be accompanied by certified DNA profiles</p>		<p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: would be internationally traded if not on Appendix I • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation • long-term impacts of environmental changes on this species are unknown</p>
<p>Prop. 12.6 African elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p><b>Botswana</b> Amendment of annotation *604 regarding the population of Botswana to read: For the exclusive purpose of allowing in the case of the population of Botswana: a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in live animals for commercial purposes to appropriate and acceptable destinations (and as determined by the national legislation of the country of import); c) trade in registered stocks of raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces) of Botswana origin owned by the Government of Botswana for commercial purposes only to CITES approved trading partners who will not re-export ivory. No international trade in ivory to be permitted until 18 months after the adoption of the proposal (May 2004). Thereafter an initial amount of not more than 20,000 kg of ivory may be traded, followed by annual export quotas of not more than 4,000 kg from the year 2005 onward; d) trade in hides; e) trade in leather goods for non-commercial purposes; and f) trade in ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (36 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: Botswana, 120,000 and increasing; continental population 519,461 and decreasing (most recent estimate, 1998); historically over-exploited for ivory trade (1979 continental population more than twice current population); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every four years)</li> <li>• Threats: poaching, illegal trade; habitat destruction; human-elephant conflict; human-human conflict</li> <li>• Trade: all but four populations are on Appendix I; Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe transferred to Appendix II in 1997 with export of 49,437.5 kg of ivory to Japan in April 1999; South Africa transferred to Appendix II in 2000 but no ivory export allowed; other exports since 2000 include: 50 tonnes of elephant hide from South Africa, 20 live elephants from Botswana to Angola and 25 from South Africa to Mozambique, and unknown quantities of ivory and hide tourist souvenirs from Zimbabwe; Namibia exported tusks from 77 trophy-hunted bull elephants in 2000-2001; unknown whether Zimbabwe's annual export quota of 400 trophy elephants, South Africa's annual quota of 43 trophy elephants in 2000 and 2001, or Botswana's quota of 180 (2000), 180 (2001) and 210 (2002) trophy elephant bulls were filled</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Botswana did not identify ivory importing countries; the most likely importer, Japan, has been criticised for inability to track ivory offered in retail trade to legal ivory sources</li> <li>• Botswana did not consult with other Range States</li> <li>• No trade in ivory, whether from stockpiles, on an annual basis (item (c) in the proposal), or as carvings for non-commercial purposes (i.e. tourist souvenirs) (item (f) in the proposal) should be allowed while illegal ivory trade and poaching for tusks remain serious threats</li> <li>• A minimum of 2563 tusks, 14,648 ivory objects or pieces and 6213.15 kg of ivory were seized and reported world-wide between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, representing over 2000 dead elephants; this does not include 6000 kg of ivory that originated in Zambia, destined for Japan, that was seized in Singapore in July 2002, after arriving by ship from South Africa</li> <li>• A minimum of 1059 African and 39 Asian elephants were reported poached for their tusks between 1 January 2000 to 6 June 2002</li> <li>• On a continent-wide basis, both African and Asian elephant populations continue to decline</li> <li>• Nearly all ivory confiscated by authorities in Asia, particularly in China and Thailand, between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, came from African elephants</li> <li>• In 2001, investigators Martin and Stiles found over 105,000 ivory tourist souvenirs for sale in eight Asian countries, made from both Asian and African elephant ivory; European, American, and Asian tourists are main buyers</li> <li>• Enforcement controls in most Range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade; increased enforcement costs caused by ivory trade cannot be met by many Range States</li> <li>• The international system for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) is not operating adequately; MIKE and the system for monitoring illegal trade in elephant products (ETIS) are not capable of assigning causes to any increase or decrease in poaching or illegal trade, nor do sufficient baseline data exist to allow for accurate monitoring of trends since COP10</li> <li>• No convincing evidence has been presented that revenue earned from the 1999 sale of ivory to Japan benefited conservation of the species</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.7 African elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p><b>Namibia</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (36 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: Namibia, 9305 and increasing; continental population 519,461 and decreasing (most recent estimate, 1998); historically over-exploited for ivory trade (1979 continental population more than twice current population); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every four years)</li> <li>• Threats: poaching; illegal trade; habitat destruction; human-elephant conflict; human-human conflict</li> <li>• Trade: all but four populations are on Appendix I; Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe transferred to Appendix II in 1997 with export of 49,437.5 kg of ivory to Japan in April 1999; South Africa transferred to Appendix II in 2000 but no ivory export allowed; other exports since 2000 include: 50</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Namibia did not identify ivory importing countries; the most likely importer, Japan, has been criticised for inability to track ivory offered in retail trade to legal ivory sources; no evidence that revenue earned from the 1999 sale of ivory to Japan benefited conservation of the species</li> <li>• Namibia did not consult with other Range States</li> <li>• No trade in ivory, whether from stockpiles, on an annual basis (item (e) in the proposal), or as carvings for non-commercial purposes (i.e. tourist souvenirs) (item (d) in the proposal), should be allowed while illegal ivory trade and poaching for tusks remain serious threats</li> <li>• A minimum of 2563 tusks, 14,648 ivory objects or pieces and 6213.15 kg of ivory were seized and reported world-wide between 1 January 2000 and 6 June</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Amendment of annotation 604 regarding the Namibian population to read: For the exclusive purpose of allowing in the case of the population of Namibia: a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in live animals for non-commercial purposes to appropriate and acceptable destinations (as determined by the national legislation of the country of import); c) trade in hides; d) trade in leather goods and ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes; and e) trade in registered stocks of raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces) of Namibian origin owned by the Government of the Republic of Namibia to trading partners that have been verified by the CITES Secretariat to have sufficient national legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that ivory imported from Namibia will not be re-exported and will be managed according to all requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.) concerning domestic manufacturing and trade. No international trade in ivory to be permitted until 18 months after the adoption of the proposal (May 2004). Thereafter, an initial amount of not more than 10,000 kg of ivory may be traded, followed by annual export quotas of not more than 2,000 kg of ivory, from the year 2005 onwards</p>	<p>tonnes of elephant hide from South Africa, 20 live elephants from Botswana to Angola and 25 from South Africa to Mozambique, and unknown quantities of ivory and hide tourist souvenirs from Zimbabwe; Namibia exported tusks from 77 trophy-hunted bull elephants in 2000-2001; unknown whether Zimbabwe's annual export quota of 400 trophy elephants, South Africa's annual quota of 43 trophy elephants in 2000 and 2001, or Botswana's quota of 180 (2000), 180 (2001) and 210 (2002) trophy elephant bulls were filled</p>	<p>2002, representing over 2000 dead elephants; this does not include 6000 kg of ivory that originated in Zambia, destined for Japan, that was seized in Singapore in July 2002, after arriving by ship from South Africa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A minimum of 1059 African and 39 Asian elephants were reported poached for their tusks between 1 January 2000 to 6 June 2002</li> <li>• On a continent-wide basis, both African and Asian elephant populations continue to decline</li> <li>• Nearly all ivory confiscated by authorities in Asia, particularly in China and Thailand, between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, came from African elephants</li> <li>• In 2001, investigators Martin and Stiles found over 105,000 ivory tourist souvenirs for sale in eight Asian countries, made from both Asian and African elephant ivory; European, American, and Asian tourists are main buyers</li> <li>• Enforcement controls in most Range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade; increased enforcement costs caused by ivory trade cannot be met by many Range States</li> <li>• The international system for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) is not operating adequately; MIKE and the system for monitoring the illegal trade in elephant products (ETIS) are not capable of assigning causes to any increase or decrease in poaching or illegal trade, nor do sufficient base line data exist to allow for accurate monitoring of trends since COP10</li> <li>• No convincing evidence has been presented that revenue earned from the 1999 sale of ivory to Japan benefited conservation of the species</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.8 African elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p><b>South Africa</b> Amendment of annotation 604 regarding the South African population to read: For the exclusive purpose of allowing in the case of the population of South Africa: a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in live animals for re-introduction purposes into protected areas formally proclaimed in terms of the legislation of the importing country; c) trade in hides and leather goods; d) trade in raw ivory of whole tusks of any size, and cut pieces of ivory that are both 20 cm or more in length and one kilogram or more in weight of Government-owned stocks originating from the Kruger National Park. An initial stockpile of 30,000 kg is proposed and a</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (36 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: South Africa, 13,051 and increasing; continental population 519,461 and decreasing (most recent estimate, 1998); historically over-exploited for ivory trade (1979 continental population more than twice current population); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every four years)</li> <li>• Threats: poaching; illegal trade; habitat destruction; human-elephant conflict; human-human conflict</li> <li>• Trade: all but four populations are on Appendix I; Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe transferred to Appendix II in 1997 with export of 49,437.5 kg of ivory to Japan in April 1999; South Africa transferred to Appendix II in 2000 but no ivory export allowed; other exports since 2000 include: 50 tonnes of elephant hide from South Africa, 20 live elephants from Botswana to Angola and 25 from South Africa to Mozambique, and unknown quantities of ivory and hide tourist souvenirs from Zimbabwe; Namibia exported tusks from 77 trophy-hunted bull elephants in 2000-2001; unknown whether Zimbabwe's annual export quota of 400 trophy elephants, South Africa's annual quota (2000, 2001) of 43 trophy elephants, or Botswana's quota of 180 (2000), 180 (2001) and 210 (2002) trophy elephant bulls were filled</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• South Africa has been widely criticised for its inability to control illegal wildlife trade</li> <li>• In July 2002, it was reported that a shipment of 6000 kg of ivory that originated in Zambia, destined for Japan, was seized in Singapore, after arriving by ship from South Africa</li> <li>• South Africa has failed to adopt national legislation to implement CITES as required in RC 11.18</li> <li>• South Africa did not identify ivory importing countries; the most likely importer, Japan, has been criticised for inability to track ivory offered in retail trade to legal ivory sources</li> <li>• South Africa did not consult with other Range States</li> <li>• No trade in ivory, whether from stockpiles or on an annual basis (item (d) in the proposal) should be allowed while illegal ivory trade and poaching for tusks remain serious threats</li> <li>• A minimum of 2563 tusks, 14,648 ivory objects or pieces and 6213.15 kg of ivory were seized and reported world-wide between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, representing over 2000 dead elephants</li> <li>• A minimum of 1059 African and 39 Asian elephants were reported poached for their tusks between 1 January 2000 to 6 June 2002</li> <li>• On a continent-wide basis, both African and Asian elephant populations continue to decline</li> <li>• Nearly all ivory confiscated by authorities in Asia, particularly in China and Thailand, between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, came from African elephants</li> <li>• In 2001, investigators Martin and Stiles found over 105,000 ivory tourist souvenirs for sale in eight Asian countries, made from both Asian and African elephant ivory; European, American, and Asian tourists are main buyers</li> <li>• Enforcement controls in most Range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade; increased enforcement costs caused by ivory trade cannot be met by many Range States</li> <li>• The international system for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) is not operating adequately; MIKE and the system for monitoring illegal trade in</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>subsequent annual quota of 2,000 kg accumulated each year through annual mortalities and management practices. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly</p>		<p>elephant products (ETIS) are not capable of assigning causes to any increase or decrease in poaching or illegal trade, nor do sufficient base line data exist to allow for accurate monitoring of trends since COP10</p> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.9 African elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p><b>Zambia</b></p> <p>Transfer of the Zambian population from Appendix I to Appendix II for the purpose of allowing: a) trade in raw ivory under a quota of 17,000 kg of whole tusks owned by Zambia Wildlife Authority (ZAWA) obtained from management operations; and b) live sales under special circumstances</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (36 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: Zambia, 29,016 and decreasing; continental population 519,461 and decreasing (most recent estimate, 1998); historically over-exploited for ivory trade (1979 continental population more than twice current population); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every four years)</li> <li>• Threats: poaching; illegal trade; habitat destruction; human-elephant conflict; human-human conflict</li> <li>• Trade: all but four populations are on Appendix I; Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe transferred to Appendix II in 1997 with export of 49,437.5 kg of ivory to Japan in April 1999; South Africa transferred to Appendix II in 2000 but no ivory export allowed; other exports since 2000 include: 50 tonnes of elephant hide from South Africa, 20 live elephants from Botswana to Angola and 25 from South Africa to Mozambique, and unknown quantities of ivory and hide tourist souvenirs from Zimbabwe; Namibia exported tusks from 77 trophy-hunted bull elephants in 2000-2001; unknown whether Zimbabwe's annual export quota of 400 trophy elephants, South Africa's annual quota (2000, 2001) of 43 trophy elephants, or Botswana's quota of 180 (2000), 180 (2001) and 210 (2002) trophy elephant bulls were filled</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In July 2002, it was reported that a shipment of 6000 kg of ivory that originated in Zambia, destined for Japan, was seized in Singapore, after arriving by ship from South Africa; enforcement controls and compliance with the Convention must be in place before species can be transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in accordance with RC 9.24, Annex 4</li> <li>• Zambia's elephant population has declined from 160,000 elephants in 1981 to 58,000 in 1985, to 41,000 in 1987, to 33,004 in 1995, and to 29,016 in 1998; in Zambia's Kafue National Park, the population fell from 4500 in 1996 to fewer than 2000 in year 2000</li> <li>• Zambia's ivory stockpile grew from zero to approximately 8000 kg over seven years between 1992 and 1999, but grew by 9000 kg in just three years and now totals 17,000 kg; the proposal does not adequately explain this increase in the rate of ivory accumulation or where this large amount of ivory has come from</li> <li>• Zambia has not identified ivory importing countries; the most likely importer, Japan, has been criticised for inability to track ivory offered in retail trade to legal ivory sources</li> <li>• Zambia's stated plan to encourage capture of wild elephants for training for elephant-back rides and export does not conform to existing annotations which allow the export of live elephants only to appropriate and acceptable destinations (defined in RC 11.20) or for reintroduction purposes; training methods used to "tame" wild-caught live elephants are widely recognized as inhumane; live exports, if any, should be confined to non-commercial purposes</li> <li>• Zambia did not consult with other Range States</li> <li>• No trade in ivory should be allowed while illegal ivory trade and poaching for tusks remain serious threats</li> <li>• A minimum of 2563 tusks, 14,648 ivory objects or pieces and 6213.15 kg of ivory were seized and reported world-wide between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, representing over 2000 dead elephants</li> <li>• A minimum of 1059 African and 39 Asian elephants were reported poached for their tusks between 1 January 2000 to 6 June 2002</li> <li>• On a continent-wide basis, both African and Asian elephant populations continue to decline</li> <li>• Nearly all ivory confiscated by authorities in Asia, particularly in China and Thailand, between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, came from African elephants</li> <li>• In 2001, investigators Martin and Stiles found over 105,000 ivory tourist souvenirs for sale in eight Asian countries, made from both Asian and African elephant ivory; European, American, and Asian tourists are main buyers</li> <li>• Enforcement controls in most Range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade; increased enforcement costs caused by ivory trade cannot be met by many Range States</li> <li>• The international system for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) is not operating adequately; MIKE and the system for monitoring the illegal trade in elephant products (ETIS) are not capable of assigning causes to any increase or decrease in poaching or illegal trade, nor do sufficient base line data exist to allow for accurate monitoring of trends since COP10</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.10</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (36 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: Zimbabwe, 88,123 and increasing; continental population</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zimbabwe has been widely criticised for its inability to control poaching and</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>African elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p><b>Zimbabwe</b> Amendment of annotation *604 regarding the population of Zimbabwe to read: For the exclusive purpose of allowing in the case of the population of Zimbabwe: a) trade for commercial purposes in registered stocks of raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces) of Zimbabwe origin owned by the Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe, to trading partners that have been verified by the CITES Secretariat to have sufficient national legislation and domestic trade controls to ensure that ivory imported from Zimbabwe will not be re-exported and will be managed according to all requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev.) concerning domestic manufacturing and trade. No international trade in ivory to be permitted until 18 months after the adoption of the proposal (May 2004). Thereafter, an initial one-off quota of not more than 10,000 kg of ivory may be traded, and a subsequent annual quota of not more than 5,000 kg of ivory; b) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; c) trade in live animals for non-commercial purposes to appropriate and acceptable destinations; d) trade in hides and leather goods; and e) trade in ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes</p>	<p>519,461 and decreasing (most recent estimate, 1998); historically over-exploited for ivory trade (1979 continental population more than twice current population); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every four years)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threats: poaching; illegal trade; habitat destruction; human-elephant conflict; human-human conflict</li> <li>• Trade: all but four populations are on Appendix I; Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe transferred to Appendix II in 1997 with export of 49,437.5 kg of ivory to Japan in April 1999; South Africa transferred to Appendix II in 2000 but no ivory export allowed; other exports since 2000 include: 50 tonnes of elephant hide from South Africa, 20 live elephants from Botswana to Angola and 25 from South Africa to Mozambique, and unknown quantities of ivory and hide tourist souvenirs from Zimbabwe; Namibia exported tusks from 77 trophy-hunted bull elephants in 2000-2001; unknown whether Zimbabwe's annual export quota of 400 trophy elephants, South Africa's annual quota (2000, 2001) of 43 trophy elephants, or Botswana's quota of 180 (2000), 180 (2001) and 210 (2002) trophy elephant bulls were filled</li> </ul>	<p>illegal wildlife trade, particularly in recent years</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zimbabwe has not identified ivory importing countries; the most likely importer, Japan, has been criticised for inability to track ivory offered in retail trade to legal ivory sources</li> <li>• Zimbabwe did not consult with other Range States</li> <li>• No trade in ivory, whether from stockpiles, on an annual basis (item (a) in the proposal), or as carvings for non-commercial purposes (i.e. tourist souvenirs) (item (e) in the proposal) should be allowed while illegal ivory trade and poaching for tusks remain serious threats</li> <li>• A minimum of 2563 tusks, 14,648 ivory objects or pieces and 6213.15 kg of ivory were seized and reported world-wide between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, representing over 2000 dead elephants; this does not include 6000 kg of ivory that originated in Zambia, destined for Japan, that was seized in Singapore in July 2002, after arriving by ship from South Africa</li> <li>• A minimum of 1059 African and 39 Asian elephants were reported poached for their tusks between 1 January 2000 to 6 June 2002</li> <li>• On a continent-wide basis, both African and Asian elephant populations continue to decline</li> <li>• Nearly all ivory confiscated by authorities in Asia, particularly in China and Thailand, between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, came from African elephants</li> <li>• In 2001, investigators Martin and Stiles found over 105,000 ivory tourist souvenirs for sale in eight Asian countries, made from both Asian and African elephant ivory; European, American, and Asian tourists are main buyers</li> <li>• Enforcement controls in most Range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade; increased enforcement costs caused by ivory trade cannot be met by many Range States</li> <li>• The international system for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) is not operating adequately; MIKE and the system for monitoring illegal trade in elephant products (ETIS) are not capable of assigning causes to any increase or decrease in poaching or illegal trade, nor do sufficient base line data exist to allow for accurate monitoring of trends since COP10</li> <li>• No convincing evidence has been presented that revenue earned from the 1999 sale of ivory to Japan benefited conservation of the species</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.11 African elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: sub-Saharan Africa (36 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: continental population 519,461 and decreasing (most recent estimate, 1998); historically over-exploited for ivory trade (1979 continental population more than twice current population); low reproductive output (females produce one calf every four years)</li> <li>• Threats: poaching; illegal trade; habitat destruction; human-elephant conflict; human-human conflict</li> <li>• Trade: all but four populations are on Appendix I; Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe transferred to Appendix II in 1997 with export of 49,437.5 kg of ivory to Japan in April 1999; South Africa transferred to Appendix II in 2000 but no ivory export allowed; other exports since 2000 include: 50 tonnes of elephant hide from South Africa, 20 live elephants from Botswana to Angola and 25 from South Africa to Mozambique, and unknown quantities of ivory and hide tourist souvenirs from Zimbabwe; Namibia exported tusks from 77 trophy-hunted bull elephants in 2000-2001; unknown whether Zimbabwe's annual export quota of 400 trophy elephants, South Africa's annual quota (2000, 2001) of 43 trophy elephants, or Botswana's quota of 180 (2000), 180 (2001) and 210 (2002) trophy elephant bulls were filled</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illegal ivory trade and poaching for tusks remain serious threats to the survival of both African and Asian elephants</li> <li>• On a continent-wide basis, both African and Asian elephant populations continue to decline; poaching is altering sex ratios in Asian elephant populations, potentially exacerbating declines and impeding recovery prospects</li> <li>• A minimum of 2563 tusks, 14,648 ivory objects or pieces and 6213.15 kg of ivory were seized and reported world-wide between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, representing over 2000 dead elephants; this does not include 6000 kg of ivory that originated in Zambia, destined for Japan, that was seized in Singapore in July 2002, after arriving by ship from South Africa</li> <li>• A minimum of 1059 African and 