

Amendments, adopted at Bangkok on 14 March 2013, to Appendices I and II of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (Bangkok, 14 March 2013)

Joint Standing Committee on Treaties Public Hearing – Monday, 24 June 2013

Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities portfolio

QUESTION 1

The Committee asked:

Senator SINGH: Is there some kind of list we can have of the 70 proposals? Just so that we have some understanding of what was included and what was not and how.

Answer:

The list of the 55 proposals which were adopted at the 16th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (CoP16) is at [Annex A](#); the list of the 15 proposals which were not adopted or withdrawn is at [Annex B](#). A summary of discussions for each proposal, published by the International Institute for Sustainable Development is at [Annex C](#).

QUESTION 2

Mr Richardson offered to take on notice: The list of recreational fishing bodies consulted.

Answer:

As detailed in the consultation timeline provided at [Annex D](#), letters were sent to recreational fishing bodies on 4 December 2013 inviting comment on the CITES CoP16 Appendix II marine species listing proposals by 14 January 2013. A list of the recreational fishing bodies consulted is provided in the stakeholder consultation list at [Annex E](#).

QUESTION 3

The Committee asked:

Senator SMITH: On notice, could you just provide me with some information about the consultation process and time frames that were utilised specifically around the commercial fishers?

And, at a national level, perhaps if you could provide some detailed information around Western Australia then that would be particularly valuable, particularly across the south coast of Western Australia

Answer:

As detailed in the consultation timeline provided at [Annex D](#), in determining Australian Government positions in relation to the marine species Appendix II listing proposals for CITES CoP16, the department consulted: all Commonwealth, state and territory fisheries and environment agencies; peak fishing and seafood industry bodies; recreational fishing associations; aquarium industry representatives; researchers and research institutions of relevance to fisheries; environment non-government organisations; and Indigenous groups and Land Councils.

These consultations included peak fishing industry bodies of relevance to Western Australia, such as the Commonwealth Fisheries Association, and the Western Australian Fishing Industry Council. A list of all fishing bodies consulted is provided in the stakeholder consultation list at [Annex E](#).

**AMENDMENTS TO APPENDICES I AND II OF THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL
TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA**

Made at Bangkok, Thailand on 14 March 2013

SPECIES			AMENDMENT
FAUNA			
<u>MAMMALIA</u>			
ARTIODACTYLA			
Bovidae	<i>Rupicapra pyrenaica ornate</i>	Abruzzo Chamois	Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II
Camelidae	<i>Vicugna vicugna</i>	Vicuña	Transfer of populations of Ecuador from Appendix I to Appendix II with the following annotation: "Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of the vicuña population of Ecuador, for the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in wool sheared from live vicuñas and in cloth and items made thereof, including luxury handicrafts and knitted articles. The reverse side of the cloth must bear the logotype adopted by the range States of the species, which are signatories to the Convenio para la Conservación y Manejo de la Vicuña, and the selvages the words 'VICUÑA ECUADOR'. Other products must bear a label including the logotype and the designation 'VICUÑA ECUADOR-ARTESANÍA'. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly."
CHIROPTERA			
Pteropodidae	<i>Pteropus brunneus</i>	Dusky flying-fox	Deletion from Appendix II
DASYUROMORPHIA			
Thylacinidae	<i>Thylacinus cynocephalus</i>	Tasmanian tiger	Deletion from Appendix I
DIPROTODONTIA			
Macropodidae	<i>Onychogalea lunata</i>	Crescent nailtail wallaby	Deletion from Appendix I
Potoroidae	<i>Caloprymnus campestris</i>	Buff-nosed rat-kangaroo	Deletion from Appendix I
PERAMELEMORPHIA			

SPECIES			AMENDMENT
Chaeropodidae	<i>Chaeropus ecaudatus</i>	Pig-footed bandicoot	Deletion from Appendix I
Thylacomyidae	<i>Macrotis leucura</i>	Lesser rabbit-eared bandicoot	Deletion from Appendix I
SIRENIA			
Trichechidae	<i>Trichechus senegalensis</i>	West African manatee	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I
<u>AVES</u>			
FALCONIFORMES			
Falconidae	<i>Caracara lutosa</i>	Guadalupe caracara	Deletion from Appendix II
GALLIFORMES			
Phasianidae	<i>Lophura imperialis</i>	Imperial pheasant	Deletion from Appendix I
	<i>Tympanuchus cupido attwateri</i>	Attwater's greater prairie chicken	Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II
PICIFORMES			
Picidae	<i>Campephilus imperialis</i>	Imperial woodpecker	Deletion from Appendix I
STRIGIFORMES			
Strigidae	<i>Sceloglaux albifacies</i>	White-faced owl	Deletion from Appendix II
<u>REPTILIA</u>			
SAURIA			
Gekkonidae	<i>Naultinus</i> spp.	New Zealand green geckos	Inclusion in Appendix II
SERPENTES			
Viperidae	<i>Protobothrops mangshanensis</i>	Mangshan pit-viper	Inclusion in Appendix II
TESTUDINES			
Chelidae	<i>Chelodina mccordi</i>	Roti Island snake-necked turtle	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I
Emydidae	<i>Clemmys guttata</i>	Spotted turtle	Inclusion in Appendix II
	<i>Emydoidea blandingii</i>	Blanding's turtle	Inclusion in Appendix II
	<i>Malaclemys terrapin</i>	Diamondback terrapin	Inclusion in Appendix II
Geoemydidae	<i>Batagur borneoensis</i> , <i>B. trivittata</i> , <i>Cuora</i>	Freshwater box	Inclusion of <i>Cyclemys</i> spp., <i>Geoemyda japonica</i> , <i>G. spengleri</i> , <i>Hardella thurjii</i> , <i>Mauremys japonica</i> ,

SPECIES			AMENDMENT
	<i>aurocapitata</i> , <i>C. flavomarginata</i> , <i>C. galbinifrons</i> , <i>C. mccordi</i> , <i>C. mouhotii</i> , <i>C. pani</i> , <i>C. trifasciata</i> , <i>C. yunnanensis</i> , <i>C. zhoui</i> , <i>Cyclemys</i> spp., <i>Geoemyda</i> <i>japonica</i> , <i>G. spengleri</i> , <i>Hardella thurjii</i> , <i>Heosemys</i> <i>annandalii</i> , <i>H. depressa</i> , <i>Mauremys annamensis</i> , <i>M. japonica</i> , <i>M. nigricans</i> , <i>Melanochelys trijuga</i> , <i>Morenia petersi</i> , <i>Orlitia</i> <i>borneensis</i> , <i>Sacalia bealei</i> , <i>S. quadriocellata</i> and <i>Vijayachelys silvatica</i>	turtles	<i>M. nigricans</i> , <i>Melanochelys trijuga</i> , <i>Morenia petersi</i> , <i>Sacalia bealei</i> , <i>S. quadriocellata</i> and <i>Vijayachelys silvatica</i> in Appendix II. Adoption of a zero quota on wild specimens for commercial purposes for <i>Batagur borneoensis</i> , <i>B. trivittata</i> , <i>Cuora aurocapitata</i> , <i>C. flavomarginata</i> , <i>C. galbinifrons</i> , <i>C. mccordi</i> , <i>C. mouhotii</i> , <i>C. pani</i> , <i>C. trifasciata</i> , <i>C. yunnanensis</i> , <i>C. zhoui</i> , <i>Heosemys annandalii</i> , <i>H. depressa</i> , <i>Mauremys annamensis</i> , and <i>Orlitia borneensis</i>
Platysternidae	Platysternidae	Big-headed turtles	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I
Testudinidae	<i>Geochelone platynota</i>	Burmese star tortoise	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I
Trionychidae	<i>Aspideretes leithii</i> , <i>Chitra chitra</i> , <i>C. vandijki</i> , <i>Dogania subplana</i> , <i>Nilssonina formosa</i> , <i>Palea steindachneri</i> , <i>Pelodiscus axenaria</i> , <i>P. maackii</i> , <i>P. parviformis</i> , and <i>Rafetus swinhoei</i> .	Softshell turtles	Inclusion of <i>Aspideretes leithii</i> , <i>Dogania subplana</i> , <i>Nilssonina formosa</i> , <i>Palea steindachneri</i> , <i>Pelodiscus axenaria</i> , <i>P. maackii</i> , <i>P. parviformis</i> , and <i>Rafetus swinhoei</i> in Appendix II and transfer of <i>Chitra chitra</i> and <i>C. vandijki</i> from Appendix II to Appendix I
<u>AMPHIBIA</u>			
ANURA			
Dendrobatidae	<i>Epipedobates machalilla</i>	Machalilla poison dart frog	Inclusion in Appendix II
Rheobatrachidae	<i>Rheobatrachus silus</i>	Southern gastric-brooding frog	Deletion from Appendix II
	<i>Rheobatrachus vitellinus</i>	Northern gastric-brooding frog	Deletion from Appendix II
<u>ELASMOBRANCHII</u>			
CARCHARHINIFORMES			
Carcharhinidae	<i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i>	Oceanic whitetip shark	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: "The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i> in CITES Appendix II will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative

