



CITES 2010

Analysis of Proposals to Amend Appendices I and II

To be discussed at the 15th Conference of the Parties to CITES, Doha, Qatar, 13 – 25 March 2010, prepared by the Species Survival Network

Abbreviations used: RC=Resolution Conf. • CoP=Conference of the Parties • SC=Standing Committee • AC=Animals Committee • PC=Plants Committee
References cited available upon request.

SPECIES/PROPOSER/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 1</p> <p>Grey Wolf <i>Canis lupus</i></p> <p>Switzerland, as Depositary Government, at the request of the Animals Committee</p> <p>Inclusion of an annotation to the species <i>Canis lupus</i> listed in Appendix I and II reading: "Excludes the domesticated form and the dingo which are referenced as <i>Canis lupus familiaris</i> and <i>Canis lupus dingo</i>"</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The current CITES-approved mammal reference considers <i>Canis familiaris</i> (domesticated dog) as well as the dingo to be subspecies of <i>Canis lupus</i>. Neither domesticated forms of the dog nor the dingo have ever been treated as being covered by the listing of <i>Canis lupus</i> in the Appendices. AC24 recommended adding an annotation to the listing of <i>Canis lupus</i> to clarify these issues. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSN agrees that neither domesticated forms of the dog nor the dingo have ever been treated as being covered by the listing of <i>Canis lupus</i> in the Appendices; the proposal simply clarifies this point so as to be consistent with the current CITES-approved mammal reference.
<p>Prop. 2</p> <p>Bobcat <i>Lynx rufus</i></p> <p>USA</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II as the species no longer merits listing as per Article II, paragraph 2(b), in accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Criterion A in Annex 2b</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution: Canada, Mexico, and USA. Population: Least Concern (IUCN 2009), population stable; USA population 1,419,333 to 2,638,738 (Roberts 2008) and increasing; size of Canadian population unknown, but believed 'secure'; size and trend of Mexican population unknown, and species considered 'very rare' in some areas and 'relatively abundant' in others. Threats: Habitat loss. Trade: Between 1998 and 2007, 481,975 specimens were traded internationally; most (439,177) were skins (CITES Trade Database 2009); other specimens traded internationally included tails (used for garment trim), garments, skin pieces, and leather products; main importers were Greece and Italy; USA was by far the largest exporter, followed by Canada, with very few exports from Mexico. The proposal claims that trade in Iberian and Eurasian lynx is well-controlled; that it is highly unlikely that pieces of their skin could enter illegal trade in quantities significant enough to impact populations; and that the ready 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USA has proposed delisting four times, most recently at CoP14 when it was soundly rejected. Range States of the Critically Endangered Iberian lynx (<i>Lynx pardinus</i>) and the Eurasian lynx (<i>Lynx lynx</i>) raised concerns that delisting would facilitate illegal trade in these species. The Iberian lynx is the world's most endangered felid, with only 84 to 143 adults remaining in two breeding populations; 2 of 9 recognized Eurasian lynx subpopulations are Critically Endangered and 4 are Endangered (Lynx Survey of Europe 2001); illegal skin trade remains the leading threat to the Eurasian lynx (IUCN 2009). USA claims that listing as a look-alike is no longer warranted because it has "produced a web-based <i>Lynx</i> identification manual ... as an aide in distinguishing full skins and skins lacking a head and tail of <i>L. rufus</i> and

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>availability of legally acquired bobcat is a 'safeguard' against the illegal take and trade of other <i>Lynx</i> spp.</p>	<p><i>Lynx</i> spp. (<i>emphasis added</i>).” However:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ the manual is not a useful tool for distinguishing among <i>Lynx</i> species, or between <i>Lynx</i> species and other spotted cats, because it does not address the full range of fur patterns and colors that occur in these species; ■ 11%, or 42,611 specimens, of <i>Lynx</i> spp. legally traded in 2002-2006 were not full skins, or skins lacking only a head and tail, and would not be identifiable using this manual; and ■ according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service National Wildlife Forensics Laboratory, <i>Lynx</i> skin pieces cannot be identified as to species even with forensic laboratory analysis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal’s statement that, “in the opinion of industry representatives, distinguishing <i>L. rufus</i> parts, pieces and derivatives from those of <i>Lynx canadensis</i> is not difficult...” is irrelevant to distinguishing <i>L. rufus</i> from Iberian or Eurasian lynx. • Despite the proposal's claims, a 2008 survey of European <i>Lynx</i> range States (AC24 Doc. 10.3, Annex 3) demonstrated that illegal trade in Iberian and Eurasian lynx occurs at significant levels considering their low population sizes. Even one skin of Iberian lynx is significant to a wild population of less than 150 individuals; the same is true for Eurasian lynx populations with low numbers (i.e. the Bohemian-Bavarian population with about 75 individuals). • At least 104 specimens of Eurasian lynx and one of Iberian lynx have been reported seized in recent years, including 74 whole skins seized in Greece in 2001. Demand for these rare <i>Lynx</i> taxa exists; there is no evidence that delisting <i>L. rufus</i> will reduce illegal trade in other <i>Lynx</i> species. • European <i>Lynx</i> range States still oppose delisting, stating in October 2008 (AC24 Doc. 10.3, Annex) that: “A concern by the EU is that illegally harvested <i>Lynx lynx</i> could end up in products of EU manufacturers and be sold as <i>Lynx rufus</i> or <i>Lynx canadensis</i> fur”; “even a small increase in poaching will have an important negative impact on populations, and hence any measure that makes it easier to enter skins into trade (e.g., through de-listing of <i>Lynx rufus</i> from CITES) may create an incentive to poaching and illegal trade in specimens of <i>Lynx lynx</i>”; and “a simple delisting could allow <i>Lynx lynx</i> to enter trade more easily if there is no document trail for <i>Lynx rufus</i> entering international trade.”