39 Asian elephants were reported poached for their tusks between 1 January 2000 to 6 June 2002</li> <li>• Nearly all ivory confiscated by authorities in Asia, particularly in China and Thailand, between 1 January 2000 and 6 June 2002, came from African elephants</li> <li>• In 2001, investigators Martin and Stiles found over 105,000 ivory tourist souvenirs for sale in eight Asian countries, made from both Asian and African elephant ivory; European, American, and Asian tourists are main buyers</li> <li>• Enforcement controls in most Range States are inadequate to prevent poaching and illegal trade; increased enforcement costs caused by ivory trade cannot be met by many Range States</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><b>Kenya and India</b></p> <p>Transfer to Appendix I of populations currently included in Appendix II, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 1, sections C i) and ii) and D, and in light of Annex 3 on "Split Listing" and Annex 4 on "Precautionary Measures"</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The international system for monitoring illegal killing of elephants (MIKE) is not operating adequately; MIKE and the system for monitoring illegal trade in elephant products (ETIS) are not capable of assigning causes to any increase or decrease in poaching or illegal trade, nor do sufficient base line data exist to allow for accurate monitoring of trends since COP10</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.12</p> <p>Vicuña <i>Vicugna vicugna</i></p> <p><b>Argentina</b></p> <p>Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of the population of the province of Catamarca, for the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in products made from wool sheared from live animals, in cloth, derived manufactured products and other handicraft artefacts bearing the label "VICUÑA –ARGENTINA"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador</li> <li>Population: Argentina, 33,414 and increasing; at least 13,435 in Catamarca province of Argentina (complete survey has not been done) and increasing, but some local populations not increasing; global wild population approximately 227,201 and increasing; historically over-exploited for trade (global population declined from 400,000 to 10,000 between 1950s and 1967)</li> <li>Threats: poaching for wool and meat; perceived competition with livestock</li> <li>Trade: certain populations in Argentina, Bolivia and Chile, and all populations in Peru, are on Appendix II (annotation allows international trade in wool sheared from live vicuña, and in the stock extant at the time of COP9 (1994) in Peru, and in products made thereof); all other populations are on Appendix I; there is illegal trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal includes all wild populations within the province of Catamarca, some of which are not increasing; proposal does not present information about each wild population in the province</li> <li>Stricter controls are required to supervise shearing, approve licensed dealers in vicuña products and to check on producers to ensure that only legal fiber is exported; no national legislation exists to cover all aspects relating to the trade in vicuña or the administrative aspects relating to this trade; enforcement controls and compliance with the Convention must be in place before species can be transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in accordance with RC 9.24, Annex 4</li> <li>Mortality during capture, abortions during or after capture, disruption of reproductive cycle associated with shearing, and disruption of social groups (including separation of calves from mothers) may lead to population declines but are not addressed</li> <li>Proposal includes trade from wild vicuña as well as from captive operations, which rely on capture from the wild; conservation concerns about captive operations include disease transmission to the wild population, genetic effects of escaped animals, impacts on population dynamics and social organization and impacts on fragile habitat; conservation value and socio-economic benefits of captive management have not been demonstrated; no proceeds from the sale of fiber from captive populations are channelled into conservation programs</li> <li>USA opened markets for vicuña products on 1 July 2002, increasing demand for lucrative vicuna wool products; no changes in CITES status should occur until the effects on management and trade are known</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: would be in international trade if not on Appendix I • small population sizes • inadequate enforcement • inadequate implementation of the Convention</p>
<p>Prop. 12.13</p> <p>Vicuña <i>Vicugna vicugna</i></p> <p><b>Bolivia</b></p> <p>Transfer to Appendix II of the populations of Bolivia that are in Appendix I, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, with the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in products made from wool sheared from live animals and bearing the label "VICUNA-BOLIVIA"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador</li> <li>Population: Bolivia, 56,383 and increasing; global wild population 227,201 and increasing; historically over-exploited for trade (global population declined from 400,000 to 10,000 between 1950s and 1967); three Bolivian populations currently on Appendix II are largest in Bolivia (32,916 or over 72% of population); six other populations vary in size from 487 to 3934</li> <li>Threats: poaching for wool and meat; perceived competition with livestock</li> <li>Trade: certain populations in Argentina, Bolivia and Chile, and all populations in Peru, are on Appendix II (annotation allows international trade in wool sheared from live vicuña, and in the stock extant at the time of COP9 (1994) in Peru, and in products made thereof); all other populations are on Appendix I; there is illegal trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poaching and illegal trade are serious concerns in Bolivia: in 1999 an individual was arrested with 324 vicuña skins; poached vicuña products offered for sale domestically in large quantities; tour operators claim to encounter skinned vicuña carcasses on a regular basis; game wardens report cases of poaching; vicuña rugs, made from skins, are offered for sale in La Paz; wool industry may prefer the longer hairs that can be obtained from dead animals, including poached animals</li> <li>Regulatory mechanisms to control trade in vicuña wool are in early stages of implementation and are insufficient at this time; enforcement controls and compliance with the Convention must be in place before species can be transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in accordance with RC 9.24, Annex 4</li> <li>Bolivian vicuña populations proposed for down-listing are very small (between 414 and 3513 animals)</li> <li>Mortality during capture, abortions during or after capture, disruption of reproductive cycle associated with shearing, and disruption of social groups (including separation of calves from mothers) may lead to population declines but these are not addressed</li> <li>USA opened markets for vicuña products on 1 July 2002, increasing demand for lucrative vicuna wool products; no changes in the CITES status should occur until the effects on management and trade are known</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: would be in international trade if not on</p>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 12.14 Vicuña <i>Vicugna vicugna</i></p> <p><b>Chile</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of the population of the Primera Región of Chile through a modification of annotations –106 and +211</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Argentina, Bolivia, Chile, Peru, Ecuador</li> <li>• Population: Chile, 17,000-22,000 and increasing; 16,899 in the Primera Region; global wild population approximately 227,201 and increasing; historically over-exploited for trade (global population declined from 400,000 to 10,000 between 1950s and 1967);</li> <li>• Threats: poaching for wool and meat; perceived competition with livestock</li> <li>• Trade: certain populations in Argentina, Bolivia and Chile, and all populations in Peru, are on Appendix II (annotation allows international trade in wool sheared from live vicuña, and in the stock extant at the time of COP9 (1994) in Peru, and in products made thereof); all other populations are on Appendix I; there is illegal trade</li> </ul>	<p>Appendix I • small population sizes • inadequate enforcement • inadequate implementation of the Convention</p> <p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy of regulatory mechanisms to control capture and trade have not been demonstrated; enforcement controls and compliance with the Convention must be in place before species can be transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II, in accordance with RC 9.24, Annex 4</li> <li>• Mortality during capture, abortions during or after capture, disruption of reproductive cycle associated with shearing, and disruption of social groups (including separation of calves from mothers) may lead to population declines and should be addressed</li> <li>• Proposal includes trade from wild vicuña as well as from existing captive vicuña operations, which rely on capture from the wild; conservation concerns about captive operations include disease transmission to the wild population, genetic effects of escaped animals, impacts on population dynamics and social organization and impacts on fragile habitat; the legal, social and ecological framework for captive management is unresolved; conservation value and socio-economic benefits of captive management have not been demonstrated</li> <li>• USA opened markets for vicuña products on 1 July 2002, increasing demand for lucrative vicuña wool products; no changes in the CITES status should occur until the effects on management and trade are known</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: would be in international trade if not on Appendix I • inadequate enforcement • inadequate implementation of the Convention</p>
<p>Prop. 12.15 Lesser Rhea <i>Rhea pennata pennata</i></p> <p><b>Chile</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of the Chilean population, in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 4, section B.2.b</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Chile, Argentina</li> <li>• Population: proposal estimates Chilean population at 49,526; much larger Argentine population of <i>R..p pennata</i> transferred to Appendix II at COP 11; other subspecies of <i>R. pennata</i> are on Appendix I</li> <li>• Threats: hunting for meat, skins and eggs; predation; habitat fragmentation</li> <li>• Trade: between 1987-1997, 57 live specimens were exported from Chile to overseas zoos</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposal is to export products from captive-breeding operations; Chile should submit a proposal to the Parties to register the operations in accordance with RCs 8.15 and 10.16</li> <li>• Two northern subspecies of <i>R. pennata</i> are in serious danger of extinction and are threatened by hunting for meat and eggs</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • northern populations decreasing</p>
<p>Prop. 12.16 Yellow-naped Parrot <i>Amazona auropalliata</i></p> <p><b>Costa Rica</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Mexico, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Costa Rica</li> <li>• Population: has declined markedly in last twenty years; considered endangered in Mexico, El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua; almost extinct in Guatemala; Costa Rican population reduced in number, local populations extirpated in some areas; island race <i>A.a. caribaea</i> reduced to 1-200 birds</li> <li>• Threats: loss of habitat; illegal take of chicks for national and international pet trade; 70% of nests in Guatemala are poached; one-third of nests poached in Costa Rica; 100% of nestlings of the subspecies <i>A.a. caribaea</i> are taken in the Bahia Islands, Honduras; in Nicaragua estimated one-half of chicks taken die during capture and transportation; adults are also taken for the trade in Mexico</li> <li>• Trade: Nicaragua allows annual legal export of 600 specimens; illegal take in Nicaragua for national and international trade estimated at &gt; 86,000/yr; most commonly-seized parrot at US-Mexican border 1990-93; extensive illegal trade between Range States, from Guatemala to Mexico, Honduras to Nicaragua, Nicaragua to El Salvador and Costa Rica as well as from Costa Rica to Panama and Nicaragua; parrots taken from Guatemala go to USA, Germany and Japan</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marked population decline resulting from habitat loss and over-collecting of nestlings; capture of nestlings may involve destruction of nest tree, reducing prospects of recovery of the species; listing urgently needed to protect wild population</li> <li>• Enforcement of protective laws lacking; uncontrolled nest poaching even in reserves; listing on Appendix I will compliment efforts by Range States to prevent trade in specimens taken illegally</li> <li>• Reducing access to international markets has lowered level of illegal removal of parrot chicks from nests</li> <li>• A 2001 report of Mexico's technical subcommittee on parrot conservation recommended the species be transferred to Appendix I at COP12</li> <li>• Identification problems make it important that this species and <i>A. oratrix</i> be transferred to Appendix I together</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.17 Yellow-headed Parrot <i>Amazona oratrix</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Mexico, Belize, Guatemala, Honduras</li> <li>• Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000); population 