SPECIES			AMENDMENT
			issues.”
Sphyrnidae	<i>Sphyrna lewini</i> , <i>S. mokarran</i> and <i>S. zygaena</i>	Scalloped hammerhead shark, great hammerhead shark and smooth hammerhead shark	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “The entry into effect of the inclusion of these species in CITES Appendix II will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues.”
LAMNIFORMES			
Lamnidae	<i>Lamna nasus</i>	Porbeagle shark	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Lamna nasus</i> in CITES Appendix II will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve related technical and administrative issues.”
PRISTIFORMES			
Pristidae	<i>Pristis microdon</i>	Freshwater sawfish	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I
RAJIFORMES			
Myliobatidae	<i>Manta</i> spp.	Manta rays	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>manta</i> spp. in CITES Appendix II will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve related technical and administrative issues.”
<u>INSECTA</u>			
LEPIDOPTERA			
Papilionidae	<i>Papilio hospiton</i>	Corsican swallowtail butterfly	Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II
FLORA			
AGAVACEAE	<i>Yucca queretaroensis</i>	Queretaro yucca	Inclusion in Appendix II
ANACARDIACEAE	<i>Operculicarya decaryi</i>	Jabihy	Inclusion in Appendix II
APOCYNACEAE	<i>Hoodia</i> spp.	Hoodia	Amendment of annotation #9 related to <i>Hoodia</i> spp. to read as follows, for the purpose of clarification: “All parts and derivatives except those bearing a label: Produced from <i>Hoodia</i> spp. material obtained through controlled harvesting and production under the terms of an agreement with the relevant CITES Management Authority of [Botswana under agreement No. BW/xxxxxx]

SPECIES			AMENDMENT
			[Namibia under agreement No. NA/xxxxxx] [South Africa under agreement No. ZA/xxxxxx]"
ARALIACEAE	<i>Panax ginseng</i> and <i>Panax quinquefolius</i>	Ginseng	Amendment of the annotation to the listings of <i>Panax ginseng</i> and <i>Panax quinquefolius</i> included in Appendix II. Amendment of annotation #3 with the addition of the underlined text: “ <u>Designates</u> whole and sliced roots and parts of roots, <u>excluding manufactured parts or derivatives such as powders, pills, extracts, tonics, teas and confectionery.</u> ”
BROMELIACEAE	<i>Tillandsia kautskyi</i>	Kautsky's tillandsia	Deletion from Appendix II
	<i>Tillandsia sprengeliana</i>	Sprengel's tillandsia	Deletion from Appendix II
	<i>Tillandsia sucrei</i>	Sugar tillandsia	Deletion from Appendix II
CRASSULACEAE	<i>Dudleya stolonifera</i> and <i>Dudleya traskiae</i>	Laguna beach live-forever and Santa Barbara Island live-forever	Deletion from Appendix II
EBENACEAE	<i>Diospyros</i> spp.	Malagasy ebony	Inclusion of the populations of Madagascar in Appendix II, and limited to logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets by an annotation.
LAURACEAE	<i>Aniba rosaeodora</i>	Brazilian rosewood	Amend the annotation #12 to "Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood and extracts. Finished products containing such extracts as ingredients, including fragrances, are not considered to be covered by this annotation".
LEGUMINOSAE (Fabaceae)	<i>Dalbergia cochinchinensis</i>	Thailand rosewood	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “#5 Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets.”
	<i>Dalbergia retusa</i> and <i>Dalbergia granadillo</i>	Black rosewood and granadillo rosewood	Inclusion in Appendix II
	<i>Dalbergia stevensonii</i>	Honduras rosewood	Inclusion in Appendix II
	<i>Dalbergia</i> spp.	Malagasy rosewood	Inclusion of the populations of Madagascar in Appendix II, and limited to logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets by an annotation
	<i>Senna meridionalis</i>	Taraby	Inclusion in Appendix II
PASSIFLORACEAE	<i>Adenia firingalavensis</i>	Bottle liana	Inclusion in Appendix II
	<i>Adenia subsessifolia</i>	Katakata	Inclusion in Appendix II
PEDALIACEAE	<i>Uncarina grandidieri</i>	Uncarina	Inclusion in Appendix II

SPECIES			AMENDMENT
	<i>Uncarina stellulifera</i>	Uncarina	Inclusion in Appendix II
SANTALACEAE	<i>Osyris lanceolata</i>	East African sandalwood	Inclusion in Appendix II
THYMELAEACEAE (Aquilariaceae)	<i>Aquilaria</i> spp. and <i>Gyrinops</i> spp.	Agarwood	<p>Deletion of the annotation to the listing of <i>Aquilaria</i> spp. and <i>Gyrinops</i> spp. in Appendix II, and replacement with a new annotation with a new number, as follows:</p> <p>“All parts and derivatives, except:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) seeds and pollen; b) seedling or tissue cultures obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; c) fruits; d) leaves; e) exhausted argawood powder, including compressed powder in all shapes; f) finished products packaged and ready for retail trade, this exemption does not apply to beads, prayer beads and carvings.”
VITACEAE	<i>Cyphostemma laza</i>	Laza	Inclusion in Appendix II

SPECIES PROPOSALS WHICH WERE NOT ADOPTED AT THE 16TH MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

<i>Species</i>	Common name	Proponent	Proposal	Reasons why this proposal did not get adopted.
<i>Ursus maritimus</i>	Polar bear	United States of America	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	<p>The proposal was rejected, as it did not receive a two-thirds majority vote in favour of the proposal.</p> <p>There appears to have been divergent views on whether the polar bear met the scientific and trade criteria for transfer to Appendix I.</p>
<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i>	White rhinoceros	Kenya	<p>Amendment of the annotation for <i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i> as follows: (added text <u>underlined</u>): “<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i> (Only the populations of South Africa and Swaziland; all other populations are included in Appendix I. For the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations and hunting trophies. <u>Hunting trophies from South Africa and Swaziland shall be subject to a zero export quota until at least CoP18.</u> 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>	Kenya withdrew the proposal at CoP16.
<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	African elephant	United Republic of Tanzania	<p>Transfer the population of the African elephant, <i>Loxodonta africana</i> of the United Republic of Tanzania (URT) from Appendix I to Appendix II in accordance with the precautionary measures specified in Annex 4 A 2b i), ii) and c) of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP15) with an annotation to read: for the exclusive purpose of the following:</p> <p>a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in registered raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces) subject to the following:</p> <p>i. a one-off sale of 101,005.25 kilograms from registered government-owned stocks, originating in Tanzania (excluding seized ivory and ivory of unknown origin); ii. only to trading partners that have been already designated by the Standing Committee, as having sufficient national legislation</p>	Tanzania withdrew the proposal prior to the meeting.

Species	Common name	Proponent	Proposal	Reasons why this proposal did not get adopted.
			<p>and domestic trade controls to ensure that the imported ivory will not be re-exported and will be managed in accordance with all requirements of Resolution Conf. 10.10 (Rev. CoP15) concerning domestic manufacturing and trade. These are Japan designated as a trading partner at the 54th meeting (Geneva, October 2006), and China designated as a trading partner at the 57th meeting (SC57, Geneva, July 2008);</p> <p>iii. not before the Secretariat has verified the registered government-owned stocks;</p> <p>iv. the proceeds of the trade are used exclusively for elephant conservation, community conservation and development programmes within or adjacent to the elephant range in Tanzania;</p> <p>v. Tanzania will not present further proposals to allow trade in elephant ivory from its population in Appendix II to the Conference of the Parties for the period from CoP16 and ending four years from the date of the single sale of ivory that is to take place in accordance with provisions in paragraphs b) i), b) ii), b) iii), b) iv). In addition such further proposal shall be dealt with in accordance with Decisions 14.77 and 14.78.</p> <p>c) trade in raw hides including foot, ears and tails;</p> <p>d) trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, as defined in Resolution Conf. 11.20;</p> <p>The Standing Committee can decide to cause the trade in a), b), c) and d) above to cease partially or completely in the event of non-compliance by exporting or importing countries, or in the case of proven detrimental impacts of the trade on other elephant populations as may be proposed by the CITES Secretariat. 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>	
<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	African elephant	Burkina Faso and Kenya	<p>Amend the annotation for <i>Loxodonta africana</i> as follows (additional text <u>underlined</u>, deleted text struckthrough):</p> <p>h) no further proposals to allow trade in elephant ivory from <u>any</u> populations already in Appendix II shall be submitted to the Conference of the Parties for the period from CoP14 and ending nine years from the date of the single sale of ivory that is to take place in accordance with provisions in paragraphs g) i), g) ii), g) iii), g) vi) and g) vii). In addition, such further proposals shall be dealt with in accordance with Decisions 14.77 and 14.78 (Rev. CoP15).</p>	Burkina Faso on behalf of Kenya withdrew the proposal at CoP16.

Species	Common name	Proponent	Proposal	Reasons why this proposal did not get adopted.
<i>Gallus sonneratii</i>	Sonnerat's junglefowl	Switzerland, as the Depositary Government, at the request of the Animals Committee	Deletion from Appendix II	The proposal was not adopted. There were concerns about declining populations and the potential for a de-listing to threaten the species by promoting trade in feathers.
<i>Ithaginis cruentus</i>	Blood pheasant	Switzerland, as the Depositary Government, at the request of the Animals Committee	Deletion from Appendix II	The proposal was not adopted. Range States indicated that deletion might trigger international trade that would threaten the species.
<i>Tetraogallus caspius</i>	Caspian snowcock	Switzerland, as the Depositary Government, at the request of the Animals Committee	Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II	The proposal was not adopted. Range States indicated that their populations were still vulnerable.
<i>Tetraogallus tibetanus</i>	Tibetan snowcock	Switzerland, as the Depositary Government, at the request of the Animals Committee	Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II	The proposal was not adopted. Range States cited a lack of data for the down-listing and held concerns that the downlisting would spur trade
<i>Crocodylus acutus</i>	American crocodile	Colombia	Transfer of the population of the Bay of Cispata, municipality of San Antero, Department of Córdoba, Republic of Colombia, from Appendix I to Appendix II	The proposal was rejected, as it did not receive a two-thirds majority vote in favour of the proposal.
<i>Crocodylus porosus</i>	Saltwater crocodile	Thailand	Transfer of the population of Thailand from Appendix I to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild specimens	The proposal was rejected, as it did not receive a two-thirds majority vote in favour of the proposal.
<i>Crocodylus siamensis</i>	Siamese crocodile	Thailand	Transfer of the population of Thailand from Appendix I to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild specimens	The proposal was rejected, as it did not receive a two-thirds majority vote in favour of the proposal.
<i>Paratrygon aiereba</i>	Ceja river stingray	Colombia	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Paratrygon aiereba</i> in CITES Appendix II will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues.	The proposal was rejected, as it did not receive a two-thirds majority vote in favour of the proposal.