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● USA claims that considerable time and resources are needed to make non-detriment findings (NDFs) for <i>L. rufus</i>. However, USA issues a single NDF to cover the export of bobcat pelts, and if the bobcat population is robust as claimed, making an NDF should be relatively easy. ● USA has proposed listing the bobcat on Appendix III while the EU maintains it on Annex B under EU regulation. However, species on Appendix III are listed in Annex C under EU regulation, which requires no paperwork or proof of legal origin. Also, since non-EU countries trade in <i>Lynx</i> spp., the USA suggestion would not solve the look-alike problem, which can only be addressed by retaining the bobcat on Appendix II. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2b, paragraph A): trade in bobcat skins must subject to regulation to ensure that trade in specimens of <i>Lynx</i> species on Appendix I or II can be brought under effective control</p>
<p>Prop. 3</p> <p>Polar Bear <i>Ursus maritimus</i></p> <p>USA</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 1, paragraph C) ii)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Circumpolar Arctic marine environments of Canada, Denmark (Greenland), Norway, Russian Federation, and USA. ● Population: 20,000-25,000 in 19 populations; Vulnerable (IUCN 2009) owing to a suspected population reduction of >30% within three generations (45 years) due to decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and habitat quality. In 2007, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), using the best science available, predicted range-wide polar bear population declines of approximately 71% within 45 years and 80% within a century (Amstrup <i>et al.</i> 2007); status of populations has deteriorated over the past four years: in 2005, the IUCN/SSC Polar Bear Specialist Group (PBSG) categorized 2 of 19 populations as increasing, 5 as stable, 5 as declining, 6 as data deficient, and 1 unknown, whereas in 2009 the PBSG categorized only 1 of 19 populations as increasing, 3 as stable, 8 as declining, and 7 as data deficient or unknown. ● Threats: Polar bears are completely dependent on sea ice, the total of which has been reduced by 8 percent in the past 30 years, while summer sea ice has been reduced by 15-20 percent. Record retreats of summer sea ice occurred in 2007 and 2008. Climate models predict an additional decline in total sea ice of 10-50% by 2100 and the complete loss of summer sea ice in the Arctic in about 30 years. Experts project that polar bears will not survive the complete loss of summer sea ice (Amstrup <i>et al.</i> 2009). ● Trade: Over 31,000 polar bear specimens traded internationally 1992-2006 (about 2,086 annually) for commercial (e.g. polar bear skin rugs) 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) states that species in trade qualify for listing on CITES Appendix I if they show a “marked decline in the population size in the wild, which has been inferred or projected on the basis of a decrease in area of habitat and a decrease in quality of habitat”(emphasis added). The polar bear meets these criteria. ● Polar bears are vulnerable to overexploitation because they have a low reproductive rate, with females reaching sexual maturity at 4-5 years in age and producing on average less than two cubs every three years. Mortality of cubs is high, sometimes exceeding 70%. ● Although Canada claims that levels of take and export are sustainable, the status of populations there has deteriorated in the past four years. In 2005 the PBSG categorized 5 of the 13 populations in <u>Canada</u> as declining, 5 as stable, 2 as increasing and the rest as data deficient; but in July 2009, the PBSG determined that though 1 was increasing, 7 were declining and only 3 were stable. Declining populations are still being harvested for export. ● Regarding Canada’s management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ “Scientific evidence indicates that the shared Baffin Bay polar bear population has been subject to long-term overexploitation by Canada and Greenland” (PBSG, July

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>and non-commercial purposes (e.g. trophies) (CITES Trade Database); exports have increased since the early 1990s. Skins accounted for the majority of items exported for commercial purposes. An average of 216 skins was exported annually, 87% from Canada and 13% from Greenland. Japan (59%), Denmark (15%), and Norway (12%) were the main importers. 51% of exports were from Canada, 31% from Greenland, 8% from Norway, 7% from the USA, and 3% from Russia. Top importing countries were Denmark (29%), the United States (19%), Japan (13%), Canada (11%), Norway (10%), Germany (4%), and the United Kingdom (2%). In 2007, the numbers of skins and trophies exported were the largest on record (554 and 128, respectively) (CITES Trade Database). Canada is the only range State currently exporting polar bear specimens for commercial purposes; Greenland temporarily suspended all exports in 2008.</p>	<p>2009).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ In December 2008, the EU banned polar bear imports for the populations of Baffin Bay and Kane Basin because Canada could not demonstrate that take levels are sustainable. ■ In Norwegian Bay and Lancaster Sound, current levels of take may be exceeding sustainable yield (Taylor 2008). ■ USA did not approve the Gulf of Boothia population for import of sport-hunted trophies because they could not determine that management is based on scientifically sound quotas (Ragan 2009). ■ In 2001, USA stopped imports of trophies from M'Clintock Channel after it was discovered that the population had been severely reduced by excessive harvest; this measure remains in place (USFWS 2008). ■ The Viscount Melville Sound population was severely reduced by excessive harvest (<i>ibid</i>). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Transfer to Appendix I is necessary to ensure that primarily commercial trade does not compound the threats posed to the species by loss of habitat. <p>■ Meets criteria for inclusion in Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 1, paragraph C ii): projected marked decline in population size in the wild due to decrease in area and quality of habitat • affected by trade</p>
<p>Prop. 4</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>United Republic of Tanzania</p> <p>To transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II the population of the United Republic of Tanzania with the following annotation: “for the exclusive purpose of the following: a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in registered raw ivory (whole tusks and pieces) subject to the following: i) a one-off sale of 89,848.74 kg</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States). ● Population: 108,816 (definite) plus 27,937 (probable) in Tanzania (IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group 2007). Current continental population less than 50% of estimated population in 1979. ● Threats: Poaching, illegal trade, habitat destruction, human-elephant conflict and civil unrest. Poaching severely reduced elephant populations in the past and continues to affect populations in all African sub-regions. ● Trade: All but four populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999; South Africa’s population transferred to Appendix II in 2000; one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 tons of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa approved at CoP12, expanded at CoP14 to incorporate government-owned stockpiles from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe registered by 31 January 2007; sale of 108 ton to China and Japan took place October-November 2008; current annotation for populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe allows trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, trade in live animals to 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tanzania participated in negotiations at CoP14 which led to approval of a 9-year ivory trade moratorium, intended to provide a “resting period” for both elephants and CITES (see comments on Prop 6). By submitting this proposal, Tanzania has undermined the spirit and intent of the CoP14 agreement and destroyed the promised resting period. ● No further ivory trade should be permitted before the Decisions agreed at CoP14 have been implemented, including: the comprehensive reviews of the impact of legal trade (Decision 14.78); the African Elephant Action Plan and African Elephant Fund (Decision 14.75 and 14.79) and their conservation initiatives. ● Proposal claims that populations in Tanzania are secure, but contains almost no information regarding poaching; poaching is nonetheless a significant problem threatening populations in the country: a total of 11,678kg of ivory seized in 2009 is reported to have originated in Tanzania;