7000 at most in 1994, &gt;90% decline since mid-1970s; available evidence suggests further decline since 1994; race <i>A.o. tresmariae</i> in Mexico's Tres Marias Islands estimated at &lt; 800 in 1984; nesting success only one in four</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Species in serious decline, with over-collecting greatest threat; capture of nestlings may involve destruction of nest tree; listing urgently needed to protect wild population</li> <li>• Although protected in Mexico since 1983, Belize since 1981, and Honduras</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><b>Mexico</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threats: over-collecting for international and domestic trade; habitat destruction (more than 70% of original habitat lost to cattle ranching and agriculture); subsistence hunting and persecution by farmers (Belize)</li> <li>• Trade: legal quota of 60 birds from Mexico in 2000; most popular <i>Amazona</i> parrot in trade; between 37,600 and 86,000 traded internationally 1982-1989; thousands illegally exported from Mexico each year; most commonly-confiscated parrot in Mexico 1998-2000; second most commonly-seized parrot at USA-Mexican border 1990-93; mortality from illegal capture very high; though bred in captivity, 50% of captive birds in USA in mid-1990s probably wild-caught</li> </ul>	<p>since 1990, enforcement is lacking; uncontrolled nest poaching even in natural reserves supporting the last viable populations in Mexico; listing on Appendix I will compliment efforts by Range States to prevent trade in specimens taken illegally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mexico's technical subcommittee on parrot conservation identified Appendix I protection as critical to the survival of the species</li> <li>• Reducing access to international markets has lowered level of illegal removal of parrot chicks from nests</li> <li>• Identification problems make it important that this species and <i>A. auropalliata</i> be transferred to Appendix I together</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.18 Blue-headed Macaw <i>Ara couloni</i></p> <p><b>Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 1, section D</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Peru, Brazil, Bolivia</li> <li>• Population: uncommon to rare; probably under 10,000 (may be no more than 500-1000 pairs according to recent observations in Peru (main Range State); reproductive output apparently very low</li> <li>• Trade: almost unknown in trade before 1995, but both legal and illegal trade have increased since; hundreds offered in markets in Brazil, possibly originating from Peru; Germany seized 30 in 2001; most illegal trade goes to Europe; export from Brazil and Bolivia illegal; Peru allows small number of legal exports</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Brazil and Bolivia support the proposal (no comment from Peru)</li> <li>• Birds command high prices (US\$2000 to US\$12,500) and therefore attract smugglers</li> <li>• All birds currently in Europe may come from illegal stock</li> <li>• As very little is known about the bird in the wild, scientific justification for Peru's export quota is questionable</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • low population • collection for trade may affect wild populations • low reproductive output • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.19 Cape Parrot <i>Poicephalus robustus</i></p> <p><b>South Africa</b> Transfer of the South African population from Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 1, section A (ii), B (i) and C(ii)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: South Africa</li> <li>• Population: very low (most recent population figure 634 birds; only 100 of these may be breeding); range discontinuous; recruitment rate low; birds only breed starting at 4-5 years; may not breed every year; only half of chicks survive; recently "split" from grey-headed parrot, <i>Poicephalus fuscicollis</i></li> <li>• Threats: chief threat is habitat loss, coupled with low reproductive output; birds shot by farmers and poached for domestic traditional medicine; spread of viral disease</li> <li>• Trade: international trade hard to assess because of confusion with <i>P. fuscicollis</i>; 20-50 birds (~10% of population) poached per year for pet trade, mostly for domestic sale; market value has increased from R1,000 (US\$99) to over R35,000 (US\$3461) in last decade</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proponent is sole Range State</li> <li>• Though little international trade recorded, rarity of species and rise in value justifies Appendix I listing on precautionary grounds</li> <li>• Illegal domestic trade apparently rising; nine confiscated in 2001 in Eastern Cape, six confiscated May/June 2002</li> <li>• Pair recently sold for R40,000 (US\$3955) in South Africa</li> <li>• Few captive birds outside South Africa; under 50 in South African studbook; captive-bred birds cannot be returned to wild population because of threat of viral disease</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • wild population very small and localized • low reproductive output • threatened by over-collecting, habitat loss and disease</p>
<p>Prop. 12.20 Big-headed Turtle <i>Platysternon megacephalum</i></p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B I)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: China (including Hong Kong SAR), Lao PDR, Myanmar, Thailand, Viet Nam</li> <li>• Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000); once common in food markets in China but now rare, indicating drastic population decline; declines noted in all Range States except Thailand; only remote or well-protected areas may have stable populations</li> <li>• Threats: over-collecting for food and pet trade for domestic and international markets; habitat loss</li> <li>• Trade: without CITES listing, almost impossible to distinguish legal from illegal trade imports into China</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>• Kunming Workshop named <i>P. megacephalum</i> as one of the 11 highest-priority taxa for Appendix II listing</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • declining wild population • likely to become more seriously threatened if trade not regulated • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.21 Annam Pond Turtle <i>Mauremys [Annamemys] annamensis</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Viet Nam, possibly Cambodia</li> <li>• Population: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); formerly abundant in limited range but recent surveys have failed to find it in the wild</li> <li>• Threats: over-collecting for domestic and international markets; habitat degradation</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><b>China, Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A, and B(i) and (ii)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trade: recorded in food markets in Asia and in pet trade in Europe and North America, though Viet Nam prohibits exports</li> </ul>	<p>Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All participants at Kunming Workshop supported this proposal</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • declining wild population • Critically Endangered • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.22</p> <p><i>Heosemys</i> spp.: Arakan Forest Turtle (<i>Heosemys depressa</i>); giant Asian pond turtle (<i>H. grandis</i>); Philippine Pond Turtle (<i>H. leytensis</i>); Spiny Turtle (<i>H. spinosa</i>)</p> <p><b>China, Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a): a) sections A and B (i) for <i>H. depressa</i>; b) section B (i) for <i>H. grandis</i> and <i>H. spinosa</i>; and c) section A for <i>H. leytensis</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: <i>H. depressa</i>: Myanmar; <i>H. grandis</i>: Cambodia, Viet Nam, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand; <i>H. leytensis</i>: Philippines; <i>H. spinosa</i>: Brunei Darussalam, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand</li> <li>Population: <i>H. depressa</i>: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); <i>H. grandis</i>: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); <i>H. leytensis</i>: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); only four specimens known; last reported in 1988; <i>H. spinosa</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2000)</li> <li>Threats: <i>H. depressa</i>: over-collection for domestic consumption and international food trade; <i>H. grandis</i>: valued for human consumption because of its large size; collecting mature individuals threatens species with low annual reproductive output and long lifespan; <i>H. spinosa</i>: intensive collecting for international pet trade; habitat loss</li> <li>Trade: <i>H. grandis</i>: intensively collected for export; juveniles also in pet trade; <i>H. spinosa</i>: juveniles in demand for pet trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Myanmar supports listing of <i>H. depressa</i>, <i>H. grandis</i> and <i>H. spinosa</i>; Indonesia supports listing of <i>H. spinosa</i></li> <li>Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>All participants at Kunming Workshop supported this proposal</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • declining wild populations • either already Critically Endangered or Endangered or likely to become more seriously threatened if trade not regulated • <i>H. leytensis</i> extremely rare, <i>H. depressa</i> with restricted distribution • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.23</p> <p>Yellow-headed Temple Turtle <i>Hieremys annandalii</i></p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B i)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: Cambodia, Lao PDR, Viet Nam, Thailand, Malaysia</li> <li>Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000); endangered in Cambodia, Lao PDR and Viet Nam; vulnerable or endangered in Thailand; marginal in Malaysia; population trends unknown</li> <li>Threats: over-collection for food and trade for domestic and international markets; habitat degradation in parts of range</li> <li>Trade: illegal trade of Cambodian turtles to Viet Nam much larger than legal trade to China; most turtles sent to Viet Nam are exported to China</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • declining wild population • Endangered • likely to become more seriously threatened if trade not regulated • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.24</p> <p>Roofed Turtles <i>Kachuga</i> spp. (except <i>K. tecta</i>)</p> <p><b>India, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II with the exception of <i>K. tecta</i> in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and: a) Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B for <i>K. dhongoka</i>, <i>K. kachuga</i>, <i>K. sylhetensis</i> and <i>K. trivittata</i>; and b) Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 b), section A for <i>K. smithii</i>, <i>K. smithii smithii</i>, <i>K. smithii pallidipes</i>, <i>K. tentoria</i>, <i>K. tentoria tentoria</i>, <i>K. tentoria circumdata</i> and <i>K. tentoria flaviventer</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Nepal, Myanmar</li> <li>Population: seven species; all <i>Kachuga</i> species in serious decline (<i>K. sylhetensis</i> has decreased by 90% in 10 years); <i>K. kachuga</i>: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000), with population probably &lt;1000; <i>K. dhongoka</i>, <i>K. sylhetensis</i> and <i>K. trivittata</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2000); <i>K. tecta</i> already listed on Appendix I</li> <li>Threats: unsustainable offtake for international and domestic food markets; larger species (<i>K. kachuga</i>, <i>K. dhongoka</i>) particularly affected by collecting; lower numbers taken for pet trade; habitat loss</li> <li>Trade: Bangladesh is centre of turtle trade in region; law regulating trade is not enforced; smuggling routes also exist through Nepal, and by air from India through Singapore; numbers of turtles from Indian subcontinent in Chinese markets has increased in recent years; trade has shifted to more abundant species as rarer ones disappear, but these too are showing significant declines</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Populations declining due to over-collection for trade</li> <li>Supported by CITES turtle working group at 18<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Animals Committee in April 2002</li> <li>Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • either already Critically Endangered or likely to become more seriously threatened if trade not regulated • declining wild populations • low reproductive output • clearly unsustainable offtake • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.25</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: Indonesia</li> <li>Population: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); little information on</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indonesia, the sole Range State, supports the proposal</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Sulawesi Forest Turtle <i>Leucocephalon yuwonoi</i></p> <p><b>China, Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B i)</p>	<p>status in wild though suitable habitat still available</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Threats: collection of adults for domestic consumption and the international food trade; collection of juveniles and adults for the international pet trade</li> <li>• Trade: number of animals observed in international trade rapidly increased after discovery in early 1990s to 2000-3000 animals traded in food markets in southern China in 1998, and collapsed to about 100 in 1999, and none in 2000 and 