Species	Common name	Proponent	Proposal	Reasons why this proposal did not get adopted.
<i>Potamotrygon motoro</i> and <i>P. schroederi</i>	Ocellate river stingray and rosette river stingray	Colombia and Ecuador	Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Potamotrygon motoro</i> and <i>Potamotrygon schroederi</i> in CITES Appendix II will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues.	The proposal was rejected, as it did not receive a two-thirds majority vote in favour of the proposal.
<i>Cuora galbinifrons</i>	Indochinese box turtle	Viet Nam	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	Not considered at the CoP, as another proposal included this species in Appendix II with a zero quota (considered to be less restrictive on trade).
<i>Geoemyda japonica</i>	Ryukyu black-breasted leaf turtle	Japan	Inclusion in Appendix II with a zero annual export quota with primarily commercial purposes for wild-caught specimens	Not considered at the CoP, as another proposal included this species with the same annotation.
<i>Mauremys annamensis</i>	Annam leaf turtle	Viet Nam	Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I	Not considered at the CoP, as another proposal included this species in Appendix II with a zero quota (considered to be less restrictive on trade).



draft decisions. Canada, supported by Australia, noted the SC Working Group on Annotations should complete its activities before developing new procedures. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, supported simplifying procedures. The Committee established a working group on these two agenda items.

On Tuesday, 12 March, the US introduced the document CoP16 Com.II.27 reflecting recommendations prepared by the working group on the basis of CoP16 Doc.75 (Rev.1) and CoP16 Doc.76 (Rev.1). The Committee accepted the recommendations. The US and the PC Chair then reviewed the definitions proposed in CoP16 Doc.75 (Rev.1) and CoP16 Doc.76 (Rev.1). The Committee accepted the definitions. The PC Chair invited the Committee to note the recommendations, relating to annotations for orchids listed on Appendix II. The Committee noted the paragraph and accepted the proposed recommendations, including the draft decision as amended in the annex.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted a draft decision (CoP16 Com.II.27) acknowledging that, at CoP16, parties agreed to include definitions of terms in annotations in the *Interpretation* section of the appendices as an interim measure until a final decision is reached by the SC on where they should be included permanently.

PROPOSALS TO AMEND APPENDICES I AND II:

On Wednesday, 6 March, in Committee I, the Secretariat introduced the draft decisions contained in CoP16 Doc.77, relating to extinct or possibly extinct species. He highlighted three problems identified by the Secretariat in handling proposals for species that were extinct or possibly extinct, including that the resolution states that possibly extinct species should not be deleted from Appendix I if they may be affected by trade in the event of rediscovery, and that a transfer onto Appendix II to monitor the effects of downlisting has little interest or value for extinct species. In comments, parties noted, *inter alia*, the need for clarification related to higher taxa and the possibility for the rediscovery of supposedly-extinct species. The Committee accepted the decisions, which were adopted in plenary on Wednesday, 13 March.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the draft decisions recommending, *inter alia*, the AC and PC to more closely examine the issue of extinct and possibly extinct species.

Rupicapra pyrenaica ornate: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, introduced the proposal to transfer *R. pyrenaica ornate* (Abruzzo chamois) from Appendix I to Appendix II, as endorsed by the AC (CoP16 Prop.1). He noted that the range state, Italy, had undertaken a Periodic Review for the species. Committee I accepted the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.1).

Vicugna vicugna: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Ecuador introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.2) to transfer *V. vicugna* (vicuña) from Appendix I to Appendix II, with an annotation specifying, among other things, enabling requirements. Committee I agreed to the proposal, with an amendment proposed by Mexico to align the annotation with the annotations of other vicuña listings.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the amended proposal (CoP16 Prop.2).

Ursus maritimus: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.3) to transfer *U. maritimus* (polar bear) from Appendix II to Appendix I, noting, *inter alia*, that while climate change is the main threat to the species, an Appendix I listing could contribute to protecting the species.

In extensive discussions, parties expressed divergent views, differing on whether the polar bear met the scientific and trade criteria for uplisting. Among supporters, the Russian Federation highlighted its concerns that legal international trade facilitates illegal trade and poaching of Russian sub-populations. Among opponents, Greenland, on behalf of Denmark, opposed the proposal on the grounds that the species does not meet the biological criteria. Interventions addressed, *inter alia*: polar bear population estimates from the IUCN Polar Bear Specialist Group, quotas, prices for polar bear hides, and the potential impact of the decision on the livelihoods of Inuit populations.

Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, citing efforts to find a constructive way forward, introduced an amendment to the US proposal (CoP16 Inf.44). He outlined the proposal to maintain the Appendix II listing and add an annotation with a “package of measures” and several draft decisions, including for range states to set export quotas at subpopulation levels and the AC to include the polar bear in the review of significant trade (RST) as an urgent case to review before CoP17.

Parties disagreed on whether the EU compromise narrowed the scope of the US proposal, with Israel challenging the Chair’s ruling on the validity of the proposal. In a vote, the motion to disallow the alternate proposal was not carried by the requisite simple majority, with 26 in favor, 73 against and 15 abstentions.

Several spoke in support of the EU proposal, including Norway, as a range state. Brazil welcomed the EU proposal but requested the deletion of the decision directed to the parties, noting that it more appropriately falls under the mandate of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Committee I first voted on the amended EU proposal, with 63 in favor, 43 against and 17 abstaining. The Committee then voted on the US proposal, with 38 in favor, 42 against and 46 abstaining. Neither vote obtained the two-thirds majority needed to pass.

Final Outcome: The CoP rejected the proposal (CoP16 Prop.3).

Pteropus brunneus: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Australia introduced its proposal (CoP14 Prop.4) to delete *P. brunneus* (dusky flying fox) from Appendix II, stating the motivation was to simplify the appendices by removing an extinct species. New Zealand and Qatar voiced support, and the Committee agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP14 Prop.4).

Thylacinus cynocephalus, Onychogalea lunata, Caloprymnus campestris, Chaeropus ecaudatus and Macrotis leucura: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Australia presented the proposals (CoP16 Prop.5-9) to remove from Appendix I: *T. cynocephalus* (Tasmanian tiger) (Prop.5), *O.*

lunata (crescent naitail wallaby) (Prop.6), *C. campestris* (buff-nosed rat-kangaroo) (Prop.7), *C. ecaudatus* (pig-footed bandicoot) (Prop.8) and *M. leucura* (lesser rabbit-eared bandicoot) (Prop.9). Australia explained the five species are extinct, and so would not require the precautionary measure of transfer to Appendix II. New Zealand, Qatar, Paraguay and China supported the proposals, and the Committee agreed.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposals (CoP16 Prop.5-9).

***Ceratotherium simum simum*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Kenya outlined the objectives of its proposal for amending an annotation on the South Africa and Swaziland populations of *C. simum simum* (Southern white rhino) listed in Appendix II to specify a temporary zero quota on hunting trophies (CoP16 Prop.10). He explained the aim was to reduce the quantity of legal rhino horn entering illegal markets and to reduce, as a result, poaching in Kenya and other rhino range states. Noting opposition from some parties to the proposed annotation, he outlined a number of consultations held on the proposal and its goals, and announced the withdrawal of the proposal. He asked parties to instead consider and support the decisions contained in CoP16 Doc.54.1 and Doc.54.2, to be discussed in Committee II. The proposal was withdrawn.

Final Outcome: The CoP noted that the proposal was withdrawn (CoP16 Prop.10).

***Loxodonta africana*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Burkina Faso, also on behalf of Kenya, withdrew their proposal on *L. africana* (African elephant) (CoP16 Prop.11 and 12). Highlighting incidents of slaughter and illegal trade, he urged measures to combat poaching. He further urged parties to recognize the legal sale of ivory as increasing poaching pressure. He recommended support for and action on the AEAP, the AEF, MIKE and ETIS. Kenya called on parties to: address illegal killing of and trade in elephants; address consumer demand; and respect the moratorium on ivory.

Final Outcome: The CoP noted that the proposals were withdrawn (CoP16 Props.11 and 12).

***Trichechus senegalensis*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Senegal, with Benin and Sierra Leone, presented the proposal to transfer *T. senegalensis* (West African manatee) from Appendix II to Appendix I (CoP16 Prop.13). Senegal noted actions being taken by range states and their general support for the listing proposal. Acknowledging the limited data available on the species and its status, Benin underscored the threat to the species from illegal international trade and the need to adopt a precautionary approach to its conservation. Numerous delegates expressed support for the proposal, including Colombia, the US and Egypt. The CMS Secretariat highlighted efforts under CMS, including a MoU on the conservation of the manatee and small cetaceans of Western Africa and Macaronesia. Committee I accepted the proposal by consensus.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.13).