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>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 SC as having sufficient national legislation 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 RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) 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); iii) not before the Secretariat has verified the registered government-owned stocks; 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; 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 CoP15 and ending six 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) iv). In addition such further proposals shall be dealt with in accordance with Decisions 14.77 and 14.78. c) trade in raw</p>	<p>appropriate and acceptable destinations for Botswana and Zimbabwe and for <i>in-situ</i> conservation programs for Namibia and South Africa, trade in hair, trade in hides, and trade in leather goods for commercial purposes or non-commercial purposes for Botswana, Namibia and South Africa and for non-commercial purposes for Zimbabwe; Namibia is permitted trade in individually marked and certified ekipas (traditional carvings) incorporated in finished jewelry for non-commercial purposes and Zimbabwe is permitted to unlimited trade in ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes.</p>	<p>in addition, DNA analysis has identified the Selous Ecosystem in Tanzania (spilling over to Niassa Game Reserve in Mozambique) as the source of 5.2 tons of ivory seized in Taiwan and 2.6 tons in Hong Kong in 2006 (Wasser <i>et al.</i> 2009). A recent press report stated that “It is believed that an average of 50 elephants are being killed in the Selous each month”, though police have not confirmed this figure.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Although Tanzania claims to be complying fully with ETIS, the ETIS report (CoP15 Doc. 44.1 Annex) notes that Tanzania “remains heavily involved in the movement of large-scale consignments of illicit ivory”; “Tanzania has either made itself or otherwise been implicated in 15 of the 55 highest volume ivory seizures reported to ETIS”; “69% of the trade by weight has involved large-scale ivory seizures, indicating the presence of active and entrenched organised criminal syndicates”; “reporting of elephant product seizure cases to ETIS has dropped off considerably in recent years, with only four records received since 2007”; since 2003 “only one out of the last eight (soon to be nine) large-scale ivory consignments have been interdicted before export by the Tanzanian authorities themselves. Such events... are suggestive of organised crime and the ability of the country to meet this challenge seems to have become significantly compromised”; “the impact of the ivory trade from Tanzania also impacts elephant populations which exist outside of the country”. ● Despite its claim to the contrary, the proposal does not meet the requirements of the precautionary measure in RC 9.24 (Rev.CoP14) requiring “appropriate enforcement controls” to be in place before a species is transferred from Appendix I to II. ● No legal trade in ivory, commercial or non-commercial, should be approved while illegal trade and poaching remain a serious threat to elephants across many parts of Africa (including in Tanzania) and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>). See under <i>Threats</i> in Prop. 6 for more information on recent ivory seizures. <p>■ Does <u>not</u> meet criteria for transfer from Appendix I to II in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 4, paragraphs A 2) b) that there are “appropriate enforcement controls and compliance with the requirements of the Convention”</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>hides. d) trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, as defined in RC 11.20. The SC 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>		
<p>Prop. 5</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>Zambia</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II of the population of Zambia for the exclusive purposes of allowing: a) trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes; b) trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, as defined in RC 11.20; c) trade in raw hides; d) trade in registered raw ivory subject to the following: i) a one-off sale of 21,692.23 kg as ivory from registered government-owned stocks, originating in Zambia (excluding seized ivory and ivory of unknown origin); ii) only to trading partners that have already been designated by the SC as having</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States). ● Population: 16,562 (definite) plus 5,948 (probable) in Zambia (IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group 2007); population declined from 160,000 in 1981 to 58,000 in 1985, 41,000 in 1987 to 33,004 in 1995, and 29,016 in 1998 and has declined further since then. ● Threats: Poaching, illegal trade, habitat destruction, human-elephant conflict and civil unrest. Poaching severely reduced elephant populations in the past and continues to affect populations in all African sub-regions. ● Trade: All but four populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999; South Africa's population transferred to Appendix II in 2000; one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 tons of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa approved at CoP12, expanded at CoP14 to incorporate government-owned stockpiles from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe registered by 31 January 2007; sale of 108 tons to China and Japan took place October-November 2008; current annotation for populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe allows trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, trade in live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations for Botswana and Zimbabwe and for in-situ conservation programs for Namibia and South Africa, trade in hair, trade in hides, and trade in leather goods for commercial purposes or non-commercial purposes for Botswana, Namibia and South Africa and for non-commercial purposes for Zimbabwe; Namibia is permitted trade in individually marked and certified ekipas (traditional 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Zambia participated in negotiations at CoP14 which led to approval of a 9-year ivory trade moratorium, intended to provide a “resting period” for both elephants and CITES (see comments on Prop 6). By submitting this proposal, Zambia has undermined the spirit and intent of the CoP14 agreement and destroyed the promised resting period. ● No further ivory trade should be permitted before the Decisions agreed at CoP14 have been implemented, including: the comprehensive reviews of the impact of legal trade (Decision 14.78); the African Elephant Action Plan and African Elephant Fund (Decision 14.75 and 14.79) and their conservation initiatives. ● This proposal contains little information regarding elephant poaching in Zambia, yet reports clearly indicate that poaching is a significant, and growing, problem; Dr Saiwana, the then Director of the Zambian Wildlife Authority, recently acknowledged this (<i>The World Today</i>, 16 October 2009); A 2007 study (Wasser <i>et al.</i>) identified Zambia as the source of an illegal shipment of 532 large tusks seized in Singapore; and the results of a 2008 study (Wasser <i>et al.</i>) suggest that 42,000 ivory hankos that were part of the same shipment, also originated in Zambia. The tusks and hankos totaled more than 6,500kg. ● The ETIS report (CoP15 Doc. 44.1 Annex) notes that:

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>sufficient national legislation 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 RC 10.10 (Rev. CoP14) concerning domestic manufacturing and trade: these are Japan designated as a trading partner at the 54th meeting (SC54 Geneva, October 2006), and China designated as a trading partner at the 57th meeting (SC57, Geneva, July 2008); iii) not before the Secretariat has verified the registered government-owned stocks; iv) the proceeds of the trade are used exclusively for elephant conservation and community conservation and development programs within or adjacent to the elephant range in Zambia; v) On a proposal from the Secretariat, the SC can decide to cause this trade 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. 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>carvings) incorporated in finished jewelry for non-commercial purposes and Zimbabwe is permitted to unlimited trade in ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes.</p>	<p>Zambia [is] “linked to large-scale ivory seizure events, indicating that highly organised criminal activity is a major feature of ivory movements”; the country is “currently active in the illicit ivory trade” and “illicit ivory trade remains a persistent challenge”; and that ivory is “usually” illegally exported from Zambia to neighboring Malawi.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proposal does not meet the requirements of the precautionary measure in RC 9.24 (Rev.CoP14), Annex 4, requiring “appropriate enforcement controls” to be in place before a species is transferred from Appendix I to II. ● No legal trade in ivory, commercial or non-commercial, should be approved while illegal trade and poaching remain a serious threat to elephants across many parts of Africa and Asia (for <i>Elephas maximus</i>). See under <i>Threats</i> in Prop. 6 for more information on recent ivory seizures. <p>■ Does <u>not</u> meet criteria for transfer from Appendix I to II in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 4, paragraphs A 2) b) that there are “appropriate enforcement controls and compliance with the requirements of the Convention”</p>
<p>Prop. 6</p> <p>African Elephant <i>Loxodonta africana</i></p> <p>Congo, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Rwanda and Sierra Leone</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Sub-Saharan Africa (37 range States). ● Population: Latest continental population estimate: 472,269 to 554,973 (IUCN African Elephant Specialist Group 2007). Poaching severely reduced populations in the past and continues to affect populations in all African regions. Current continental population is less than 50% of the estimated population in 1979. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The annotation (footnote 5) regarding the populations of <i>Loxodonta africana</i> of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe does not adequately reflect the spirit and intent of the compromise that was agreed at CoP14. It was argued at CoP14 that a comprehensive moratorium or “resting period” (including ALL African elephant populations) was