2001; as species is highly localized, trade pattern suggests real decline in the wild</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nearing commercial extinction</li> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Turtles and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>• All participants at Kunming Workshop supported this proposal</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • Critically Endangered • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.26 Yellow Pond Turtle <i>Mauremys mutica</i></p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B i)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: China (including Chinese Taipei), Japan, Viet Nam</li> <li>• Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000); considered endangered in China and Viet Nam, rare in Chinese Taipei, vulnerable in Japan (Southern Ryukyus); once one of the commonest turtles for sale in the Chinese food market; has become uncommon in recent years, indicating substantial declines in the wild populations (except in Japan where no information available)</li> <li>• Threats: over-collection for domestic and international markets; habitat loss including damage from fertilizers and herbicides</li> <li>• Trade: used for food in China; for food, pet trade and turtle jelly (Hong Kong SAR); shells imported into Chinese Taipei as important ingredient in traditional medicines; import of turtles into China and Chinese Taipei not adequately controlled despite recent efforts in China</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>• Kunming Workshop named <i>M. mutica</i> as one of the 11 highest-priority taxa for Appendix II listing</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • Endangered • declining wild population • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.27 Malayan Giant Turtle <i>Orlitia borneensis</i></p> <p><b>China, Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), section B (i)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Malaysia, Indonesia</li> <li>• Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000); supplies to export businesses by local trappers have declined considerably in recent years; habitat loss unlikely to be responsible; over-collecting presumably causing wild population to decline</li> <li>• Threats: over-exploitation for domestic and international markets; habitat loss</li> <li>• Trade: large quantities sold in food markets in East Asia, suspected to derive largely from Indonesia though trade in <i>Orlitia</i> is banned there; was the third most common species in turtle trade in Sumatra in 1996-97; Single shipment of 7544 live freshwater turtles and tortoises confiscated in Hong Kong SAR in December 2001 included 1381 <i>Orlitia</i>, most with fishhooks in throat or esophagus</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia supports the proposal</li> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>• All participants at Kunming Workshop supported this proposal</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded, though most trade illegal • Endangered • apparently declining wild population • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls</p>
<p>Prop. 12.28 Keeled Box Turtle <i>Pyxidea mouhotii</i></p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B i)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: China, India, Lao PDR, Myanmar, Viet Nam</li> <li>• Population: little information available; species has probably declined drastically, at least in China and Lao PDR</li> <li>• Threats: over-collecting for the food trade for domestic and international markets; habitat loss</li> <li>• Trade: apparently extensive exports from Lao PDR to China and Viet Nam; Lao PDR has no legislation protecting turtles; common in wildlife trade seizures along northern ground routes in Viet Nam, particularly during the spring; China has banned export of most native turtles, including <i>P. mouhotii</i>; large-scale exploitation of <i>P. mouhotii</i> for the food trade is most likely unsustainable; without CITES listing, almost impossible to distinguish legal from illegal trade imports into China; some captive breeding for commercial purposes on Chinese turtle farms</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>• Kunming Workshop named <i>P. mouhotii</i> as one of the 11 highest-priority taxa for Appendix II listing</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • apparently declining wild population • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls, especially in Lao PDR</p>
<p>Prop. 12.29</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Indonesia, Cambodia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Singapore, Thailand, Viet Nam</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia strongly supports this proposal</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Black Marsh Turtle <i>Siebenrockiella crassicolis</i></p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B i)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); endangered in Cambodia and Viet Nam; uncommon in Indonesia; may be vulnerable in Malaysia and Thailand; Myanmar populations of all turtles now severely depleted</li> <li>• Threats: collecting for food trade for domestic and international markets; habitat loss; accidental drowning in fishermen's nets</li> <li>• Trade: exported in large numbers from Sumatra, Indonesia; actual numbers probably greatly exceed legal quotas; legally exported from Cambodia and Malaysia; between January and October 1999, 135,121 wild-caught specimens exported from Peninsular Malaysia; widespread in food markets in China; most specimens probably imported illegally</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • declining wild population, at least in Myanmar • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • extensive illegal trade</p>
<p>Prop. 12.30 Hawksbill Turtle <i>Eretmochelys imbricata</i></p> <p><b>Cuba</b> Transfer of the population in Cuban waters* from Appendix I to Appendix II, pursuant to Resolution Conf. 9.24, for the exclusive purpose of allowing the Government of Cuba to export its stockpile of shell plates (7,800 kg), accumulated legally from its national conservation and management programme between 1993 and 2002, annotated as follows: a) the export will not take place until the CITES Secretariat has verified, within 12 months of the decision, that the importing country has adequate internal trade controls and will not re-export and the CITES Standing Committee accepts this verification; and b) the wild population in Cuban waters will continue to be managed as an Appendix-I species. * In accordance with Article I a of the Convention, the population for which a transfer is requested is defined as that segment of the regional Caribbean population bounded by the geographic limits of Cuban waters, which is under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Cuba, and is the exclusive area from which the shell was derived</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: tropical and subtropical ocean waters world-wide</li> <li>• Population: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); global decline of over 80% in three generations; status reaffirmed by 1999 global review, upheld in October 2001 by IUCN Red List Standards and Petitions Subcommittee; species listed on Appendix I since 1976 (Cuba has reservation, Japan withdrew reservation in 1994); probably under 5000 breeding females in entire region; large apparent population sizes may be misleading as bulk of animals are juveniles needed to support small adult breeding stock; claim that Cuban "population" is increasing at over 20% per year based on samples of less than 3% of Cuban nesting beaches, assessed only since 1997</li> <li>• Threats: illegal tortoiseshell trade; hunting for food; destruction of nesting areas; incidental catch</li> <li>• Trade: no legal international trade since 1993; Cuba's management program allows maximum catch limit of 500 per year with shells stockpiled; significant poaching and illegal trade occur throughout range (inadequate enforcement controls and compliance with CITES); "illegal trade of hawksbill turtle products as well as other sea turtle species is the highest volume, most widespread, most long-term, and persistent illegal trade of any CITES Appendix-I species in the Convention's 25-year history" (comments by USA); widespread illegal trade in hawksbill products in the Caribbean region including Cuba</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tagging and DNA data show that 30-58% of Hawksbills in Cuban waters originate in at least 11 other countries and territories, whose populations are depleted (there is no geographically-separate Cuban "population" as required for separate listing under CITES, even if trade is limited)</li> <li>• There is no way to "manage the wild population as an Appendix I species" (as proposed by Cuba) if international trade of hawksbill products is allowed (CITES only regulates international trade, not management, and such trade is not allowed for Appendix I species); Cuba intends to continue annual off-take, including Hawksbills from other countries</li> <li>• Increase in nesting correlated with 1993 moratorium in Japan and decreased commercial take in Cuba; Cuban scientists accept that Cuba's past commercial take may have affected recovery of Hawksbills in the region</li> <li>• Trade control system in Japan, the likeliest importer, cannot distinguish the source of <i>bekko</i> (tortoiseshell) after processing or at the retail level</li> <li>• 22nd Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation (April 2002, Miami) passed a resolution concluding "Re-opening even a restricted international commercial trade in Hawksbill products may threaten the recovery of depleted or declining populations of hawksbills worldwide, by encouraging stockpiling of products... all populations of hawksbill sea turtle should therefore be retained on Appendix I of CITES"</li> <li>• Similar proposals rejected at COP10 and COP11</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: would be internationally traded if not on Appendix I • Critically Endangered • wild populations declining • impossible to distinguish "Cuban population" from others • significant illegal trade throughout range • inadequate enforcement controls and compliance with CITES throughout range</p>
<p>Prop. 12.31 Narrow-headed Softshell Turtles <i>Chitra</i> spp.</p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and B i)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: <i>Chitra chitra</i>: Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand; <i>C. indica</i>: Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, possibly Nepal</li> <li>• Population: <i>Chitra chitra</i>: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); <i>C. indica</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2000) except in Bangladesh: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000); uncommon in India; declining in Nepal due to over-collecting</li> <li>• Threats: direct capture for local consumption or for international food and pet trade</li> <li>• Trade: much use is domestic as animals are very large and are usually butchered locally; also on sale at food markets in East Asia; <i>C. indica</i> once traded heavily but now largely depleted; in Thailand, trade impacts to <i>C. chitra</i> are potentially severe because of a small, depleted natural population combined with very high prices paid for live animals</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indonesia strongly supports listing <i>Chitra chitra</i>; Nepal supports the listing of <i>Chitra indica</i></li> <li>• Distinguishing the two species is very difficult</li> <li>• Workshop on Trade in Tortoises and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>• Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Tortoises in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>• Kunming Workshop named <i>Chitra</i> as one of the 11 highest-priority taxa for Appendix II listing</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • Critically Endangered • declining wild population • history of over-exploitation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.32 Giant Softshell Turtles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: <i>Pelochelys bibroni</i>: Indonesia, Papua New Guinea; <i>P. cantorii</i>: Bangladesh, China, Indonesia, India, Cambodia, Lao PDR,</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entire genus should be listed; both species occur in Indonesia and Papua New</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><i>Pelochelys</i> spp.</p> <p><b>China, United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II; a) <i>P. cantorii</i>: in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention, and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), sections A and Bi); and b) <i>P. bibroni</i>: in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention, and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 b), section A</p>	<p>Myanmar, Philippines, Papua New Guinea, Thailand, Viet Nam</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Population: <i>P. bibroni</i>: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000) and considered uncommon; <i>P. cantorii</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2000), considered extinct in the wild in China, virtually eliminated from India due to exploitation, critically endangered in Lao PDR, Cambodia, Viet Nam and probably the Philippines, apparently uncommon to rare in rest of range</li> <li>Threats: over-collecting for meat, pets and curios made from shell, for both domestic human consumption and international trade; habitat loss</li> <li>Trade: <i>P. bibroni</i>: no reported international trade; <i>P. cantorii</i>: increasingly imported from other Range States into China for food markets as native stocks of depleted; international trade at unknown levels; between January and October 1999, 43,000 individuals exported from Peninsular Malaysia; active trade in shell curios sold to tourists in Papua New Guinea; considerable domestic trade in meat of both species</li> </ul>	<p>Guinea; taxonomy is unclear, and several further species may be named</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Indonesia strongly supports the proposal; Philippines supports listing <i>P. cantorii</i></li> <li>Workshop on Trade in Turtles and Freshwater Turtles in Asia (Phnom Penh 1999) recommended that all turtle species native to the Indo-Malayan, eastern Palearctic and Australasian Realms be listed on at least Appendix II</li> <li>Participants at CITES-sponsored Technical Workshop on Conservation of and Trade in Freshwater Turtles and Turtles in Asia (Kunming 2002) generally agreed that all the remaining non-CITES listed species of Asian turtles should be listed under the Appendices of CITES [AC18 Inf. 12]</li> <li>Kunming Workshop named <i>Pelochelys</i> as one of the 11 highest-priority taxa for Appendix II listing</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • declining wild population • low reproductive output • history of over-exploitation • inadequate enforcement controls • inadequate CITES implementation</p>