***Caracara lutosa*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Mexico introduced its proposal to delete *C. lutosa* (Guadalupe caracara) (CoP16 Prop.14) from Appendix II, noting that the species is extinct. Paraguay, Peru, Venezuela, Brazil, Australia,

Chile and New Zealand supported the proposal, with New Zealand adding that an annotation was not needed. Committee I agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.14).

***Gallus sonneratii*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, New Zealand, on behalf of the AC, presented the proposal on the removal of *G. sonneratii* (grey junglefowl) from Appendix II (CoP16 Prop.15). India, supported by Pakistan and Qatar, opposed the proposal, highlighting concerns about declining populations and the potential for a de-listing to threaten the species by promoting trade in feathers. The US noted India's opposition and supported their position. The US, supported by AC Chair Solana, urged states to participate in Periodic Reviews. Committee I did not accept the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.15).

***Ithaginis cruentus*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, New Zealand, on behalf of the AC, introduced the proposal to remove *I. cruentus* (blood pheasant) from Appendix II (CoP16 Prop.16), noting the outcome of the Periodic Review indicated it no longer met listing criteria. Range states China, India, Nepal and Bhutan, supported by Pakistan, opposed the proposal, indicating deletion might trigger international trade that would threaten the species. The US supported range state views, but noted "frustration" that range states had not responded during the Periodic Review. The Committee did not accept the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.16).

***Lophura imperialis*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, France introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.17) to delete *L. imperialis* (Imperial pheasant) from Appendix I. He reported that *L. imperialis* is a hybrid between *L. edwardsi* (Edward's pheasant), which is also listed, and *L. nycthemera*. Viet Nam, the range state, supported the proposal. Parties agreed to support the proposal with an editorial modification from the Secretariat.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.17).

***Tetraogallus caspius*:** On Thursday, 7 March, New Zealand, on behalf of the AC, introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.18) to transfer *T. caspius* (Caspian snowcock) from Appendix I to Appendix II. He said the population does not meet the criteria for an Appendix I listing. Noting that Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Turkmenistan represent the seven range states, he said that only Georgia responded to requests for information, informing the AC that its population is vulnerable. Noting that its population is dependent on other range states, Georgia supported downlisting if the other six range states agreed. Armenia informed parties its population is vulnerable and opposed the proposal. Georgia then opposed the proposal. Committee I rejected the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.18).

***Tetraogallus tibetanus*:** On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, New Zealand, on behalf of the AC, introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.19) to transfer *T. tibetanus* (Tibetan snowcock) from Appendix I to Appendix II noting the Periodic Review found the species no longer meets the biological criteria for

Appendix I. Range states China, India, Nepal and Bhutan, supported by Qatar, opposed the proposal, citing lack of data and concerns that a downlisting would spur trade. AC Chair Solana recognized the right of range states to participate in appendix listings and transfers, but cited concern with justifications raised in the discussion based on anecdotal observations and data gaps. Committee I did not accept the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.19).

Tympanuchus cupido attwateri: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Switzerland, on behalf of the US, presented the proposal (CoP16 Prop.20) to transfer *T. cupido attwateri* (Attwater's greater prairie chicken) from Appendix I to Appendix II. The US supported the proposal, saying the species is intensively managed and protected in the US, and no threat is posed by the appendix transfer. Committee I agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.20).

Campephilus imperialis: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, Mexico introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.21) to delete *C. imperialis* (Imperial woodpecker) from Appendix I, noting it is extinct. Australia, Paraguay and Venezuela supported the proposal. The Committee agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.21).

Sceloglaux albifacies: On Thursday, 7 March, in Committee I, New Zealand introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.22) to remove *S. albifacies* (laughing owl) from Appendix II, noting that it is extinct. Australia and Venezuela supported the proposal. The Committee agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.22).

Crocodylus acutus: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, Colombia introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.23) to transfer a population of *C. acutus* (American crocodile) from Appendix I to II adding an annotation preventing exchange between the population and Appendix-I listed populations as well as a provisional zero export quota (CoP16 Prop.23 Addendum (Rev.1)). Thailand, Peru, Egypt, Honduras, Cuba, Venezuela, Costa Rica, Brazil, Liberia, Panama, Uruguay, Mexico, Indonesia, Ecuador, Paraguay, Senegal, Qatar and Argentina supported the proposal.

Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, the US, Israel and Switzerland noted Colombia's efforts and encouraged their ongoing work, but stated the population did not meet biological criteria for downlisting and did not support the proposal. The US raised concern that such a transfer would set a precedent for future proposals. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, suggested alternative approaches, including submitting a proposal under the ranching resolution or drafting decisions related to ranching for consideration at CoP17. In a vote, the proposal did not achieve a two-thirds majority, with 57 in favor, 50 opposed and 16 abstentions.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.23).

Crocodylus porosus: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, Thailand introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.24) to transfer *C. porosus* (saltwater crocodile) from Appendix I to Appendix II with a zero quota for wild specimens. He said the proposal applies only to the Thai population. The Gambia, the Philippines, Viet Nam, Madagascar, Pakistan, Myanmar, Colombia, China, Brazil and Cambodia supported the proposal.

Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, opposed, saying reestablishment of wild populations should be the basis for downlisting. India also opposed, expressing concern that downlisting would stimulate trade in wild specimens from range states. Australia, supported by the US, said *C. porosus* continued to meet biological criteria for Appendix I and opposed the proposal.

Noting a lack of consensus, Committee I Chair Caceres proposed a vote. Thailand requested voting by secret ballot, which more than ten parties supported. The proposal was rejected, with 61 in favor, 54 against and 6 abstaining. The US requested its vote against the proposal be recorded in the meeting record, noting it will publicly announce its position on all secret ballots.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.23).

Crocodylus siamensis: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, Thailand introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.25) to transfer their population of *C. siamensis* (Siamese crocodile) from Appendix I to Appendix II, with a zero quota for wild specimens. Thailand explained the zero quota placed on wild specimens would ensure only captive-bred populations, which contribute to local livelihoods, would be traded. The Gambia, Ecuador, Pakistan, Uganda, Madagascar, Colombia, Brazil, Lao PDR, the Philippines, Cambodia, Indonesia and China, among others, commended Thailand's captive breeding programme and supported the proposal. The US, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, and Switzerland did not support the proposal, stating that Thailand's wild population is small, fragmented and does not meet the biological criteria for downlisting, emphasizing that the IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group also opposed the proposal as the species remains "Critically Endangered." The proposal was put to a vote. It failed to meet the two-thirds majority needed to pass, with 69 voting in favor, 49 against and 11 abstaining.

On Wednesday, 13 March, Thailand, supported by Ecuador and Cambodia, requested reopening the proposal in plenary. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, supported by Switzerland, questioned the need to re-open discussion. The motion to re-open the discussion carried, with 48 in favor, 74 against and 16 abstentions. After a discussion, the CoP voted on the proposal, which was rejected, with 57 in favor, 70 against and 11 abstentions.

Final Outcome: The CoP did not adopt the proposal (CoP16 Prop.25).

Naultinus spp: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, New Zealand introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.26) to transfer all nine species of geckos in the genus *Naultinus* from Appendix III to Appendix II, noting *N. gemmaeus* meets the biological criteria for uplisting and the other species meet the "look-alike"

provisions. Many supported the proposal, including Japan, Ecuador, Samoa, Liberia and Pro-Wildlife. Committee I agreed to the proposal, which was adopted on Wednesday, 13 March.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.26).

Protobothrops mangshanensis: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, China introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.27) to include all populations of *P. mangshanensis* (Mangshan pit viper) on Appendix II, highlighting small population sizes, restricted distribution and threats from the international pet trade. The US, Pakistan and Madagascar agreed with the proposed listing. Committee I accepted the proposal, which the CoP adopted on Wednesday, 13 March.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.27).

Chelodina mccordi: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.28) to transfer *C. mccordi* (Roti Island snake-necked turtle) from Appendix II to Appendix I, highlighting that the species is listed as one of IUCN's top 25 endangered tortoises and freshwater turtles.

Indonesia, as a range state, opposed the proposal, stating that international trade is mainly in captive-bred specimens. Supported by China, Qatar and Guyana, he proposed adding an annotation to the current Appendix II listing for a zero export quota from the wild. The US did not wish to block consensus, but asked for a decision to be added requesting the AC to undertake a Periodic Review of the species.

Committee I agreed to the amended proposal with the added annotation and to a decision for its consideration in a Periodic Review.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the amended proposal and decision (CoP16 Prop.28).

Clemmys guttata: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.29) to list *C. guttata* (spotted turtle) on Appendix II, noting, among other things, its capture from the wild for trade, primarily bound for Asia. Among others, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, voiced support. Committee I agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.29).

Emydoidea blandingii: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal to list *E. blandingii* (Blanding's turtle) on Appendix II (CoP16 Prop.30), noting, among other things, its upgrade to endangered on the IUCN red list. Among others, Canada and Senegal spoke in support. Committee I agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.30).

Malaclemys terrapin: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal to include *M. terrapin* (diamondback terrapin) in Appendix II (CoP16 Prop.31) emphasizing an Appendix II listing could enhance domestic law enforcement. Several parties supported the listing, including the UK, as a range state. Committee I accepted the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.31).

Freshwater box turtles: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, before discussion on freshwater box turtles (CoP16 Prop.32), Committee I Chair Caceres, cited Rule 23.6 and said the proposal, as least restrictive to trade, would be considered prior to proposals on *Cuora galbinifrons*, *Geoemyda japonica* and *Mauremys annamensis* (CoP16 Prop.33-35). The listing proposals for *C. galbinifrons* (Prop.33) and *M. annamensis* (Prop.35) were to transfer the two species from Appendix II to Appendix I, and for *G. japonica* (Prop.34) for an Appendix II listing with a zero annual export quota, with primarily commercial purposes for wild-caught specimens. The proposal for freshwater box turtles (Prop.32) included an Appendix II listing with a zero quota on wild species for commercial purposes for *C. galbinifrons*, and an Appendix II listing for *G. japonica* and *M. annamensis*, provisions that were less restrictive to trade.

China introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.32), submitted with the US, to include 15 species of freshwater box turtles from the Family Geoemydidae in Appendix II (*Cyclemys atripons*, *C. dentate*, *C. shanensis*, *C. oldhamii*, *C. pulchrirostrata*, *Geoemyda japonica*, *G. spengleri*, *Hardella thurjii*, *Mauremys japonica*, *M. nigricans*, *Melanochelys trijuga*, *Morenia petersi*, *Sacalia bealei*, *S. quadriocellata* and *Vijayachelys silvatica*) and to annotate the Appendix II listings of another 15 species with a zero quota on wild specimens for commercial purposes (*Batagur borneoensis*, *B. trivittata*, *Cuora auropatitata*, *C. flavomarginata*, *C. galbinifrons*, *C. mccordi*, *C. mouhotii*, *C. pani*, *C. trifasciata*, *C. yunnanensis*, *C. zhoui*, *Heosemys annandalii*, *H. depressa*, *Mauremys annamensis* and *Orlitia borneensis*).

Following China's introduction, Chair Caceres clarified the adoption of the proposal would preclude consideration of Prop.33-35, again citing Rule 23.6, which stipulates that, when the adoption of one proposal necessarily implies the rejection of another proposal, the latter proposal shall not be submitted for decision. Japan agreed that the proposal on *Geoemyda japonica* (Prop.34) would not be considered, and stated instead her intent to register a national zero export quota. Viet Nam submitted a motion to allow discussion of *Cuora galbinifrons* and *Mauremys annamensis* (Prop.33 and 35), agreeing this motion could be considered after the decision on Prop.32.

Following further discussion, Committee I agreed to Prop.32.

After the decision on Prop.32, Viet Nam, under Rule 18.1, appealed the Chair's ruling. In a simple majority vote, the Chair's ruling to disallow Prop.33 and Prop.35 was sustained, with 27 voting yes, 59 no and 17 abstaining.

Recognizing the outcome of the vote, Viet Nam said the species in these two proposals, *C. galbinifrons* and *M. annamensis*, qualify for inclusion in Appendix I and asked that these species be included in the Periodic Review as a matter of priority. Committee I noted Viet Nam's request.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.32).

Platysternidae: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, Viet Nam introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.36), with the US as co-proponent, to transfer the Family Platysternidae (big-headed turtles) from Appendix II to Appendix I. Among others, Senegal supported the proposal. Committee I agreed to accept the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.36).

Geochelone platynota: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.37) to transfer *Geochelone platynota* (Burmese star tortoise) from Appendix II to I, noting, *inter alia*, the species is included on the IUCN's list of the world's 25 most endangered tortoises and freshwater turtles. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, voiced support. Committee I agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.37).

Softshell turtles: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.38), co-sponsored by China, to include in Appendix II eight species of softshell turtles from the family Trionychidae (*Aspideretes leithii*, *Dogania subplana*, *Nilssonina formosa*, *Palea steindachneri*, *Pelodiscus axenaria*, *P. maackii*, *P. parviformis* and *Rafetus swinhoe*), and to transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I two *Chitra* species (*Chitra chitra* and *C. vandijkii*). Among others, Paraguay, Thailand and Humane Society International supported the proposal. India also expressed support, noting his preference for an Appendix I listing. Committee I accepted the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.38).

Epipedobates machalilla: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, Ecuador introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.39) to include *E. machalilla* (Machalilla poison dart frog) on Appendix II. In discussions on taxonomy, Ecuador said the species, which had been recently transferred from the genus *Colostethus*, was the only *Epipedobates* species not included in the standard reference for amphibians adopted at CoP15 (Resolution Conf.12.11 (Rev. CoP15)). Nomenclature Specialist Ute Grimm said the AC Nomenclature Specialist Working Group felt unable to give a recommendation on whether *E. machalilla* was covered in the original 1987 *Epipedobates* listing and recommended that Ecuador, as the range state, undertake an investigation and submit a proposal. Following several interventions of support, Committee I agreed to the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.39).

Rheobatrachus silus* and *R. vitellinus: On Friday, 8 March, in Committee I, Australia presented two proposals (CoP16 Prop.40 and 41) to delete *R. silus* (southern gastric-brooding frog) and *R. vitellinus* (northern gastric-brooding frog), respectively, from Appendix II. Following explanation from Australia that the species are extinct, the Committee agreed to support the proposals.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposals (CoP16 Prop.40 and Prop.41).

Carcharhinus longimanus: On Monday, 11 March, in Committee I, Colombia introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.42), with co-proponents Brazil and the US, to include *C. longimanus* (oceanic whitetip shark) on Appendix II, with an annotation to delay the entry into effect by 18 months to resolve technical and administrative issues.

Extensive discussions followed. Among the supporters were Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, Liberia, the Bahamas, Norway and Republic of the Congo.

Reasons cited for support included that: the proposal is justified by scientific criteria; action by CITES would complement measures by RFMOs; and NDFs can be made to allow continued trade in sharks while ensuring their sustainable management.

Others opposed the listing, including Japan, China, Singapore, and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines. Opponents pointed to, *inter alia*: management measures for sharks developed by RFMOs; implementation challenges, including with identification of mixed shipments of fins; and negative impacts on livelihoods of coastal communities.

The Committee put the proposal to vote by secret ballot, as requested by Japan and supported by at least 10 parties. The proposal passed, with 92 for, 42 against and 8 abstentions. Several parties publicly announced their votes.

On Thursday, 14 March, in plenary, Japan, seconded by the Gambia and India, proposed re-opening discussion. Japan asked that, if the decision on whether to re-open the debate was taken to vote, it be by secret ballot.

Colombia, supported by Senegal, opposed re-opening discussion, with Colombia explaining the proposal had been "duly and extensively" addressed in Committee I and the decision taken reflected the will of the majority. Mexico and Colombia said there must be clear arguments to justify the re-opening of debate, and noted these had not been given.

The Secretariat clarified the CoP would take a decision on Japan's motion of whether to open plenary debate on the matter, and listed more than ten parties who supported the motion for a secret ballot.

Switzerland raised a procedural point, saying he understood a two-thirds majority would be required to re-open debate. Japan said the Rules of Procedure indicate motions to re-open debate may not include discussion of the substance of the discussion itself, and added the decision should be taken by a one-third majority, pointing to Rule 19 paragraph 1. The Chair ruled the decision would require a one-third majority and proceed by secret ballot.

As the motion to re-open debate was rejected by vote, with 44 voting yes, 93 no and 4 abstaining, the CoP adopted the proposal. Following this, a number of parties announced their votes, with several citing transparency as their motivation for disclosing their positions.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.42).

Sphyrna lewini*, *S. mokarran* and *S. zygaena: On Monday, 11 March, in Committee I, Brazil introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.43) to include *S. lewini* (scalloped hammerhead shark) on Appendix II with an annotation to delay the entry into effect by 18 months, with *S. mokarran* (great hammerhead shark) and *S. zygaena* (smooth hammerhead shark) included as look-alike species.

Mexico, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, Honduras, Colombia, Costa Rica and Ecuador supported the proposal as co-proponents, with many stressing unregulated international trade in fins as a key threat. A number of parties spoke in support.

Several parties voiced opposition, including the Southern African Development Community (SADC), China, India and Japan, noting, among other things, concerns: that the listing

of these three species would lead to the inclusion of other hammerhead shark species on Appendix II as lookalike species; on the socio-economic implications of the listing; and with implementation challenges.

The Committee voted on the proposal by secret ballot, as requested by China. The proposal passed, with 91 in favor, 38 against and 8 abstaining. More than ten parties announced their vote for the official record.

On Thursday, 14 March, in plenary, Grenada, seconded by China, proposed a motion to re-open discussion on the proposal. Grenada said prior to the Committee decision, many parties had been provided with contradictory information, and that re-opening the discussion would allow parties to make decisions according to their national interests based on more accurate and informed information. China added his country had additional points on implementation concerns. Grenada asked if the motion to re-open were taken to vote, it had to be by secret ballot.

Mexico, supported by Honduras, opposed re-opening discussion. Mexico stated China's explanation contravened Rule 19 paragraph 3 by referring to substantive matters, and, counter to Grenada's comment and with support from Honduras, added that no new information had become available on the proposal and there was no procedural backing to re-open debate.

The Chair announced ten parties supported the motion for a secret ballot. In the vote by secret ballot, the motion to re-open debate was rejected, with 40 voting yes, 96 no and 6 abstaining, and the proposal was adopted. Following the decision, a number of parties announced their votes, with several citing transparency as their motivation for disclosing their positions.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.43).

Lamna nasus: On Monday, 11 March, in Committee I, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.44) to list *L. nasus* (porbeagle shark) on Appendix II, supported by co-proponents Egypt, Comoros and Brazil. Several others supported the proposal, including Republic of the Congo, Canada, New Zealand, Peru, Argentina and WWF, also on behalf of the International Fund for Animal Welfare, Wild Aid and Pew Environment Group. Among the points raised by supporters were: that the porbeagle is primarily fished by developed countries and the listing will not result in additional burdens for developing countries; despite assurances at previous CoPs that RFMOs will manage *L. nasus*, RFMOs have not yet done so; an Appendix II listing can support and complement RFMO efforts; and the majority of the FAO Expert Panel agrees the species meets the biological criteria for Appendix II.