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>i) Delete the following paragraph from the annotation regarding the populations of <i>Loxodonta africana</i> of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe: “h) no further proposals to allow trade in elephant ivory from 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.”</p> <p>ii) Include an annotation regarding <u>ALL</u> populations of <i>Loxodonta africana</i>, as follows: “No further proposals concerning trade in African elephant ivory, including proposals to downlist elephant populations from Appendix I to Appendix II, shall be submitted to the Conference of the Parties for the period from CoP14 and ending twenty years from the date of the single sale of ivory that took place in November 2008. Following this twenty year resting period, any elephant proposals shall be dealt with in accordance with Decisions 14.77 and 14.78.”</p> <p>iii) Delete paragraph (f) in the annotation to the populations of <i>Loxodonta africana</i> of Namibia</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: Poaching, illegal ivory trade, habitat destruction, human- elephant conflict and civil unrest. A significant volume of ivory has been seized since CoP14: more than 20,000kg between January and October 2009 alone, including several very large seizures. 2009 seizures include: 6,232kg (Vietnam); 3,346kg (Philippines); 2,000kg (Vietnam); 1,250kg (Cameroon); 812.5kg (Thailand); 703kg (Kenya). • Trade: All but 4 populations listed on Appendix I; populations of Zimbabwe, Namibia and Botswana transferred to Appendix II in 1997, with a “one-off experimental” export of 49,437.5kg ivory to Japan in 1999. South Africa’s population transferred to Appendix II in 2000. A one-off trade in registered stockpiles of 60 metric tons of ivory from Botswana, Namibia and South Africa was approved at CoP12 in 2002. At CoP14 (2007) the quantity of ivory approved for this sale was expanded to incorporate government-owned stockpiles from Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe registered by 31 January 2007. At SC57, China was approved as a trading partner and sale to China and Japan took place in October and November 2008, with a total of 108 metric tons sold. • The current annotation (footnote 5) to the listing of populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe in Appendix II allows trade in hunting trophies for non-commercial purposes, live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations for in-situ conservation programs, hair, hides, and trade in leather goods for non-commercial or commercial purposes. Paragraph f) of the footnote (5) allows Namibia to trade in individually marked and certified ekipas (traditional carvings) incorporated in finished jewelry and Zimbabwe to trade in ivory carvings, both for non-commercial purposes. • This proposal would amend the existing footnote so that the moratorium on submitting ivory trade proposals would apply to all populations of the African elephant and would last for a period of 20 years, rather than the current nine. Additionally, the proposal would eliminate the provision that allows Namibia and Zimbabwe to trade in worked ivory for non-commercial purposes. 	<p>needed to provide Parties with time—in the absence of ivory trade, including proposals—to tighten up enforcement; to control domestic ivory markets; to monitor the effect of a complete moratorium on illegal trade; and to increase international awareness about restrictions on international ivory trade. This was the basis for the “elephant compromise” agreed at CoP14, wherein 4 African elephant range States were permitted a one-off sale of government stockpiled ivory in return for the other 33 African elephant range States getting 9 years to focus on these other activities without the threat of further ivory trade. Nonetheless, the footnote concerning the compromise was applied only to those 4 populations on Appendix II. The footnote for a resting period must be amended to apply to all elephant populations in Appendices I and II, not only to populations currently in Appendix II, in order to make this compromise a reality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking into consideration the significant ivory seizures and reports of widespread and increasing levels of poaching that have taken place since CoP14, that organized criminal syndicates are involved in poaching and ivory trade (see CoP15 Doc. 44.1 Annex), the fact that the proposals by Tanzania and Zambia have eliminated the 9-year resting period agreed at CoP14, and the potentially negative but as yet unquantifiable impacts of the ivory sales to Japan and China that took place in October- November 2008, the “resting period” for ivory trade should be extended to 20 years. • No further downlistings or ivory trade should be approved before Decisions on elephant conservation that were part of the CoP14 compromise have been implemented, including: the African Elephant Action Plan and African Elephant Fund (Decision 14.75 and 14.79) and their conservation initiatives; and comprehensive reviews of the impact of legal trade (Decision 14.78). • Poaching threatens the survival of some populations: that of Zakouma National Park in Chad fell from 3,885 in 2005 to 617 in 2009; that of Sambisa National Reserve in Nigeria may have been lost entirely. In September/October 2009 poachers killed the entire elephant herd in Sierra Leone's only wildlife park. • Prices of ivory on the black market in Asia are reported to be increasing, and have reached USD1,863/kg in Vietnam

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
and Zimbabwe: “f) trade in individually marked and certified ekipas incorporated in finished jewelry for non-commercial purposes for Namibia and ivory carvings for non-commercial purposes for Zimbabwe.”		<p>(TRAFFIC 2009), a clear indication of increasing demand. Black market prices in Asia were reported to be around USD750/kg in 2006.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph (f) of the current footnote should be deleted. The Secretariat reported at SC54 (2006) and SC58 (2009) that Zimbabwe repeatedly exported ivory from government-owned stocks in contravention of CITES and its own control mechanisms. Significant amounts of this raw ivory were accompanied by export permits issued for legal trade in ivory carvings in accordance with paragraph (f). Namibia on 1 September 2008 banned all trade in ekipas because it was unable to comply with the requirement of the CITES footnote to “mark and certify ekipas.”
<p>Prop. 7</p> <p>Mariana Mallard <i>Anas oustaleti</i></p> <p>Switzerland, as Depositary Government, at the request of the Animals Committee</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix I</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Known only from the islands of Guam, Tinian, and Saipan (Mariana Archipelago, western Pacific). • Population: No confirmed sightings since 1979; researchers and managers in Guam (USA) and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands concur that species is probably extinct. • Threats: Reduction in range and eventual extinction has been attributed to habitat loss and overhunting. • Trade: During 1975-2007, international trade included a single shipment of 1 specimen in 1993, and a shipment of 10 feathers in 2005, both likely to have been biological specimens. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The species was listed in Appendix I at the CITES Plenipotentiary Conference in 1973. • All available information indicates that the Mariana Mallard is extinct. • AC24 agreed that a proposal to delete this taxon from the Appendices would be prepared and that the depositary government would be requested to submit it to CoP15 on behalf of the AC.
<p>Prop. 8</p> <p>Morelet's Crocodile <i>Crocodylus moreletti</i></p> <p>Mexico</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix I to Appendix II with a zero quota for trade in wild specimens</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Atlantic coast of Mexico, northeast Guatemala, and Belize; 85% of distribution in México. • Population: Lower Risk/conservation dependent (IUCN 2009); recent surveys resulted in an estimated global population of 102,434 individuals of all ages in the wild, with about 19,462 of these being adults; no quantitative monitoring of population trends since 2004 (IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group). • Threats: Habitat loss and degradation; illegal harvest of wild specimens; illegal trade in young animals, skins and products. • Trade: International demand for skins and finished products; illegal trade occurs in all range States. 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classified as Critically Endangered under national law in Guatemala. • The largest CITES-registered captive breeding operation in Mexico, whose operation would be facilitated by downlisting, is outside the natural range of the species but is in the area occupied by pure <i>C. acutus</i> (listed on Appendix I), creating risk of hybridization that may threaten the latter population; IUCN Crocodile Specialist Group has raised concerns regarding danger of escapees crossbreeding in wild with <i>C. acutus</i>. • Illegal harvest exists throughout range; downlisting could increase illegal international trade by providing an opportunity for laundering. • The proposal does not provide information that sufficient compliance and enforcement controls are in place to control illegal trade of the species at both the national and international level; therefore, the relevant precautionary measures for a downlisting (criterion A 2 (b) of RC 9.24