<p>Prop. 12.33</p> <p>New Zealand Geckos <i>Hoplodactylus</i> spp. and <i>Naultinus</i> spp.</p> <p><b>New Zealand</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraphs 2(a) and 2(b), of the Convention</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: New Zealand</li> <li>Population: status unknown except for population of <i>Naultinus gemmeus</i> in a reserve which has "drastically declined" due to poaching for illegal international trade; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to late sexual maturity (2-6 years) and low reproductive output (0.5 – 2 offspring per female per year)</li> <li>Threats: habitat loss and modification; introduced mammalian predators; poaching and illegal trade; poachers destroy habitat when searching for geckos</li> <li>Trade: fully protected in New Zealand, yet are offered in international trade in numbers exceeding captive breeding capacity; high market value (up to US\$15,000 per individual) indicates high demand which has led to increased poaching; large and growing illegal trade in poached animals, particularly in USA, Germany and the Czech Republic</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listing on Appendix II will complement New Zealand's domestic efforts to prevent trade in specimens of these taxa taken illegally</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p>
<p>Prop. 12.34</p> <p>Orange-throated Whiptail Lizard <i>Cnemidophorus hyperythrus</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: USA, Mexico</li> <li>Population: status unknown except for population of one subspecies which is "seriously depleted" and populations on three islands in Mexico which are "abundant"; low reproductive potential due to small clutch size (2-3 eggs per clutch)</li> <li>Threats: habitat destruction</li> <li>Trade: 156 specimens traded 1980-1997; 96 of these were exported from USA to Japan in 1997, indicating a recent and potentially growing interest for international trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although recent international trade levels are low, international trade in live reptiles as pets has increased dramatically in recent years; a precautionary approach is warranted to ensure species is not harmed by trade</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • inferred that if trade is not regulated it will lead to a decline in the number of individuals in the wild</p>
<p>Prop. 12.35</p> <p>Whale Shark <i>Rhincodon typus</i></p> <p><b>India, The Philippines</b> Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: warm, tropical waters (excluding the Mediterranean) world-wide (123 Range States)</li> <li>Population: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); some local populations have declined drastically, while fishing effort and price have increased; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to slow growth rate, late sexual maturity (between 9 and 20-30 years), low fecundity and long birth interval; records show declining catches and, where data are available, declining catch-per-unit-effort; reported declines of 30-80% per decade, and 20-30% annually, in some areas</li> <li>Threats: over-exploitation for trade in meat and fins</li> <li>Trade: well-documented international trade in fins and meat to markets in Asia; no international agreements to regulate or monitor international trade in whale shark products exist; protected status afforded by some Parties is undermined by lack of regulation of international trade in this highly migratory species</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meat and fins easily distinguished from other shark species, easing implementation of CITES listing</li> <li>Appendix II listing will help to implement the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks</li> <li>Significant revenues, far exceeding those from trade, are being earned through whale shark tourism in some countries; over-exploitation for trade could threaten these revenues</li> <li>On Appendix II of the Convention on Migratory Species which identifies species as having unfavourable conservation status that would benefit from implementation of international cooperative agreements for its conservation and management; also included in the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea Agreement on Straddling Fish Stock and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks as a highly migratory species, recognizing the need for international cooperation</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • low reproductive output • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p>
<p>Prop. 12.36</p> <p>Basking Shark</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distribution: temperate ocean waters of Atlantic, Indo-Pacific Oceans and Mediterranean Sea (54 Range States)</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fins easily distinguished from other shark species, easing implementation of CITES listing</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><i>Cetorhinus maximus</i></p> <p><b>United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); local populations rapidly declining due to over-fishing; vulnerable to over-exploitation because of slow growth rate, late sexual maturity (20 years for females), long gestation period, low fecundity (litter size of six with gestation of up to three years); some stocks reduced by 50-80% have not recovered even after several decades</li> <li>• Threats: over-exploitation for trade in fins, cartilage and meat; incidental take</li> <li>• Trade: well-documented international trade; listed on Appendix III by the United Kingdom in 2000</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix II listing will help to implement the FAO International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations • low reproductive output • some international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p>
<p>Prop. 12.37</p> <p>Seahorses <i>Hippocampus spp.</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II a) <i>Hippocampus comes</i>, <i>H. spinosissimus</i>, <i>H. barbouri</i>, <i>H. reidi</i>, <i>H. erectus</i>, and <i>H. ingens</i> in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), section B i); and b) the other 26 described species in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention, and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 b), section A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: temperate, subtropical and tropical coastal environments between 52° north and 45° south latitude (at least 94 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: 32 recognized species range from Endangered to Data Deficient (IUCN 2000), with most (20) Vulnerable; declining numbers and diminishing specimen size in many Range States with seahorse fisheries; commercial catch in some regions has declined by 95%; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to low fecundity</li> <li>• Threats: over-exploitation for trade; by-catch; degradation and loss of habitat due to coastal development; destructive fishing practices; pollution</li> <li>• Trade: traditional medicine, live for the aquarium trade, curios; 75 countries trade in seahorses, 42 export; main exporters are Thailand, India, Mexico, the Philippines and Viet Nam; main importers of dried specimens are China and Singapore and, live specimens, North America, Europe and Japan; dried specimens sold as curios around the world</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Five largest seahorse exporting countries have experienced declines in catch of 15-75% over a recent three year period</li> <li>• International trade is one of the main causes of declining populations</li> <li>• International trade does not discriminate amongst seahorse species</li> </ul> <p>T <i>Hippocampus comes</i>, <i>H. spinosissimus</i>, <i>H. barbouri</i>, <i>H. reidi</i>, <i>H. erectus</i>, and <i>H. ingens</i> meet criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p> <p>T The other 26 species described meet criteria for Appendix II: specimens resemble the aforementioned species and a non-expert is unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>
<p>Prop. 12.38</p> <p>Humphead wrasse <i>Cheilinus undulatus</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a), section B</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: coral reefs throughout the Indo-Pacific region (42 Range States)</li> <li>• Population: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); populations have declined almost everywhere studied, particularly where heavily fished for export in the live reef fish trade; catch rates have declined in many areas; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to late sexual maturity (5-7 years)</li> <li>• Threats: over-exploitation for international trade, particularly intensive removal for live reef fish trade; destruction and degradation of coral reefs</li> <li>• Trade: life reef fish traded as food principally to Hong Kong SAR, China, and Singapore; rare species, such as humphead wrasse, command US\$90-175 per kg in Hong Kong SAR (a large specimen could weigh 190 kg); luxury market prices expected to increase as species becomes rarer; 38-132 tons imported to Hong Kong SAR (main importer) annually 1997-2000; Philippines and Indonesia are main exporters; no regional, and few national, efforts to manage the trade; illegal trade from Indonesia</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• International trade is one of the main causes of declining populations and is expected to continue</li> <li>• Very high market prices in Hong Kong SAR drives over-exploitation</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p>
<p>Prop. 12.39</p> <p>Patagonian toothfish, Antarctic toothfish <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> and <i>D. mawsonii</i></p> <p><b>Australia</b> Inclusion of <i>D. eleginoides</i> in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and inclusion of <i>D. mawsonii</i> in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention. Annotations (+200 series), Populations of <i>Dissostichus</i> species (spp.): The conservation, management or other relevant measures or resolutions adopted for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. by the Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), relating to <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. harvested from within the CCAMLR</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Antarctic and Southern Ocean waters and southern South American waters</li> <li>• Population: declining in areas where illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing occurs or has occurred; in one area the population was reduced by 55% within one year</li> <li>• Threats: over-exploitation for international trade, through IUU fishing; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to slow growth, late sexual maturity (12-15 years), and relatively low fecundity</li> <li>• Trade: toothfish are exploited for human consumption; highly valued by restaurants, with wholesale prices of approximately US\$10 per kg; Chile is main exporter; Japan and the USA main importers; 96% of fishing grounds occur within Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR) Convention Area; exploitation began in late 1980s; IUU fishing began in 1993; over past four years, of over 243,282 tonnes traded in international markets, only 123,165 tonnes were legally caught within and outside the CCAMLR area; IUU fishers claim to have caught toothfish outside of CCAMLR areas but CCAMLR concluded that catches were taken from within CCAMLR area; CCAMLR confirms</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CCAMLR manages toothfish fishing and has made progress in documenting trade though its Catch Documentation Scheme, but illegal, unregulated and unreported (IUU) fishing is causing unsustainable catch rates and depletion of populations</li> <li>• CCAMLR's regulatory measures aimed at preventing IUU fishing are constrained by the fact that they are binding only to the CCAMLR contracting Parties; IUU fishers deliberately choose non-CCAMLR States to register their vessels, and to land and trade their catches, as a means of avoiding the obligations arising from CCAMLR</li> <li>• Appendix II listing would complement CCAMLR regulatory measures by extending regulation to all CITES Parties, an additional 130 countries, thereby bringing effective control over trade to all major market or consumer states that are not members of CCAMLR or are not effectively implementing CCAMLR; CITES listing would assist CCAMLR by extending regulation to currently unregulated toothfish fisheries; CITES provides enforcement that CCAMLR lacks; this will help to bring IUU fishing under control, as importing Parties will be legally obligated to refuse such fish</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Convention Area, shall apply for the purposes of regulating trade in <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) including for the purposes of Article IV of CITES. States Party to CITES conducting trade in <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. harvested and traded in compliance with the conservation, management and other relevant measures or resolutions adopted by CCAMLR, including the Catch Documentation Scheme for <i>Dissostichus</i> spp., shall be regarded as having fulfilled their obligations under CITES as regards trade in <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. Trade in <i>Dissostichus</i> spp. harvested outside the CCAMLR Convention Area shall be subject to the relevant provisions of CITES and shall be regulated accordingly</p>	<p>that IUU has substantially increased in recent years and is often same or higher than reported catches</p>	<p>T <i>Dissostichus eleginoides</i> meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • wild populations declining • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p> <p>T <i>D. mawsonii</i> meets criteria for Appendix II: specimens resemble <i>D. eleginoides</i> and a non-expert is unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>