Many opposed the proposal, including Iceland, Chile, Thailand, Republic of Korea and Mozambique, on behalf of SADC. Opponents highlighted, *inter alia*: the need for a full stock assessment of the Southern hemisphere prior to a decision on listing; implementation challenges; and that major fisheries targeting porbeagle are well-managed.

The Committee voted by secret ballot, as requested by Guinea. The proposal passed, with 93 in favor, 39 against and 8 abstaining. Following the decision, a number of parties announced their votes.

Final Outcome: On Thursday, 14 March, in plenary, the CoP adopted the proposal. Following the decision, China requested the Secretariat to put on record that it had "great concerns" on the enforceability and implementation of the adopted proposal. He stressed it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to implement, and requested the proponents to prepare and make available necessary identification material.

Pristis microdon: On Monday, 11 March, in Committee I, Australia introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.45) to transfer *P. microdon* (freshwater sawfish) from Appendix II to Appendix I, explaining the Pristidae family is listed on Appendix I, with the exception of *P. microdon*, and said the species warrants greater CITES protection.

Many speakers supported the proposal, including Indonesia, India, the US, Kenya, Samoa and Species Survival Network (SSN), on behalf of Shark Advocates International, Project AWARE, WCS, the German Elasmobranch Society and Shark Trust. Japan expressed doubts on the benefits of uplisting, but did not wish to block consensus. Committee I accepted the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.45).

Manta: On Monday, 11 March, in Committee I, Ecuador introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.46) to include the genus *Manta* (manta rays) in Appendix II with an annotation to delay its entry into effect, underscoring its low rates of reproduction and high vulnerability to growing trade in gill plates.

Brazil and Colombia, as co-proponents, supported the proposal, along with many others including Mozambique, on behalf of SADC, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, Uruguay, Liberia and Thailand. Among reasons for support, speakers noted local fishing communities do not depend on manta rays for food or income and the species' vulnerability justified the precaution of listing.

Others, such as Cambodia, China and Japan, opposed the proposal, pointing, *inter alia*, to concerns that scientific data were insufficient and the fact proponents had not raised the need for conservation measures under the relevant RFMOs.

The Committee voted by secret ballot, as requested by Cambodia. The proposal passed, with 96 in favor, 23 against and 7 abstaining. Many parties announced their votes.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.46).

Paratrygon aiereba: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Colombia presented the proposal (CoP16 Prop.47) to include *P. aiereba* (Ceja river stingray) in Appendix II with an annotation to postpone entry into effect by 18 months, urging parties to employ the precautionary principle to list the species. Among others, Ecuador, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Madagascar and Defenders of Wildlife supported the proposal. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, opposed the proposal, citing insufficient information, and preferred an Appendix-III listing. The FAO said the species does not meet the biological criteria for an Appendix-II listing. In a vote, Committee I did not accept the proposal, with 51 votes in favor, 51 against and 19 abstentions.

On Thursday, 14 March, in plenary, Committee I Chair Caceres noted that Committee I had voted to reject the proposal. Colombia, noting her "full respect" for the Committee decision and saying she did not wish to contest the outcome, informed the CoP of the receipt of comments from range states and requested to present a draft decision to initiate a data collection process, with the aim of making progress towards a future Appendix II listing.

CoP Chair Rengsomboonsuk responded this request would mean the debate would have to be re-opened. Reiterating her respect for Committee I's decision, Colombia, supported by Paraguay and Ecuador, motioned to re-open the debate.

Colombia read the proposal, which, *inter alia*, directs the Secretariat to establish a working group with the range states under the AC to gather information on the management status, international and national trade of *P. aiereba* and encourages states, following the assessment of conservation status and threats, to participate in the development of research and monitoring programmes. Colombia agreed to an amendment from the Secretariat that the AC, rather than the Secretariat, would establish the working group.

Recalling their view there was not sufficient information to support inclusion of *P. aiereba* in Appendix II, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, supported the proposed decision. Brazil, Senegal, Peru, Uruguay, Ecuador, the US, Mexico, Venezuela, Paraguay and Chile also supported the decision. Japan requested parties not to repeat the introduction of proposals at the final moment of plenary, expressing concern about setting a precedent for such practice, but said he would not block consensus.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the amended decision, which Colombia said it would provide to the Secretariat in writing.

Potamotrygon motoro and P. schroederi: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Colombia introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.48) to list *P. motoro* (South American freshwater stingray) and *P. schroederi* (Rosette river stingray) on Appendix II, with an annotation to postpone the entry into effect. Ecuador, as co-proponent, recognized the lack of information on these species, but said listing on Appendix II would allow, *inter alia*, international control and NDFs. Brazil, Venezuela and Uruguay, as range states, along with Senegal, Argentina and the US, supported the proposal. Opposing the proposal were Paraguay and Guyana, as range states for *P. motoro*, and Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, preferring instead to list these species on Appendix III. In a vote, Committee I did not accept the proposal, with 55 voting yes, 52 no and 25 abstaining.

Final Outcome: The CoP rejected the proposal (CoP16 Prop.48).

Papilio hospiton: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.49) to transfer *Papilio hospiton* (Corsican swallowtail butterfly) from Appendix I to Appendix II, noting that the species is not traded either legally or illegally. The proposal, supported by Peru and Switzerland, was agreed by the Committee.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.49).

Yucca queretaroensis: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Mexico introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.50) to list *Yucca queretaroensis* (Queretaro yucca) in Appendix II, highlighting, *inter alia*, growing demand on international markets. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, noted that, in spite of limited available information on trade levels and the effects of harvest, they supported the proposal, and the Committee agreed.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.50).

Madagascar plants: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Madagascar introduced seven proposals (CoP16 Prop.51, 64-68 and 71) for Appendix II listings for plant species: *Operculiia decaryi* (Prop.51); *Senna meridionalis* (Prop.64); *Adenia firingalavensis* (Prop.65); *A. subsessifolia* (Prop.66); *Uncarina grandidieri* (Prop.67); *U. stellulifera* (Prop.68); and *Cyphostemma laza* (Prop.71).

In discussions, participants expressed differing views on the strength of evidence for listing. The US highlighted the improvement in data on these proposals since CoP15. South Africa said explanations provided informally by Madagascar had convinced him of threats to wild populations from international trade and the difficulties in tracking trade. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, noted, *inter alia*, the available trade information does not justify the listing, but said it would not block consensus. Committee I accepted the seven proposals.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the seven proposals (CoP16 Prop.51, 64-68 and 71).

Hoodia spp.: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Namibia introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.52) to amend the annotation of *Hoodia spp.* (Hoodias), with Botswana and South Africa as co-proponents, noting the current annotation had caused confusion on the term "agreement." Switzerland explained it had previously entered a reservation because the annotation focused on artificially-propagated species, but said he would not block consensus. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, welcomed the amendment and, supported by the US, proposed including a draft decision directed to the SC Working Group on Annotations to review this annotation. An additional request from Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, to exclude finished products was opposed by Namibia on the grounds this would expand the scope of the proposal. Namibia's position was supported by a ruling of the Committee I Chair.

Committee I agreed to the proposal with a minor amendment by the Secretariat and the decision directed to the SC.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the amended proposal and added decision (CoP16 Prop.52).

Panax ginseng and P. quinquefolius: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.53) to amend the annotation to the Appendix-II listings of *Panax ginseng* and *P. quinquefolius* (American ginseng) to exclude manufactured parts and derivatives, noting changes to previous annotations had created confusion in enforcement.

Canada said she did not view a change to the annotation as necessary but would not block consensus. Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, supported the proposal, and also proposed a new decision, supported by Canada, recommending the SC refer the amended annotations to its Working Group on Annotations for standardization and amendment, as appropriate. Committee I agreed to the proposal to amend the annotation and to the proposed decision.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal with the added decision (CoP16 Prop.53).

Tillandsia spp.: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Brazil introduced the proposals (CoP16 Prop.54-56) to delete three *Tillandsia* species from Appendix II: *T. kautskyi* (Prop.54); *T. sprengeliana* (Prop.55); and *T. sucrei* (Prop.56), explaining the species no longer qualifies for an Appendix-II listing. Among others, the PC Chair, Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, and Chile supported the proposals, which were adopted by the Committee.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposals (CoP16 Prop.54-56).

Dudleya stolonifera and D. traskiae: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, the US introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.57) to delete *D. stolonifera* (Laguna beach live-forever) and *D. traskiae* (Santa Barbara Island live-forever) from Appendix II, explaining no wild or illegal trade has been recorded since their transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II. Committee I adopted the proposal.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.57).

Diospyros spp. and Dalbergia spp.: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Madagascar presented their proposals (CoP16 Prop.58 and 63) to include, respectively, the populations of *Diospyros* spp. (Malagasy ebony) and *Dalbergia* spp. (Malagasy rosewood) in Appendix II, with an annotation limited to logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets, noting, *inter alia*, the Appendix III listing had not prevented exploitation. Many voiced support for the proposals, including the US, Cameroon, Colombia and the PC Chair.

China, supported by Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, proposed amending the text of the proposed action plan (CoP16 Inf.52) to add “especially developed country parties” when requesting importing countries to work with Madagascar.

Parties agreed to the proposals and the action plan as amended by China and with a minor amendment by the Secretariat.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposals and action plan as amended (CoP16 Prop.58 and 63).