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		<p>(Rev. CoP14), Annex 4) are not met.</p> <p>■ Proposal does <u>not</u> provide sufficient information that required precautionary measures of Annex 4, Paragraph A 2. of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) are complied with</p>
<p>Prop. 9</p> <p>Nile Crocodile <i>Crocodylus niloticus</i></p> <p>Egypt</p> <p>Transfer of the Egyptian population from Appendix I to Appendix II in accordance with RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14) and RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 4, Paragraph A.2. d)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Widely distributed throughout sub-Saharan Africa; 43 range States; all populations on Appendix I except for those in Botswana, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia, and Zimbabwe which are listed on Appendix II. ● Population: Lower Risk/Least Concern (IUCN 2009); relatively abundant in Southern and Eastern Africa, but greatly depleted in Central and Western Africa; historically present in the Nile River valley as far North as the delta, but extirpated from Egypt at the beginning of the century; species now limited in Egypt to Lake Nasser where the population is estimated to be 6,094–30,470 individuals. ● Threats: Over-hunting and conflict with fisheries led to the extirpation of the species prior to construction of the Nile River dam; current threats include conflicts with local fishermen, illegal hunting activities, and illegal trade of live specimens (hatchlings), leather products and whole skins. ● Trade: Between 2000 and 2007, Egypt exported 2 skins, 7 leather products, 3 live specimens and 1 body, all reported as confiscated or seized (Source Code I) (UNEP WCMC CITES Trade Database 2009). Between 2007 and 2009, 342 live crocodiles (hatchlings), 15 taxidermy specimens, 27 leather products and 11 skins were confiscated by Egyptian authorities at Cairo airport. Proposal states that “it is likely that in excess of 3000 hatchling crocodiles are illegally smuggled out of Egypt, and 200–400 subadult and adult crocodiles are killed annually for their skins.” Proposal requests an annual quota of 750 skins from ranches specimens, beginning in 2013. 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposal is premature: it states that no ranching operations have been approved domestically, and that “details of our planned utilization are not yet fully worked out.” ● The species is subject to significant illegal take and trade in Egypt; downlisting should not be approved until illegal trade is effectively controlled. ● SC has discussed CITES implementation in Egypt for many years and this issue remains on the agenda (SC54 Doc. 20, SC57 Doc. 20, SC58 Doc.23); implementation problems discussed by the SC include illegal trade routes from West Africa to Cairo, lack of seizures/confiscations by the Egyptian authorities, and lack of arrests or prosecutions for illegal trade. Downlisting should not be approved until Egypt’s CITES implementation problems are resolved. ● The proposal fails to provide “evidence that the taking from the wild will have no significant detrimental impact on wild populations” as required by RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14). ● The proposal fails to provide “an assessment of the likelihood of the biological and economic success of each ranching operation.” (RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)). ● The proposal provides no “assurance that the operation shall be carried out at all stages in a humane (non-cruel) manner” (emphasis added) as required by RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14). <p>■ Proposal does not meet the requirements for ranching contained in RC 11.16 (Rev. CoP14)</p>
<p>Prop. 10</p> <p>Ornate Dabb Lizard <i>Uromastix ornata</i></p> <p>Israel</p> <p>Transfer from Appendix II to Appendix I in accordance with</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic to the Arabo-Sinianian region; 4 range States: Egypt, Israel, Saudi Arabia and Yemen; distribution has shrunk compared to historical range; population fragmented with subpopulations separated by mountain ranges and water bodies. ● Population: Vulnerable due to late maturity, low fecundity and low juvenile survival rates; IUCN's (2004) preliminary global assessment states that the species is in decline and that it is "moderately abundant in suitable habitat, but populations appear to significantly fluctuate. The 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Populations fragmented, declining and affected by over-collection for the pet trade. ● Late maturity, low fecundity and low juvenile survival make species vulnerable to over-exploitation. ● Identified as Endangered in Israel and listed as Vulnerable on Egypt’s Red List.

SPECIES/PROPOSER/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 1, paragraphs A i) and v), Criteria B) iii) and iv) and Criteria C) i) and ii)	<p>species is declining from heavily disturbed and accessible areas of their range." In southern Israel there are probably no more than a few hundred individuals, down from a few thousand 10 years ago. Surveys in the eastern Sinai Peninsula in 1988-1989 showed reduced populations compared to some 20 years earlier.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: Over-collection for the international pet trade, including the illegal collection of animals within protected areas (Egypt) (IUCN 2004); habitat loss throughout its range; drought apparently related to global climate change in Israel. • Trade: <i>U. ornata</i> is in high demand in the pet trade in North America, Europe, and Japan. From 1999-2007, 4,370 wild-caught specimens entered international trade sourcing from Sudan, Libya, Lebanon, and Yemen (only Yemen is a range State). Ukraine exports more than a thousand specimens identified as captive-bred each year. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 1, paragraphs A i), and v), B iii) and iv), and C i) and ii): small size of some sub-populations • limited distribution and fragmentation of wild populations • decline in the population size in the wild • high vulnerability due to low reproductive rate • present in international trade
<p>Prop. 11</p> <p>Baker's Spinytail Iguana <i>Ctenosaura bakeri</i></p> <p>Roatan Spiny-Tailed Iguana <i>Ctenosaura oedirhina</i></p> <p>Honduran Paleate Spiny-Tailed Iguana <i>Ctenosaura melanosterna</i></p> <p>Honduras</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: All three species are endemic to Honduras and have restricted distributions: • <i>C bakeri</i>: Utila Island; total known range is 8 km² of mangrove forest; • <i>C. melanosterna</i>: Aguan Valley and the islands of Cayos Cochinos; • <i>C. oedirhina</i>: Roatan Island, with a total range of less than 100 km². • Population: Small for all three species: • <i>C bakeri</i>: Critically Endangered; population 10,000, stable but expected to decline if threats continue (IUCN 2009); • <i>C. melanosterna</i> and <i>C. oedirhina</i>: Critically Endangered, populations of both species unknown but may be fewer than 2,500 mature individuals each; populations severely fragmented, both with 10-15 isolated subpopulations; future population declines of at least 30% predicted if current rates of habitat loss continue (IUCN 2009). • Threats: Habitat destruction and fragmentation, illegal take of wild animals for domestic trade in meat and eggs; international illegal trade to USA and Europe. • Trade: Traded internationally as live animals for private collectors, particularly in Europe. 17 specimens of <i>C. melanosterna</i> reported imported to USA in 2004 and 11 in 2007. Prices in Europe and North America for all three species range from USD90-100. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species are sought by private collectors in USA and Europe. • All three species are Critically Endangered (IUCN 2009) with small populations and restricted ranges. • No legal trade authorized by the proponent and sole range State, Honduras. • Honduras states that listing on Appendix II is fundamental to effective regulation of trade in these species; international cooperation is required to protect these Critically Endangered species from trade. • These species would qualify for listing on Appendix I. <p>■ Meet criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraphs A and B): Critically Endangered • fragmented habitat and populations • internationally traded</p>
<p>Prop. 12</p> <p>Guatemalan Spiny-tailed Iguana <i>Ctenosaura palearis</i></p> <p>Guatemala</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Restricted to the upper Rio Motagua Valley in Guatemala with a total range of less than 100 km². • Population: Critically Endangered; may be fewer than 2,500 mature individuals; population severely fragmented: probably 10–15 isolated subpopulations; population has apparently declined over past 20 years but no detailed data prior to 2008; future population declines of at least 30% predicted if current rates of habitat loss continue (IUCN 2009). • Threats: Habitat loss (only 56% of the original distribution area remains); illegal trade; illegal hunting; increase of human population within the 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guatemala is sole range State; Appendix II listing would support Guatemala's national protection efforts and assist in addressing illegal imports into consumer nations. • Illegal harvest for international trade threatens this Critically Endangered, localized species. • Guatemala states that listing in Appendix II is required to prevent need to list species on Appendix I in the future. • This species would qualify for listing on Appendix I.

