

IWMC Recommendations for CoP19

Part I The Proposals

Introduction

For CITES CoP19, IWMC — World Conservation Trust has adopted a new approach to its usual recommendations on Proposals and Documents submitted for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its 19th meeting to be held in Panama City, Panama, from 14 to 25 November 2022.

In addition to regular members of the IWMC team, a total of 7 experts from different perspectives of the Conservation World were consulted and participated in the elaboration of IWMC's recommendations. For aquatic species and related documents, IWMC's recommendations relied entirely on the outcome of the Panel of Experts organised by the FAO under the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), signed in 2006, between the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations and the Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). This MoU is a tool to maintain the credibility of CITES as a science-based organization.

The format of the recommendations has also been modified in order to supply compelling arguments to support the recommendations, when requested by the nature of the proposal and/or document. The fact that IWMC addresses only some of the proposals and documents in its recommendations is dictated by our belief that these proposals and documents deal with fundamental principles involved in CITES structure, activities and evolution.

We hope these recommendations will be useful in your deliberations.

PROPOSALS

Proposal	Proponent	Criteria / Comments	Recommendation
<p>CoP19 Prop. 1</p> <p>Transfer of Hippopotamus (<i>Hippopotamus amphibius</i>) from Appendix II to Appendix I</p>	<p>Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Gabon, Guinea, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Senegal, Togo</p>	<p>The first introductory statement, “The common hippopotamus (hereafter “hippo”) is threatened with extinction” is manifestly false. The 2016 Red List Assessment estimated a 115,000-130,000 population number and ‘stable’, which does not suggest “threatened with extinction”. Some countries actually have too many hippos and need to cull them, such as Zambia , which is not mentioned in the proposal, and in the absence of political instability and poaching they can reproduce quickly. The places where large losses have been recorded (DRC and Uganda) were during periods of armed conflict.</p> <p>The IUCN assessment found that “illegal trade in Hippo ivory increased sharply following the international elephant ivory ban in 1989”. Listing hippos in Appendix I could lead to increased hippo poaching and illegal trade of its parts, which is what happened after the 1989 elephant ivory ban once the stockpiles accumulated in the 1980s were used up. A much more effective approach to conserve hippos would be to manage the habitats where they live and provide security and political stability in those areas. A trade ban is not the solution.</p>	<p align="center">Reject</p>
<p>Cop19 Prop. 2</p> <p>Transfer the population of White rhinoceros of Namibia from Appendix I to Appendix II with the following annotation: For the exclusive purpose of allowing international trade in: a) live animals for in-situ conservation only; and b) hunting trophies. All other specimens shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix I and the trade in them shall be regulated accordingly.</p>	<p align="center">Botswana, Namibia</p>	<p>Namibia is home to the second largest white rhino population after South Africa and has an excellent history of biological management and security standards. This has resulted in a positive population growth. The population therefore does not meet the biological criteria for inclusion in Appendix I. Namibia has effective legislation and law enforcement in place together with strict permit control measures. The sustainable utilization will bring positive economic support to their conservation efforts.</p>	<p align="center">Adopt</p>
<p>Cop19 Prop. 3</p> <p>Remove the existing annotation on the Appendix II listing of Eswatini’s White rhinoceros (<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i>) population.</p>	<p align="center">Eswatini</p>	<p>Eswatini has an excellent history of biological management and security standards which has resulted in a positive population growth. Effective legislation, law enforcement and control of horns by DNA will ensure only legally acquired horns will be traded. A legal trade in rhino horn has the potential to reduce poaching pressure and the illegal killing of rhino for their horn. Since most reserves suffer from a shortfall of funding and the added impact of COVID severely affected income, this alternate proposal to trade horn on a sustainable utilization basis and at the same time reducing poaching pressure is an excellent long term solution as clearly demand reduction campaigns have not been effective. The sale of 330kg of horn from natural mortalities will bring much needed revenue to support the conservation needs of Eswatini as well as benefiting rural communities.</p>	<p align="center">Adopt</p>