Aniba rosaeodora: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Brazil introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.59) to amend the annotation to the Appendix-II listing of *A. rosaeodora* (Brazilian rosewood), to reflect the new definition of “extract,” as agreed to by Committee II (CoP16 Doc.75), specifying the annotation excludes finished products. He noted the new definition considers essential oils as extracts. Argentina, Madagascar and Senegal supported the annotation amendment. The proposal was accepted by Committee I.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.59).

Dalbergia cochinchinensis: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Thailand introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.60), with co-proponent Viet Nam, to include *D. cochinchinensis* (Siamese rosewood) in Appendix II, with an annotation specifying logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets.

Several speakers supported the proposal, including Madagascar, Belize and EIA, the UK and Ireland, on behalf of the EU and its Member States and Croatia, suggested the species meets the criteria for listing on Appendix I. Committee I accepted the proposal with the annotation.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the amended proposal (CoP16 Prop.60).

Dalbergia retusa and D. granadillo: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Belize introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.61) to include *D. retusa* (black rosewood) and *D. granadillo* in Appendix II, and proposed adding an annotation specifying logs, sawn wood, veneer and plywood, explaining *D. retusa* meets the listing criteria for Appendix II and *D. granadillo* qualifies as a look-alike.

Several spoke in support of the proposal, including Panama and SSN. The Committee agreed to the proposal with the proposed annotation.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.61).

Dalbergia stevensonii: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Belize introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.62) to include *D. stevensonii* (Honduras rosewood) in Appendix II, adding Annotation 6, pointing to threats from legal and illegal logging for international trade. The proposal with its annotation was agreed by Committee I.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.62).

Osyris lanceolata: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, Kenya introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.69) to include *O. lanceolata* (East African sandalwood) on Appendix II, with an amendment to restrict inclusion in Appendix II to populations in Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Rwanda, Burundi and Ethiopia, and with the addition of Annotation 2. Among others, Tanzania, Uganda, Burundi and Ethiopia supported the proposal. Kenya also requested adoption of a decision that, *inter alia*, recommends the PC and the East African Range States review and gather further information on the status of trade; assess the impacts of such trade on the conservation status of East African species; carry out NDFs for listed populations; and report on the work at CoP17. The Committee agreed to the proposal as amended, with its annotation and decision directed to the PC, the East African Range States, which Kenya said it will provide to the Secretariat in writing.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal (CoP16 Prop.69).

Aquilaria spp. and Gyrinops spp.: On Tuesday, 12 March, in Committee I, China introduced the proposal (CoP16 Prop.70), with co-proponents Kuwait and Indonesia, to delete the current annotation to the listing of *Aquilaria* spp. and *Gyrinops* spp. (agarwood-producing taxa) in Appendix II, and replace it with a new annotation. She also presented two new proposed draft decisions related to the development of an identification manual for agarwood products. Senegal, Egypt, Qatar and Malaysia

supported the proposal with the amendments. TRAFFIC raised concerns about the exemption of exhausted powder.

Committee I agreed to the proposal for the deletion of the annotation, replacement with the new annotation as amended and the proposed draft decisions by consensus.

Final Outcome: The CoP adopted the proposal and the decisions (CoP16 Prop.70).

CLOSING PLENARY

On Thursday, 14 March, during the closing session, South Africa offered to host CoP17 in 2016 and presented a video about her country. Delegates accepted South Africa's offer by acclamation.

CoP16 Chair Preecha Rengsomboonsuk thanked all delegates for their participation. Several parties, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations made closing remarks. John Scanlon, CITES Secretary-General, praised the delegates for tackling 161 working documents over nine days. He commended the spirit of respect in the room and the decision to place many new species under CITES' control. The meeting was gavelled to a close at 4:36 pm.

A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF COP16

"This will be a difficult two weeks," remarked one delegate, as CITES CoP16 commemorated its 40th anniversary and CoP16 got underway by tackling the contentious question of the use of secret ballots for voting. The divided positions on the issue—exemplified by divergent views on the number of parties needed to support even initiating the discussions—led to two "extraordinary" plenaries in the early days of the meeting to address the matter. Yet the question of transparency was only one of the challenging issues addressed by the CoP. Numerous drafting and working groups convened throughout the two weeks to resolve divergent views on a number of ongoing debates, most notably on budget, including whether and how to approach the Global Environment Facility (GEF) to serve as a financial mechanism for CITES, and conflicts of interest in the scientific committees. For some of these matters, along with several of the proposed species listings on the CITES Appendices, no consensus was achieved, and parties resorted to voting to reach final decisions.

Regardless of their positions on each specific debate, wide agreement was expressed inside and outside of the negotiating rooms on the need for action against illegal trade, increasingly referred to as a crime. This widespread understanding of the severity of wildlife trafficking was underscored by several events that took place in parallel with CoP negotiations. These included a roundtable of ministers and high-ranking officers convened at the beginning of the CoP, followed by meetings of wildlife enforcement networks and a symposium on wildlife crime that brought together justices and attorneys general. Each gathering underscored that illegal trade in wildlife is a growing threat that can only be addressed with concerted actions, such as through the recently established International Consortium on Combating Wildlife Crime (ICWC).

This brief analysis will explore the legacy and future of CITES through a closer look at transparency (and voting), illegal trade (with a focus on rhinos, elephants and Asian big cats) and

the ongoing challenge of balancing economic, environmental and social considerations, including through developing and strengthening cooperation across other organizations and multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs).

A SEE-THROUGH CONVENTION? TRANSPARENCY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

A series of votes on the Rules of Procedure on the use of secret ballots, including votes on whether and how to even address the issue, led to confusion and contestation, revealing deep divides among parties and regions on the way the CoP takes decisions. While few parties spoke openly about fears of bribery, discussions in the corridors provided more candid commentary. Some lamented that powerful donor nations exert undue influence on small, developing countries, particularly African and small island developing states, many of whom depend on bilateral funding for areas of work beyond CITES. One developing country delegate alluded to these pressures, noting that negotiations happened more in hallways and communiqués to home governments than in the official meeting rooms.

A key divide among parties was whether these secret ballots were "procedural" or "substantive" issues, and the majority of parties, as indicated by the vote outcome, viewed them as the latter. For many, this decision highlighted the significance of the matter, but did not resolve the question of whether secret ballots increased freedom for countries by reducing their susceptibility to political pressures from other states or lobbyists, or whether it masked such political pressures and removed delegates' accountability to home governments and citizens.

Following the first secret ballot, the US announced it had a domestic mandate to announce its position publicly on every vote taken in secret. In Committee I's work on proposals to amend the appendices, a growing number of parties took similar action, announcing their vote for the official record. Many pointed to transparency as the motivation for these announcements, and, in the corridors, some delegates suggested that if enough parties were to take this approach, it would effectively undermine the decision on secrecy—although, of course, this depends on parties being truthful when divulging their votes.

For some participants, however, the issue of transparency was not easily reconciled with their view that secret ballots didn't mask bribery (as some feared), but instead relieved small developing parties from the pressures of regional bloc and donor positions. In extraordinary plenary debates, several parties pointed to the role of secret ballots in democracies, which allows voters freedom from coercion. Others, though, stressed the difference between individual voters and sovereign states in international negotiations, viewing the need for public accountability as stronger than fears of political pressure from other states.

While these debates dominated the agenda in the early days of the CoP, once decided upon, parties seemed willing to move on and work constructively on other agenda items. Among these, in the days following the extraordinary plenary sessions, CoP16 revised and adopted several decisions on the budget, enforcement measures to address wildlife crime and the Strategic Vision, along with appendices amendments for a number of species including sharks, manta rays, turtles, rosewood and ebony.

ANNEX D

Timeline of Departmental Consultations on marine species listing proposals in the lead up to the 16th Conference of the Parties of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES CoP16)

Date	Activity	Stakeholders	Agenda/Discussions/Topic
17 February 2012	Meeting	Non Government Organisations	CoP16 timelines, planning and potential proposals
10 May 2012	27 th meeting of the Australian Fisheries Management Forum	Commonwealth, state and territory fisheries management agencies	CoP16 timelines, planning and potential proposals, and consultation processes
6 July 2012	Interdepartmental meeting	Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (DAFF); Australian Fisheries Management Authority (AFMA); Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT); Attorney Generals Department (AGD)	<p>1. Discuss CoP16 preparations including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix I proposal to uplist freshwater sawfish by Australia; • Appendix II proposal by Germany to list porbeagle shark; and • Request received from the United States CITES Scientific Authority for updated trade and biological data and any other new information on the conservation status of oceanic whitetip and three species of hammerhead sharks (scalloped hammerhead, smooth hammerhead and great hammerhead sharks), to inform development of potential listing proposals for CoP16. <p>2. CITES Appendix III listings of porbeagle shark and scalloped hammerhead shark, (following Notification to CITES Parties received on 27 June 2012 advising that these species were to be listed on CITES Appendix III on 25 September 2013).</p>
9 July 2012	Email	DAFF, AFMA, DFAT, AGD	<p>Email sent to Commonwealth agencies requesting further /preliminary positions on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information on scalloped hammerhead shark, to be listed on Appendix III;