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>species' range.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trade: National illegal trade of meat and eggs; international illegal trade for the private collectors of live specimens, mainly in USA and Europe; proposal records prices of USD90 in USA and Europe; Internet searches indicate that specimens sell in Europe for 65-125 Euro each; 240 specimens reported imported to USA in 2008; species is protected by law, and no permits are issued for trade. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraph A and B): Critically Endangered • fragmented habitat and population • internationally traded
<p>Prop. 13</p> <p>Tree Frogs <i>Agalychnis</i> spp.</p> <p>Honduras and Mexico</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Found in canopy of lowland to moist montane forests in subtropical and tropical areas in Central and South America; five species now recognized: • <i>A. annae</i>: endemic to Costa Rica; • <i>A. callidryas</i>: Belize, Colombia, Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, and Panama; • <i>A. moreletii</i>: Belize, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Mexico; • <i>A. saltator</i>: Costa Rica, Honduras, and Nicaragua; • <i>A. spurrelli</i>: Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, and Panama. • Population: • <i>A. annae</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2009); population decline of more than 50% in last ten years; • <i>A. callidryas</i>: Least Concern, with declining population trend (IUCN 2009); • <i>A. moreletii</i>: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2009); • <i>A. saltator</i>: Least Concern (IUCN 2009); • <i>A. spurrelli</i>: Least Concern (IUCN 2009). • Threats: Harvesting for international pet trade (<i>A. annae</i>, <i>A. moreletii</i> and <i>A. callidryas</i>); ongoing habitat degradation and destruction through agriculture, logging, pollution and global warming; the fungal disease chytridiomycosis has decimated <i>Agalychnis</i> populations. This disease is probably the main cause of the disappearance of <i>A. moreletii</i> in Mexico. • Trade: USA has imported over 21,800 specimens of <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. annually (at least 20,000 of which were <i>A. callidryas</i>) in past decade.; • <i>A. callidryas</i>: highly sought-after in the international pet trade; widely available in pet shops and dealers in USA and Europe. USA imported at least 207,717 specimens from 1999-2008, 99.8 % for commercial trade; these included specimens from Nicaragua, Guatemala, Panama, Honduras, Mexico, and Costa Rica; Nicaragua exports specimens raised in captivity to USA, Canada, France, Germany, and Netherlands (23,754 in 2006, 24,850 in 2007, 29,354 in 2008); • <i>A. moreletii</i>: common in the pet trade; USA recorded imports (probably of illegal origin) of 168 wild-caught specimens from Guatemala between 1999 and 2008 with 1610 specimens labeled "<i>Agalychnis</i> spp." coming from range of <i>A. moreletii</i>; offered by several pet shops and in private advertisements in USA and Europe (for 25-180 Euro each). • <i>A. spurrelli</i>: occasionally available at reptile fairs, on the Internet and in private advertisements in Europe; USA recorded imports of 21 wild-caught specimens from Costa Rica in last 10 years, with 953 specimens labeled "<i>Agalychnis</i> spp." coming from range of <i>A. spurrelli</i>; • <i>A. annae</i>: offered in pet shops in USA and Europe but not recorded as imported by USA; • <i>A. saltator</i>: no trade recorded. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. are exploited for the international pet trade with demand from USA, Europe, and Japan. • Wild populations of all <i>Agalychnis</i> species except <i>A. saltator</i> are declining, some (e.g. <i>A. annae</i>) drastically; some have limited and fragmented distributions; threatened by over-exploitation for international commercial trade. • In most range States, <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. are nationally protected and commercial exports not allowed. However, importing countries may not be aware of this and allow imports. CITES regulation would address this serious problem. • The entire genus should be listed because the different <i>Agalychnis</i> species are difficult to identify for non-experts. Although some claim that <i>A. callidryas</i> can be distinguished easily from the others because of its reddish-orange eyes, in fact, it is not the only <i>Agalychnis</i> with reddish-orange eyes (both <i>A. spurrellii</i> and <i>A. saltator</i> may have red eyes). In addition, shipments usually contain dozens of individuals, and customs officers will not be able to examine eye color of every specimen. • Many specimens in trade are identified to genus level only, as <i>Agalychnis</i> spp., further supporting a listing of the entire genus, partly in order to regulate trade in the rarer species. • At least 6 of the 10 range States, including major exporting countries, support this proposal. In addition to the proponents, Guatemala, Nicaragua, El Salvador, and Costa Rica have stated that they support the proposal. • The IUCN/SSC Amphibian Specialist Group supports the listing of <i>Agalychnis</i> spp. in Appendix II. <p>■ <i>A. callidryas</i> and <i>A. moreletii</i> meet criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2a, paragraph B): populations in decline and exploited for international trade; <i>A. saltator</i>, <i>A. annae</i> and <i>A. spurrelli</i> meet criteria</p>