PROPOSALS

Proposal	Proponent	Criteria / Comments	Recommendation
<p>CoP19 Prop. 37</p> <p>Inclusion of requiem sharks (<i>Carcharhinidae spp.</i>) in Appendix II</p>	<p>Bangladesh, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, European Union, Gabon, Israel, Maldives, Panama, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Syrian Arab Republic, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland</p>	<p>19 shark species of the family <i>Carcharhinidae</i> are to be included in Appendix II. As a single proposal it does not meet the CITES criteria as merely three species meet the CITES criteria, 12 species do not meet the CITES criteria and four have insufficient data</p>	<p align="center">Withdraw</p>
<p>CoP19 Prop. 38</p> <p>Inclusion of hammerhead sharks (<i>Sphyrnidae spp.</i>) in Appendix II</p>	<p>Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, European Union, Panama</p>	<p>The inclusion of <i>Sphyrna tiburo</i> in Appendix II occurs in accordance with Article II.2(a) of the Convention while satisfying criteria A and B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17), therefore meeting the CITES criteria, including all remaining species in the family <i>Sphyrnidae</i> as look-alikes</p>	<p align="center">Adopt</p>
<p>CoP19 Prop. 39</p> <p>Inclusion of certain freshwater stingrays (<i>Potamotrygonidae</i>) in Appendix II</p>	<p align="center">Brazil</p>	<p>The proposal encompasses seven freshwater stingrays (<i>P. albimaculata</i>; <i>P. henlei</i>; <i>P. jabuti</i>; <i>P. leopoldi</i>; <i>P. marquesi</i>; <i>P. signata</i>; and <i>P. wallacei</i>). <i>P. wallacei</i> and <i>P. leopoldi</i> are to be included in Appendix II in accordance Article II of the Convention as well as in accordance with criteria A and B in Annex 2a of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). The other species are to be included as look-alike species. While <i>P. wallacei</i> does meet the CITES criteria, <i>P. leopoldi</i> does not.</p>	<p align="center">Reject</p>
<p>CoP19 Prop. 40</p> <p>Inclusion of six species of guitarfish in Appendix II</p>	<p align="center">Israel, Kenya, Panama, Senegal</p>	<p>Six species of guitarfish (<i>Acroteriobatus variegatus</i>; <i>Pseudobatos horkelii</i>; <i>Rhinobatos albomaculatus</i>; <i>R. irvinei</i>; <i>R. rhinobatos</i>; <i>R. schlegelii</i>) are to be included in Appendix II in accordance with Article II, paragraph 2(a) of the Convention, and satisfying criteria A and B in Annex 2a of CITES Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). In addition, 37 species are to be added as look-alike species. International trade cannot be identified as a key driver for population decline for any of the proposed species. Therefore, the proposal does not meet the CITES criteria.</p>	<p align="center">Reject</p>
<p>CoP19 Prop. 41</p> <p>Inclusion of zebra pleco (<i>Hypancistrus zebra</i>) in Appendix I</p>	<p align="center">Brazil</p>	<p>The proposal to include <i>Hypancistrus zebra</i> in Appendix I occurs in accordance with Article II of CITES Convention paragraph 1, and by meeting Annex 1 B (iii; iv) and Annex 1 C (i; ii) of CITES Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Despite pressure on the species due to an hydroelectric dam and illegal trade it is not faced with extinction and therefore does not meet the CITES criteria.</p>	<p align="center">Reject</p>

PROPOSALS

Proposal	Proponent	Criteria / Comments	Recommendation
<p><u>CoP19 Prop. 42</u></p> <p>Inclusion of three species of sea cucumber (<i>Thelenota spp.</i>) in Appendix II.</p>	<p>European Union, Seychelles, United States of America</p>	<p>Three species belonging to the genus <i>Thelenota</i>, comprising <i>Thelenota ananas</i>, <i>T. anax</i> and <i>T. rubralineata</i> are to be included in Appendix II, in accordance with Article II.2(a) and under criteria A and B in Annex 2a of CITES Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP17). Given the slow rate of decline in the genus and the low trade in the species, the proposal does not meet the CITES criteria.</p>	<p>Reject</p>
<p><u>CoP19 Prop. 43</u></p> <p>Amendments to various annotations for plant species listed in Appendices I and II</p>	<p>Canada</p>	<p>IWMC strongly supports all the proposed amendments originally recommended by the SC Working Group on Annotations, chaired by Canada, and then agreed by the Standing Committee. IWMC wishes to congratulate Canada for having submitted that proposal of amendments to annotations, including a typographical one (replacement of a , with a ; in the English version of an annotation), in full accordance with Article XV of the Convention, Resolution Conf. 11.21 (Rev. CoP18) and Rules 24 and 25 of the Rules of procedure of the Conference of the Parties. This should be kept in mind when documents CoP19 Doc. 66.4.2 and CoP19 Doc. 88 would be considered.</p>	<p>Adopt</p>

— PROPOSALS END —