Date	Activity	Stakeholders	Agenda/Discussions/Topic
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information and preliminary positions on oceanic whitetip shark and the three hammerhead shark species, to provide to the USA in response to its request on potential for listing these species on CITES Appendix II; and • final positions on Australia's proposed freshwater sawfish proposal and co-sponsorship request from Germany on Appendix II proposal for porbeagle shark.
10 July 2012	Email	Queensland Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (QLD DAFF)	<p>Regarding provision of information to the USA on oceanic whitetip shark and the three species of hammerhead sharks, as Queensland had expressed concern in relation to how some Queensland data had been used in the 2010 CoP15 proposal for these species.</p> <p>Queensland were provided the opportunity to provide alternate and/or contextual information to the USA.</p>
17 July 2012	Email	New South Wales Department of Primary Industries (NSW DPI)	<p>Provided NSW DPI updated information to be supplied to the USA regarding the three species of the hammerhead sharks that was related to NSW, and provided opportunity to provide additional relevant information.</p>
19 July 2012	Consultation letters to heads of agencies, along with emails cc'd to line areas	All state and territory fisheries agencies, DAFF and AFMA	<p>Information about Appendix III listings of porbeagle shark and scalloped hammerhead shark and the implications of this as opposed to an Appendix II listing, which was foreshadowed as expected to be proposed for upcoming CoP.</p>
24 July 2012	Email	QLD DAFF, DAFF, AFMA	<p>Forwarded the final response sent to the USA regarding potential proposals for oceanic whitetip shark and the three species of hammerhead sharks</p>

Date	Activity	Stakeholders	Agenda/Discussions/Topic
25 July 2012	Email	Western Australian Depart of Fisheries (WA DoF)	Advice from WA on extent of hammerhead shark catch, and species composition
27 July 2012	Email	Victorian Department of Primary Industries (VIC DPI)	Victoria advised that they have no state commercial fisheries for porbeagle or scalloped hammerhead shark
6 August 2012	Email	NSW DPI	Advice from NSW that they have limited porbeagle and scalloped hammerhead shark catch.
10 August 2012	Consultation letters	State/territory environment agencies, fisheries agencies, industry bodies, researchers, non-government organisations, recreational fishers, other interested parties	Seeking advice on the Australian Government potential proposal to up-list freshwater sawfish from Appendix II to Appendix I of CITES, in advance of the 4 October 2012 due date for submission of finalised CoP16 listing proposals.
16 October	CITES CoP proposals starting to be released and published on the CITES website	All CITES Parties	All Parties' proposals for CoP16 beginning to become available
27 November 2013	Call for comments on CITES CoP16 published on the department's website	Public, Industry and any other interested stakeholders	Advising of CoP16 agenda and inviting comments on the list of proposals for amendment.
30 November 2013	Letter	Indigenous Advisory Council and the Threatened Species Scientific Committee	Advising of CoP16 agenda and inviting comments on the list of proposals for amendment.
4 December 2012	Consultation Letters	State and territory fisheries agencies and environment agencies, fishing industry bodies, seafood industry bodies, recreational fishing bodies, researchers and research institutions,	Requesting comments on CoP16 listings proposals in order to form an Australian position

Date	Activity	Stakeholders	Agenda/Discussions/Topic
		non-government organisations, other interested parties (see consultation list, including peak industry bodies of relevance to WA, at Attachment A)	
6 December 2012	28 th meeting of the Australian Fisheries Management Forum meeting	Commonwealth, state and territory fisheries management agencies	Advised fisheries management agencies of the process for domestic consultation on proposals to list marine species on Appendix II. Provided the department's preliminary analyses of each of the species listing proposals, including anticipated domestic implications, should the listings be successful.
13 December 2012	Email	Australian Environment Network	Providing electronic copy of letter sent to the network advising of CoP16 agenda and inviting comments on the list of proposals for amendment.
18 December 2012	Email	Conservation non-government organisations (WWF, HSI, Project Aware, TRAFFIC, IFAW, Australian Marine Conservation Society, WSPA, PEW, Greenpeace)	Providing electronic copy of letter sent to the Australian Environment Network advising of CoP16 agenda, inviting comments on the list of proposals for amendment, and inviting attendance at a departmental meeting with non-government organisations
16 January 2013	Interdepartmental meeting	DFAT, AFMA, DAFF, Customs, AGD, Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C), AUSAID, Therapeutic Goods Administration (TGA) (unable to attend)	Discussing comments received during consultation period in order to determine positions to be recommended to the Minister.
17 Feb 2013	Meeting	Non-government organisations	Discussing outcomes of consultation process, and likely Australian positions at CoP, noting that Ministerial decision was yet to be advised.

Stakeholder Consultation List**State Fisheries and Environment Agencies**

Last Name	First Name	Title	Company Name
Curnow	Ian	Executive Director - Fisheries	Northern Territory Department of Primary Industry and Fisheries
Goulstone	Andrew	Director of Commercial Fisheries	New South Wales Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries
Brayford	Heather	Deputy Director-General	Western Australian Department of Fisheries
Doroudi	Mehdi	Executive Director - Fisheries and Aquaculture	Department of Primary Industry and Resources South Australia
Gott	Robert	Director (Marine Resources)	Tasmanian Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment
Hurst	Anthony	Executive Director - Fisheries Victoria	Victorian Department of Primary Industries
Mohr	Maria	Managing Director - Fisheries Queensland	Queensland Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Chesterman	Andrew	Director-General	Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (QLD)
Jim	Grant	Chief Executive	Department of Natural Resources, Environment, The Arts and Sport (NT)
Fennessy	Adam	Deputy Secretary	Natural Resources and Environment Policy (VIC)
McNamara	Keiran	Director General	Department of Environment and Conservation (WA)
Barnes	Sally	Chief Executive	Office of Environment and Heritage, Department of Premier and Cabinet (NSW)
Holmes	Allan	Chief Executive	Department of Environment and Natural Resources (SA)
Evans	Kim	Secretary	Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment (TAS)

Commonwealth Fisheries Agencies

Last Name	First Name	Title	Company Name
Neil	Gordon	General Manager, Fisheries Branch	Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Rayns	Nick	Executive Manager	Australian Fisheries Management Authority

Non Government Stakeholders

Last Name	First Name	Title	Company Name
Fishing and Seafood Industry			
Perez	Eric		Queensland Seafood Industry Association
Green	Neil	C/o Winston Harris, Executive Officer	Queensland Seafood Industry Association
Sarneckis	Katherine		NT Seafood Industry Council
Barwick	Matt		Northern Prawn Fishery Management Advisory

			Committee
Jarrett	Annie		Northern Prawn Fishery Management Advisory Committee
Leyland	Guy		Western Australian Fishing Industry Council
Exel	Martin		Commonwealth Fisheries Association Inc
Vajtauer	Renee		Seafood Industry Victoria
			Tasmanian Seafood Industry Council
Woolford	Jonas		Wildcatch Fisheries South Australia
Christoe	Michelle		Seafood Services Australia
Lambeth	Lyn		OceanWatch Australia Ltd
Moore	Jessica	Secretariat	NSW Seafood Industry Council
			Master Fish Merchants' Association of Australia
Recreational Fishing			
Makepeace	Chris		Amateur Fishermans Association NT
Lynne	Judy		Sunfish
Matthews	Andrew		RecFishWest
Poole	Malcolm		Recreational Fishery Alliance of NSW
Collins	Christopher		VRFish
Flack	Gary		South Australian Recreational Fishing Advisory Council
Nikolai	Mark		Tasmanian Association for Recreational Fishing
Environmental Non Government Organisations			
Faehrmann	Cate	Executive Director	NSW Nature Conservation Council
Jones	Alison	Coordinator	Capricorn Conservation Council
Kennedy	Michael	Director	Humane Society International
Kindleysides	Darren	Director	Australian Marine Conservation Society
Llewellyn	Ghislaine		World Wildlife Fund Australia
Malan	Lyndie	Hon Sec	Great Keppel Island Environment Group
Quirk	Genevieve		Greenpeace
Roe	David	Marine Conservation Officer	Project AWARE Foundation
Sant	Glenn	Global Marine Programme Leader	TRAFFIC International
Smyth	Chris		Australian Conservation Foundation
Verstegen	Piers	Director	Conservation Council of WA
Wishart	Felicity		The Wilderness Society
Thornburn	Dean	Director	Indo-Pacific Environmental Pty Ltd
Research			
Austin	Chris		School of Science and Primary Industries ,Charles Darwin University
Bax	Nic		CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research
Bravington	Mark		Mathematics, Informatics and Statistics, CSIRO Marine Lab
Campbell	Andrew	Director	Research School for the Environment and Livelihoods ,Charles Darwin University
Dell	Quinton	Marine Ecologist, Wealth from Oceans Flagship	CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research
Douglas	Michael		Aquatic ecosystems and water resources , Charles

			Darwin University
Field	Ian		Department of Environment and Geography, Macquarie University
Grewe	Peter	Marine Research Scientist	CSIRO Division of Marine Research
Kyne	Peter		Charles Darwin University
Morgan	David		School of Biological Sciences and Biotechnology, Murdoch University
Pillans	Richard		CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research
Seymour	Jamie		School of Marine and Tropical Biology, James Cook University
Simpfendorfer	Colin	Fishing and Fisheries Research Centre	James Cook University
Smith	Tony		CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research
Stevens	John	Former Senior Principal Research Scientist	CSIRO Marine and Atmospheric Research
Townsend	Kathy		School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland
Courturier	Lydie		School of Biological Sciences, The University of Queensland
Phillips	Nicole		National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Aquarium			
Squire Jnr	Lyle	Director	Cairns Marine Aquarium Fish
Indigenous groups, Land Councils			
Hadden	Kate	Environment Manager	Tiwi land Council
Hill	Kim		Northern Land Council
Jackson	Micha		Northern Australian Indigenous Land and Sea Management Alliance
Leyland	Guy		Carpentaria Land Council
Love	Kristyne		Anindilyakwa Land Council
McGrath	Vic		Torres Strait Regional Authority
Oades	Daniel		The Nyikina Mangala rangers KLC
Roberts	Chris	Team Leader of the Caring for Country Unit	Balkanu (Western Cape) Cape York Development Corporation