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 b, paragraph A) as they resemble <i>A. callidryas</i> and <i>A. moreletii</i>
<p>Prop. 14</p> <p>Kaiser's Newt <i>Neureergus kaiseri</i></p> <p>Iran</p> <p>Include in Appendix I in accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 1, paragraphs A ii), iii) and v), B i), iii) and iv) as well as C ii)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic to four streams (in a single catchment area) within a restricted area of the southern Zagros Mountains of Iran; suitable habitat only known to occur from 1,000-2,000 m above sea level; known area of occupancy is less than 10km². • Population: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2009): species is rare and has experienced a population decline of more than 80% within the past ten years; total population estimated to number fewer than 1,000 mature individuals (Sharifi <i>et al.</i> 2008); populations are severely fragmented. • Threats: Principal and immediate threat is illegal collecting for national and international pet trade; species is also adversely impacted by habitat loss and drought; in at least one stream, the expansion of Dez Dam has allowed fish that prey on salamander eggs and larvae to invade <i>N. kaiseri</i> habitat; climate change may affect survival of <i>N. kaiseri</i> through fluctuation of stream discharge and contraction of optimum habitat as water temperature rises. • Trade: Although protected in Iran and no legal exports are permitted, wild-caught individuals are offered for sale in Europe and in the USA. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population decline of this Critically Endangered species is primarily due to illegal collection for the international pet trade. • The species is likely to become extinct if illegal international trade is not brought under control. • Collectors target adults during the breeding season (when they leave the water), severely reducing the viability of small populations. • This species is nationally protected and commercial exports are not allowed. However, importing countries are often not aware of this and allow imports. Listing of this species in Appendix I will address this serious problem. • Wild-caught specimens of Kaiser's spotted newt are offered for sale in North America, Europe and Japan and can be purchased on the Internet for as much as USD320 each. • The proposal is supported by the IUCN/SSC Amphibian Specialist Group, the Amphibian Ark and leading specialists on the species, Dr. Mozafar Sharifi and Dr. Steve Anderson. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 1, paragraphs A ii), iii) and v), B i), iii) and iv) and C ii): subpopulations very small • high vulnerability to extrinsic factors • restricted area of distribution • projected decrease in distribution, habitat, and number of individuals • marked decline in population size due to decrease in habitat and high levels of exploitation</p>
<p>Prop. 15</p> <p>Scalloped Hammerhead <i>Sphyrna lewini</i></p> <p>Great Hammerhead <i>Sphyrna mokarran</i></p> <p>Smooth Hammerhead <i>Sphyrna zygaena</i></p> <p>Sandbar Shark <i>Carcharhinus plumbeus</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: • <i>S. lewini</i>: coastal and semioceanic species, circumglobal in coastal warm temperate and tropical waters; • <i>S. mokarran</i>: widely distributed, tropical species largely restricted to continental shelves; • <i>S. zygaena</i>: semipelagic species, world-wide in temperate and tropical seas and on the ontinental shelves; • <i>C. plumbeus</i>: coastal species, worldwide in subtropical and warm temperate waters; • <i>C. obscurus</i>: wide-ranging coastal and pelagic species, patchily distributed in tropical and warm temperate seas. • Population: • <i>S. lewini</i>: Endangered (IUCN 2009); globally, stocks of this species have declined to 15-20% of baseline. Northwest Atlantic: populations estimated to have declined by 89% over a 15 year period (1986-2000); more recent data indicate that <i>Sphyrna</i> spp. declined by 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Endangered scalloped hammerhead is increasingly targeted for its fins, which are highly desired and valuable in the international shark fin trade because of their large size and high fin-ray count. • The aggregating behavior of this species makes it vulnerable to over-exploitation because entire schools can be captured during aggregation. • The fins of the species in this proposal are difficult to distinguish: all are large, triangular and have a high fin-ray (cartilage) count. Traders are often able to distinguish them as a group from fins of other species, and customs officials