<p>Prop. 12.40</p> <p>Sri Lankan Rose Butterfly <i>Atrophaneura jophon</i> and <i>A. pandiyana</i></p> <p><b>Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion of <i>Atrophaneura jophon</i> in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a section A; and inclusion of <i>Atrophaneura pandiyana</i> in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 b), section A</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: <i>Atrophaneura jophon</i>, Sri Lanka; <i>A. pandiyana</i>, India</li> <li>• Population: <i>A. jophon</i>, Critically Endangered (IUCN 2000) (<i>A. pandiyana</i> not listed by IUCN); very restricted and fragmented distribution; habitat declining; limited extent of occurrence (less than 100 km<sup>2</sup>); known only from one location; wild population unknown but believed to be small</li> <li>• Threats: habitat destruction; illegal trade</li> <li>• Trade: international trade levels unknown (however, by comparison, dead and live specimens of birdwing butterflies are traded in large quantities in Europe, North America and Japan); <i>A. jophon</i> specimens observed on offer in Germany and the Czech Republic for up to US\$203 each; <i>A. jophon</i> fully protected in Sri Lanka so international trade is illegal; <i>A. pandiyana</i> also offered in international trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix II listing would compliment domestic measures in Sri Lanaka to stop illegal trade</li> <li>• International trade is one of the most important threats to this species</li> </ul> <p>T <i>Atrophaneura jophon</i> meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • Critically Endangered • wild populations declining • restricted, fragmented, limited distribution • declining habitat • illegal international trade is inferred to have a detrimental impact on wild populations</p> <p>T <i>A. pandiyana</i> meets criteria for Appendix II: specimens resemble <i>A. jophon</i> and a non-expert is unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>
<p>Prop. 12.41</p> <p>Swallowtail Butterflies <i>Papilio aristophontes</i>, <i>P. nireus</i> and <i>P. sosia</i></p> <p><b>Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Community</b> Inclusion of <i>Papilio aristophontes</i> in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a, section A; and inclusion of <i>P. nireus</i> and <i>P. sosia</i> in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, 2 b), section A</p>	<p>Distribution: <i>Papilio aristophontes</i>, Comoro Islands; <i>P. nireus</i> and <i>P. sosia</i>, Africa</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Population: <i>P. aristophontes</i>, Endangered (IUCN 2000) (<i>P. nireus</i> and <i>P. sosia</i> not listed by IUCN); distribution very restricted and fragmented; habitat declining; wild population unknown but believed to be small</li> <li>• Threats: habitat destruction</li> <li>• Trade: international trade levels unknown (however, by comparison, dead and live specimens of birdwing butterflies are traded in large quantities in Europe, North America and Japan); <i>P. aristophontes</i> specimens observed on sale in Germany, France and the Czech Republic for up to US\$122 each</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Papilio aristophontes</i> is not protected by domestic laws of the Comoro Islands, its habitat is not protected, and it is not the subject of any management measures</li> <li>• International trade is one of the most important threats to this species</li> </ul> <p>T <i>Papilio aristophontes</i> meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • wild populations declining • restricted, fragmented, limited distribution • declining habitat • international trade inferred to have a detrimental impact on wild populations</p> <p>T <i>P. nireus</i> and <i>P. sosia</i> meet the criteria for Appendix II: specimens resemble males of <i>P. aristophontes</i> and a non-expert is unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>
<p>Prop. 12.42</p> <p>Monkey Puzzle Tree <i>Araucaria araucana</i></p> <p><b>Argentina</b> Inclusion of <i>Araucaria araucana</i> in Appendix I, replacing <i>Araucaria araucana</i>** +219</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Current annotations (+219, -114) restrict listing to populations of Chile and Argentina, though Argentina and Chile are sole Range States</li> <li>• Purpose of proposal is not to alter listing status but to clarify intent of Parties at COP11, when population of Argentina was added to Appendix I</li> <li>• COP11 proposal was intended to eliminate split listing of species, as Chilean population was already on Appendix I; the Secretariat, however, interpreted the listing of Argentine population to mean that “introduced populations” in other countries, if any, would remain on Appendix II (Notification 2000/037 of July 31, 2000)</li> <li>• Adoption of this proposal would unequivocally place entire species in</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of listing on Appendix I will eliminate the law enforcement problems caused by the current “split-listing” of the species</li> <li>• Even if introduced populations exist, CITES listings should not result in introduced populations being on a different Appendix from those in Range States unless that is specifically intended by the proponent, as these populations ultimately derive from the listed populations in the Range States</li> <li>• Chile supports current proposal</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
(populations of Argentina and Chile), and deletion of <i>Araucaria araucana</i> * -114 #1 in Appendix II	Appendix I, wherever it occurs • Postal vote on issue failed for lack of a quorum	T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • restricted and decreasing area of distribution • illegal trade in seeds is harming wild populations
<p>Prop. 12.43 Cacti <i>Cactaceae</i> spp.</p> <p><b>Switzerland</b> Amendment of the text of the annotation °608 that refers to artificially propagated specimens of <i>Gymnocalycium mihanovichii</i> (cultivars) forms lacking chlorophyll, to read as follows: <i>Cactaceae</i> spp. colour mutants lacking chlorophyll, grafted on the following grafting stocks: <i>Harrisia</i> “Jusbertii”, <i>Hylocereus trigonus</i> or <i>Hylocereus undatus</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annotation °608 exempts certain cactus hybrids and cultivars, including <i>Gymnocalycium mihanovichii</i> cultivars lacking chlorophyll, from Appendix II trade controls</li> <li>• New cultivars lacking chlorophyll have been developed; this proposal seeks to extend the annotation °608 exemption to these and all such cultivars</li> <li>• Cultivars lacking chlorophyll are products of horticulture, do not exist in the wild, and are readily distinguished from naturally occurring cacti</li> </ul>	<b>SUPPORT</b>
<p>Prop. 12.44 Prickly Pear Cacti Opuntioideae spp.</p> <p><b>Switzerland</b> Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: North and South America</li> <li>• Population: 361 species; two <i>Opuntia</i> taxa from Ecuador (Galapagos) listed as Critically Endangered, eight as Endangered, and seven as Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); six of 129 species in Mexico are “rare”; one of 81-87 species in USA is “endangered”; five species in Chile are “rare”; some species threatened by forest clearance and mining in Brazil; some species seriously affected by agricultural practices and forest clearance in parts of Argentina, Paraguay and Uruguay; some species have restricted distributions; some are considered invasive species</li> <li>• Threats: agriculture; forest clearance; mining; intentional destruction; urbanization; road construction</li> <li>• Trade: fruits, timber, and live plants (wild and artificially propagated) are traded; “supermarket plants” and cultivars of the most important species in horticulture currently exempted from CITES; most trade in wild specimens is in dried “skeletons” (timber) of four species, exported from Mexico and USA to Japan and Europe; extensive illegal trade in wild-collected opuntias (USA seized at least 740 specimens of six species originating in Mexico 1994-2002, including 70-80 wild-collected specimens in 2002 alone) (Mexico also reports illegal trade)</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range States of Chile, Mexico and USA oppose the proposal</li> <li>• The inclusion of Opuntioideae spp. in Appendix II provides some protection for species that are Critically Endangered, Endangered, Vulnerable and rare</li> <li>• There is a substantial illegal trade in wild-collected specimens that may be harming wild populations</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • international trade may have a detrimental impact on wild populations • inferred that if trade is not controlled one or more of the taxa may meet at least one of the criteria for listing on Appendix I in the near future</p>
<p>Prop. 12.45 Leaf-bearing Cacti <i>Pereskioideae</i> spp., <i>Peresklopsis</i> spp. and <i>Quiabentia</i> spp.</p> <p><b>Switzerland</b> Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Pereskioideae spp. (<i>Pereskia</i> spp. and <i>Maihuea</i> spp.): Central and South America and the Caribbean (28 Range States); <i>Peresklopsis</i> spp.: Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico; <i>Quiabentia</i> spp.: Brazil, Argentina, Bolivia, Paraguay</li> <li>• Population: one species, <i>Pereskia quisqueyana</i>, from Dominican Republic, Endangered (IUCN 1997) (not due to trade)</li> <li>• Threats: habitat destruction; forest clearance for agriculture</li> <li>• Trade: very low levels of trade in wild-collected specimens (53 live specimens 1992-1999); only one species, <i>Peresklopsis spathulata</i>, is artificially propagated (by cuttings) for use as stock for grafting of seedlings of rare cacti species</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Range States of USA and Chile oppose the proposal, whilst Mexico states it will support the proposal if the other Range States do (and, if the proposal is accepted, will list <i>Pereskia lychnidiflora</i> and its native <i>Peresklopsis</i> in Appendix III)</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • some wild populations declining • if trade is not controlled one or more of the taxa may meet at least one of the criteria for listing on Appendix I in the near future</p>
<p>Prop. 12.46 Tonopah Fishhook Cactus <i>Sclerocactus nyensis</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: USA</li> <li>• Population: recently described; known from only two locations; identified as “critically imperiled”, “rare”, and at “great risk of extirpation due to extreme rarity, imminent threats, and/or biological factors”; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to slow-growth, small populations, restricted distribution</li> <li>• Threats: illegal collection; agricultural and industrial development; off-road vehicles; highway maintenance; mining</li> <li>• Trade: seeds (exempted from the Appendix II listing) offered for sale on European web sites, indicating desirability to collectors; local authorities receive inquiries from Europeans about population locations; most species adversely affected by illegal collection; no legal international trade recorded 1994-2000</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sole Range State, USA, is the proponent</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • small wild population • restricted distribution • high vulnerability due to species’ biology • threatened by illegal collection and extrinsic factors</p>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 12.47 Blaine's Pincushion <i>Sclerocactus spinosior</i> ssp. <i>blainei</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: USA</li> <li>• Population: known from only ten locations; identified as "critically imperiled", "rare", and at "great risk of extirpation due to extreme rarity, imminent threats, and/or biological factors"; vulnerable to over-exploitation due to slow-growth, small populations, restricted distribution</li> <li>• Threats: illegal collection; agricultural and industrial development; off-road vehicles; highway maintenance</li> <li>• Trade: seeds (exempted from the Appendix II listing) increasingly offered for sale on European web sites, indicating desirability to collectors; local authorities receive inquiries from Europeans about population locations; most species adversely affected by illegal collection; no legal international trade recorded 1994-2000</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sole Range State, USA, is the proponent</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for Appendix I: internationally traded • small wild population • restricted distribution • high vulnerability due to species' biology • threatened by illegal collection and extrinsic factors</p>
