

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



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

Summary record of the tenth session of Committee I

11 March 2013: 9h00 – 12h05

Chair: C. Caceres (Canada)  
Secretariat: J. Scanlon  
D. Morgan  
Rapporteurs: J. Caldwell  
P. Cremona  
S. Glaser  
J. Gray

***Interpretation and implementation of the Convention***

Amendment of the Appendices

77. Proposals to amend Appendices I and II

Brazil, Colombia and the United States of America introduced proposal CoP16 Prop. 42 to include *Carcharhinus longimanus* (oceanic whitetip shark) in Appendix II. They highlighted the vulnerability of the species due its low productivity, noted that the species was normally a bycatch, and emphasized that local fishing communities would not be affected by its inclusion in Appendix II. They believed inclusion in Appendix II would complement existing management strategies for the species employed by Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMOs) while noting that the species was not included in management plans throughout its range. They stated that the fins could be easily identified, and commented that the 18-month delay in the listing coming into effect would allow implementation and enforcement measures to be put into place.

General support for the proposal was expressed by Australia, Bahamas, Benin, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, Congo, Guinea, Honduras, Ireland on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, Liberia, Mali, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Senegal and Pew Environment Group, speaking also on behalf of the International Fund for Animal Welfare, WildAid and WWF.

New Zealand noted that many of the actions required for CITES implementation would be similar to those already undertaken by RFMOs addressing fisheries management. It observed that changes to fishing methods could be made in order to reduce bycatch. Liberia called for Parties to support enforcement efforts in developing countries and Norway, supported by Bahamas, stressed the importance of the participation of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in ensuring that the proposal was transparent and science-based. Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, stated that the European Union had committed funding to support capacity-building for implementation of listings of marine species.

Japan noted that measures implemented by RFMOs to manage the species had considerably improved and, supported by China, believed these would be more effective in ensuring sustainable management than an Appendix-II listing. It also noted that catch documentation schemes had proved difficult to implement in the past and was concerned that the proposed 18-month delay in implementation would not be sufficient to resolve enforcement issues, a view echoed by China and the Russian Federation. It further believed there was a risk that the commodity value of the species would increase as a result of the listing.

China reported difficulties in identifying non-fin commodities and distinguishing fins in mixed shipments. Australia, however, reported that identification of the fins of this species had not proved problematic in its own experience, and Pew Environment Group observed that the fins were the most easily distinguished of any shark in trade. Singapore, supported by the International Coalition of Fisheries Associations, also emphasized the potential difficulties in enforcement.

Grenada and Saint Vincent and the Grenadines opposed the proposal, expressing their concern regarding the potential socioeconomic impact on small island developing States. They believed that efforts should focus on the effective implementation of existing fisheries management measures. In response to a query from Grenada concerning activities that would be required in the 18-month period prior to implementation of the listing, the Secretariat clarified that the funding offered by the European Union would be used to assist Parties with issues relating to permitting and non-detriment findings. Brazil noted that it planned to organize a capacity-building workshop for the Central and South America and Caribbean region, while Colombia stated that the 18-month period would allow for countries to identify capacity requirements, adding that technical support could be offered to other regions.

FAO described the outcomes of the Expert Panel discussions on the proposed listing, underlining that the panel had agreed that the species met the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix II, with fins being in demand for international trade, this leading to retention of bycatch.

Japan requested a secret ballot and received the support of at least 10 Parties. The proposal was put to a vote. Ninety-two Parties supported the proposal, 42 opposed it and eight abstained. The proposal was accepted. Chile, Congo, Niger and the United States explained that they had voted in favour of the proposal.

Proposal CoP16 Prop. 43 to include *Sphyrna lewini* (scalloped hammerhead shark), *S. mokarran* (great hammerhead shark), and *S. zygaena* (smooth hammerhead shark) in Appendix II with an annotation, was introduced by Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Honduras, Ireland, on behalf of the Member States of the European Union and Croatia, and Mexico. *S. lewini* was proposed for listing in Appendix II to avoid its becoming eligible for inclusion in Appendix I in the near future, while the other two species were included for look-alike reasons. Brazil stated that any listing proposal needed to be assessed on the basis of the scientific evidence, in terms of practicability of implementation, and in relation to the political context, so as not to be dissonant with the political will of the international community. It believed this proposal qualified on all these grounds. The co-proponents underlined their belief that scientific criteria for listing were met in this proposal, and that inclusion in Appendix II was an appropriate mechanism by which to manage the species, stressing that such a listing was not tantamount to a ban on trade, and that livelihoods would not be adversely affected. They also believed that inclusion in Appendix II would complement measures taken by RFMOs, a view supported by Sierra Leone, which believed there was widespread support for the proposal in West Africa.

Yemen believed that sustainable protection of sharks was required in its region. Comoros and New Zealand supported the proposal, the latter stating that many of its comments made on the previous proposal applied to this proposal also. Brazil and New Zealand both stressed that they would be prepared to contribute to capacity-building in their respective regions.

The meeting was adjourned at 12h05.