<p>Prop. 12.48 Santa Barbara Island Dudleya <i>Dudleya traskiae</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: USA</li> <li>• Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000) and under domestic legislation; restricted distribution on one small island; feared extinct in 1970, a few plants were discovered in 1975</li> <li>• Threats: ranching; farming; introduced herbivores</li> <li>• Trade: limited to artificially propagated live specimens; no international trade recorded 1994-2000; no evidence of illegal trade in wild-collected specimens</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The sole Range State, USA, is the proponent</li> </ul> <p>T Meets criteria for transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II, in accordance with Annex 4 of RC 9.24: does not meet criteria for Appendix I • species not in demand for international trade • its transfer to Appendix II unlikely to stimulate trade in, or cause enforcement problems for, other species in Appendix I</p>
<p>Prop. 12.49 Thorncroft's Aloe <i>Aloe thorncroftii</i></p> <p><b>South Africa</b> Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II in accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 4, section B, paragraph 2 a)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: South Africa</li> <li>• Population: 7906 plants in eight sub-populations in wild (September 2000 survey); actual figure probably higher</li> <li>• Threats: habitat conversion; fire; competition from alien species</li> <li>• Trade: apparently no collecting from wild since 1978; limited horticultural interest but no recorded trade since 1981; much easier and cheaper to grow plants from seed, than to collect plants from wild populations</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal is part of review of <i>Aloe</i> spp. in Appendices</li> <li>• RC 9.24, Annex 4.B.1, states that "No species listed in Appendix I shall be removed from the Appendices unless it has been first transferred to Appendix II, with monitoring of any impact of trade on the species for at least two intervals between meetings of the Conference of the Parties"; if proponent seeks eventual delisting it should indicate what monitoring will be done</li> </ul>
<p>Prop. 12.50 Bigleaf Mahogany <i>Swietenia macrophylla</i></p> <p><b>Nicaragua</b> Inclusion in Appendix II of the neotropical populations, including logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(a), of the Convention and Resolution Conf. 9.24, Annex 2 a)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: Mexico, Costa Rica, Panama, Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, Nicaragua, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Venezuela, Ecuador, Peru</li> <li>• Population: Vulnerable (IUCN 2000); declining throughout range; greatly depleted throughout the northern Range States where distribution decreasing rapidly; some populations commercially extinct in Brazil and Colombia; only 3% of range in Protected Areas</li> <li>• Threats: intensive legal and illegal logging for international trade; deforestation for agriculture; loss of genetic diversity and vigor due to selective harvest practices; potential impacts of global climate change</li> <li>• Trade: exploitation levels not sustainable and exceed forests capacity to regenerate; listed on Appendix III by Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica ("all populations in the Americas"), Mexico and Peru; extensive illegal trade (most logs extracted from Central America are illegal); in Brazil widespread illegal exploitation on Indian and public lands led government to halt trade and cancel or suspend forest management plans; documented smuggling of look-alike species; illegal extraction takes place even in Protected Areas</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Illegal logging and unsustainable trade remain major threats to this species</li> <li>• CITES Mahogany Working Group noted continuing inconsistencies in trade volumes reported by importing and exporting countries and international bodies</li> <li>• Appendix II will complement activities of Range States to bring exploitation levels under stricter control and reduce illegal extraction and trade</li> </ul> <p>T Meets the criteria for Appendix II: internationally traded • wild populations declining, some drastically • international trade is having a detrimental impact on wild populations</p>
<p>Prop. 12.51</p> <p>Orchids Appendix-II ORCHIDACEAE spp.</p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Annotation of Orchidaceae in Appendix II The annotation to specifically read as follows: Artificially propagated specimens of hybrids within the genera <i>Cattleya</i>, <i>Cymbidium</i>, <i>Dendrobium</i> (<i>phalaenopsis</i> and <i>nobile</i> types</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal developed as a consequence of a review of the listing of the Orchidaceae, begun at the 10th Meeting of the Plants Committee (Shepherdstown, 2000)</li> <li>• Seeks to exempt many commercial shipments of orchid hybrids from CITES control; qualifications intended to reduce risk that wild-collected plants will be exported improperly</li> <li>• Artificially propagated hybrids of these genera constitute by far the largest component of international commercial orchid trade</li> <li>• Annotation intended to create an incentive for trade in artificially propagated specimens, by eliminating the need for CITES permits, as a preferred alternative to trade in wild-collected specimens, and to reduce the workload of permit-issuing authorities so that they may concentrate</li> </ul>	<p><b>OPPOSE UNLESS AMENDED</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal as written may violate Article VII, paragraph 5, which states that "Where a Management Authority of the State of export is satisfied that... any specimen of a plant species was artificially propagated...., a certificate by that Management Authority to that effect shall be accepted in lieu of any of the permits or certificates required under the provisions of Article III, IV or V"</li> <li>• To comply with Article VII and to avoid implementation and enforcement problems, proposal should be amended to require issuance of certificate of artificial propagation, on a fast track if necessary</li> <li>• The proposed exemption is not comparable to the exemption for flaked seedlings (RC 11.11), which is based on the concept of "readily recognizable" parts or derivatives (Article I, Par. B(iii)), not whole adult plants</li> </ul>

SPECIES /PROPONENT/PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>only), <i>Oncidium</i>, <i>Phalaenopsis</i> and <i>Vanda</i>, including their intergeneric hybrids, are not subject to the provisions of the Convention when:</p> <p>a) specimens are traded in shipments consisting of individual containers (i.e. cartons, boxes, or crates) containing 100 or more plants each; b) all plants within a container are of the same hybrid, with no mixing of different hybrids within a container; c) plants within a container can be readily recognized as artificially propagated specimens by exhibiting a high degree of uniformity in size and stage of growth, cleanliness, intact root systems, and general absence of damage or injury that could be attributable to plants originating in the wild; d) plants do not exhibit characteristics of wild origin, such as damage by insects or other animals, fungi or algae adhering to leaves, or mechanical damage to roots, leaves, or other parts resulting from collection; and e) shipments are accompanied by documentation, such as an invoice, which clearly states the number of plants and which of the six exempt genera are included in the shipment, and is signed by the shipper. Plants not clearly qualifying for the exemption must be accompanied by appropriate CITES documents</p>	<p>their efforts on specimens requiring closer scrutiny</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annotation will place a burden of responsibility on inspection officials to ensure that specimens qualify for the exemption; additional mechanisms may need to be considered for such an exemption to be workable</li> <li>• Attendees at 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Plants Committee agreed that implementation of this annotation should be monitored to determine whether it causes any difficulties, especially with enforcement of requirements of the Convention for non-exempt orchid species and hybrids. If it is determined that adoption of this annotation results in an increase in illegal trade, or creates other significant difficulties in regulating non-exempt specimens, it was agreed that the annotation should be repealed as soon as possible</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adoption could lead to an increase in illegal trade; additional mechanisms needed to make exemption workable; proposal should not be adopted or implemented until such mechanisms have been developed</li> <li>• Participants at 12<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Plants Committee offered suggestions for such mechanisms, including more thorough identification of merchandise, country-of-origin Management Authority certification of hybrids, and verification of uniformity of container contents</li> <li>• Proposal should either be withdrawn until an accompanying resolution setting out appropriate enforcement mechanisms is available, or amended so that the annotation does not enter into force until such a resolution is adopted and itself enters into force</li> </ul>
<p>Prop. 12.52</p> <p>Desert-living Cistanche <i>Cistanche deserticola</i></p> <p><b>China</b> Deletion of the annotation to <i>Cistanche deserticola</i> in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: China</li> <li>• Population: decreasing; decreasing area of distribution</li> <li>• Threats: over-collection for medicinal trade; destruction of host plant (<i>C. deserticola</i> is a parasitic herb)</li> <li>• Trade: estimated 120 tons traded internationally each year, originating from China, destined for Asian countries; illegal trade; artificial propagation possible, but not conducted on a commercial scale</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sole Range State, China, is the proponent</li> <li>• This species was listed on Appendix II at COP11, with an annotation “#3, Designated whole and sliced roots and parts of roots, excluding manufactured parts or derivatives such as powders, pills, extracts, tonics, teas and confectionery”; however, the species does not have roots and the main parts of the plant used are the stems</li> </ul>
<p>Prop. 12.53</p> <p>Maguire’s Bitter Root <i>Lewisia maguirei</i></p> <p><b>United States of America</b> Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: USA</li> <li>• Population: Endangered (IUCN 2000), considered “critically imperiled”; known from only eight locations all within 8 km of one another; total population estimated at 4,500 and stable</li> <li>• Threats: mining; development</li> <li>• Trade: not known to be in domestic or international trade; no evidence of illegal trade</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sole Range State, USA, is the proponent</li> </ul>
<p>Prop. 12.54</p> <p>Lignum-vitae <i>Guaiaicum</i> spp.</p> <p><b>Germany on behalf of the member States of the European Union</b> Inclusion in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(b), of the Convention, annotated as follows: Designate all parts and derivatives, including wood, bark and extract</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Distribution: USA, Mexico, possibly Guatemala, the Caribbean</li> <li>• Population: six species (two, <i>G. officinale</i> and <i>G. sanctum</i>, currently on Appendix II); populations of unlisted species are “likely to decrease”; one, <i>G. coulteri</i>, “in danger of extinction, vulnerable species, rare species, and species under special protection”</li> <li>• Threats: habitat destruction; deforestation; agriculture; introduced species</li> <li>• Trade: timber, resin and wood chips (used as a natural aromatic substance) are main export products; collection and export of one unlisted species, <i>G. coulteri</i>, expanding and its population decreasing; trade levels are not completely known; Germany imports about 50 tonnes of <i>G. coulteri</i> timber annually plus an additional 20-40 tonnes annually of <i>Guaiaicum</i> resin and wood chips; USA regularly imports batches of 1.5 tonnes of resin from Mexico; illegal trade exists but not quantified</li> </ul>	<p><b>SUPPORT</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Trade in listed species may hide trade in unlisted species (trade data are not identified to species level) thus undermining efforts to regulate and monitor trade</li> </ul> <p>T The currently unlisted <i>Guaiaicum</i> spp. meet the criteria for Appendix II: specimens resemble the aforementioned species and a non-expert is unlikely to be able to distinguish between them</p>

2100 L Street NW · Washington · DC 20037 USA · Tel: +1 301-548-7769 · Fax: +1 301-258-3080  
European Bureau · Graefelfinger Str. 65 · D - 81375 Munich · Germany · Tel: +49 89-81299-508 · Fax: +49 89-81299-706