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Dusky Shark <i>Carcharhinus obscurus</i></p> <p>Palau and the United States of America</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “The entry into effect of the inclusion of these species in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues.”</p>	<p>76% between 1992 and 2005. <i>S. lewini</i> declined by 98% in North Carolina between 1972 and 2003. Annual landings of <i>Sphyrna</i> spp. off southern Brazil fell from 1993/1994 peak (700 metric tons (t)) to between 100 and 300 t (1995-2002), with catch-per-unit effort (CPUE) of <i>S. lewini</i> in the spring gillnet fishery declining by about 60-90% (1993-2001). CPUE of <i>S. lewini</i> in Kwa-Zulu Natal (South Africa) declined from ~5.5/km to ~2/km net/year between 1978 and 2003 – approximately 64% over a 25-year period. Similar declines similar are likely to have occurred elsewhere where this species is heavily fished. The number of adult individuals observed aggregating at Espiritu Santo seamount in the Gulf of California has declined sharply; estimated school size was 525 in 1981, but rarely more than eight between 1998 and 2004 . • <i>S. mokarran</i>: Endangered (IUCN 200); • <i>S. zygaena</i>, <i>C. plumbeus</i>, and <i>C. obscurus</i>: Vulnerable (IUCN 2009).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: <i>S. lewini</i>: extensive target fisheries for fins; high bycatch mortality. • Trade: <i>Sphyrna</i> spp. in this proposal collectively formed a significant proportion of the fin trade (~5.9%) in a 2006 survey in Hong Kong; ~1.3-2.7 million <i>S. zygaena</i> or <i>S. lewini</i> (biomass 49,000-90,000 t) annually in the shark fin trade (Clarke <i>et al.</i> 2006). Fins of <i>Sphyrna</i> spp. have an average auction value of USD125 per kg. <i>S. mokarran</i> fins sell for an average of USD133 per kg. The fins of <i>C. plumbeus</i>, and <i>C. obscurus</i> are also in high demand and are traded internationally. 	<p>can be trained to do the same. Relatively inexpensive DNA tests are also available to confirm species identity. These tests can be carried out within 24 hours.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listing on Appendix II will ensure that international trade is sustainably managed and accurately recorded, as per the voluntary International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks) of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). • The FAO Ad Hoc Panel concluded that the three species of hammerhead (<i>S. lewini</i>, <i>S. mokarran</i> and <i>S. zygaena</i>) meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II, but did not feel that there was sufficient information to list <i>C. obscurus</i> or <i>C. plumbeus</i> in accordance with Article II paragraph 2(b) of the Convention. <p>■ <i>S. lewini</i> meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a): internationally traded • declining wild populations • known, or can be inferred or projected, that the regulation of trade in the species is necessary to avoid it becoming eligible for inclusion in Appendix I in the near future. The other species satisfy Criterion A in Annex 2b of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) for look-alike reasons</p>
<p>Prop. 16</p> <p>Oceanic Whitetip Shark <i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i></p> <p>Palau and USA</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Carcharhinus longimanus</i> in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Widespread in tropical and subtropical waters; usually found far offshore between about 30° N and 30° S in all oceans; range includes the western Atlantic from Portugal to the Gulf of Guinea, and possibly the Mediterranean. In the Indo-Pacific, found from the Red Sea and the coast of East Africa to Hawaii, Samoa, Tahiti and the Tuamoto Islands. In the eastern Pacific, ranges from southern California south to Peru. • Population: Vulnerable (IUCN 2009); Critically Endangered (IUCN 2009) in Northwest Atlantic and West Central Atlantic, based on enormous reported declines. IUCN has stated that if data from areas outside the northwest and western central Atlantic were available, the global population would probably be shown to have experienced similar declines, since fisheries for the species are similar in other areas. • Threats: Overexploitation, mainly for the fin trade; species unmanaged throughout its range; falls into FAO’s lowest productivity category of the most vulnerable commercially exploited aquatic species. • Trade: The large fins of this species are prized in international trade. They have been described as a ‘preferred species’ (Vannuccini 1999) for shark fin soup. Their fins accounted for approximately 1.8% of the fins surveyed in Hong Kong fin markets in 2006. Fins of <i>C. longimanus</i> have 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This formerly widespread and abundant species is subject to unsustainable fishing pressure throughout its range. • Drastic declines reported for well-studied stocks; where unregulated fisheries represent a source of supply for the international trade, other stocks are also likely to be declining rapidly. • The high value of the fins and low value of the meat has led to widespread finning. White-tipped fins easy to identify; relatively inexpensive DNA tests are also available to confirm species identity. • Listing on Appendix II will ensure that international trade is sustainably managed and accurately recorded, as per the FAO’s voluntary International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). • The FAO Ad Hoc Panel concluded that this species meets the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a): internationally traded • declining wild</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	an average auction price of USD122 per kg.	populations • known, or can be inferred or projected, that the regulation of trade in the species is necessary to avoid it becoming eligible for inclusion in Appendix I in the near future
<p>Prop. 17</p> <p>Porbeagle <i>Lamna nasus</i></p> <p>Palau and Sweden on behalf of the Member States of the European Community</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: "The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Lamna nasus</i> in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve related technical and administrative issues, such as the possible designation of an additional Management Authority and adoption of Customs codes."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Coastal and oceanic species found worldwide in temperate and cold-temperate waters; centers of distribution in the North Atlantic and in a circumglobal band in the southern Atlantic, southern Indian, southern Pacific and Antarctic Oceans. ● Population: Vulnerable; Northeast Atlantic and Mediterranean subpopulations Critically Endangered; Northwest Atlantic subpopulation Endangered (IUCN 2009). 2009 assessments of North and South Atlantic stocks have shown historical declines to <30% of baseline, and more recent rates of decline of >50%; other southern hemisphere stocks caught in targeted fisheries and as bycatch also declining; estimated generation time at least 18 years in the North Atlantic and 26 years in the southern Oceans. ● Threats: Main threat is unsustainable fisheries (target and bycatch) driven by high market value of meat and fins; target fisheries in North Atlantic unsustainable for decades, with annual landings falling from thousands of tonnes to a few hundred in less than 50 years; southern stocks much smaller, slower-growing and longer-lived than northern stocks, making them more vulnerable to overfishing; without sustainable management southern hemisphere stocks likely to experience declines similar to those of northern hemisphere stocks. ● Trade: Meat traded internationally at high prices, both fresh and frozen; fins valuable and prevalent in the international fin trade; other products traded internationally include leather and liver oil, and probably cartilage and other parts. Trade records are generally not species-specific; international trade levels, patterns and trends are largely unknown. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Low reproductive capacity and high commercial value of both mature and immature age classes makes this species highly vulnerable to over-exploitation and population depletion. ● Falls into the lowest productivity category of the most vulnerable species of the FAO. ● Marked population decline meets CITES and FAO guidelines for listing of commercially exploited aquatic species. ● Identification possible: meat often identified by name; a generic guide to the identification of shark fins is currently in preparation. Relatively inexpensive DNA tests are also available to confirm species identity. Turn-around time for these tests is in the region of 2–7 days from receipt of sample, depending upon urgency ● Listing on Appendix II will ensure that international trade is sustainably managed and accurately recorded, as per the FAO's voluntary International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks). ● In December 2009, the Council of the European Union agreed on a zero Total Allowable Catch for porbeagle sharks for the year 2010. ● The FAO Ad Hoc Panel concluded that this species meets the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraphs A and B and Annex 2b, paragraph A): marked decline due to over-exploitation • CITES regulation needed to avoid qualifying for Appendix I in near future</p>
<p>Prop. 18</p> <p>Spiny Dogfish <i>Squalus acanthias</i></p> <p>Palau and Sweden on behalf of the Member States of the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Highly migratory; found in temperate and boreal waters in the northern and southern hemispheres, including the Northwest and Northeast Atlantic, Northwest and Northeast Pacific, South Atlantic and Southeast Pacific Oceans; occurs on the continental shelf, from the intertidal to the shelf slope; usually found in large aggregations just above the seafloor. ● Population: Vulnerable; Northeast Atlantic subpopulation Critically 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Despite drastic population declines across the globe, large quantities continue to be traded internationally. ● Regional and international conservation measures for this species have yet to be implemented. ● Listing on Appendix II will ensure that international trade is sustainably managed and accurately recorded, as per the

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>European Community</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: "The entry into effect of the inclusion of <i>Squalus acanthias</i> in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve related technical and administrative issues, such as the development of stock assessments and collaborative management agreements for shared stocks and the possible designation of an additional Scientific or Management Authority."</p>	<p>Endangered; Mediterranean Sea, Northwest Atlantic and Northwest Pacific subpopulations Endangered; Black Sea, Northeast Pacific and South American subpopulations Vulnerable (IUCN 2009); northern populations show declines ranging from 40% to 99%; southern hemisphere data show declines from 20% to 50%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: Major threats are over-exploitation by targeted fisheries and bycatch, unregulated trade and inadequate management of populations; fisheries preferentially targeting aggregations of mature, and usually pregnant, females have led to drastic reductions in population size and changes in demographic structure; among the most vulnerable of all shark species to overexploitation owing to its aggregating habit, late maturity, low reproductive capacity, longevity, long generation time and extremely low intrinsic rate of population increase; falls into FAO's lowest productivity category for commercially exploited aquatic species. • Trade: Meat widely consumed, particularly in Europe: used in fish and chips (UK) and "Schillerlocken" (Germany); also eaten in other EU countries and Japan. Oil, fins and hides widely traded in international markets. As European stocks decline, demand is being met by frozen imports from 25 countries, dominated by the USA and Argentina. 	<p>FAO's voluntary International Plan of Action for the Conservation and Management of Sharks (IPOA-Sharks).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relatively inexpensive DNA tests are available to confirm species identity. These tests can be carried out within one week. • In December 2009, the Council of the European Union agreed to a 90% reduction in Total Allowable Catch for spiny dogfish for the year 2010, leaving a 10% allowance for by-catch. • This species is among the most vulnerable of all sharks to overexploitation and falls into FAO's lowest productivity category for commercially exploited aquatic species. • The FAO Ad Hoc Panel concluded that this species does not meet the criteria for inclusion in Appendix II because they interpret criterion B in Annex 2a of RC 9.24 to mean that the species must already have suffered a marked decline to be listed on Appendix II; whereas, the Secretariat has advised that decline is not relevant to criterion B and that this criterion is meant to be used to include a species on Appendix II to prevent decline; SSN agrees with the Secretariat's interpretation of criterion B (see SSN View on CoP15 Doc. 63). • The apparently high numbers of spiny dogfish in some areas should not be used as a reason to oppose the listing; other populations have suffered significant declines; and given its life history characteristics and the way that fisheries target mature and usually pregnant females, populations that may seem large now can decline rapidly. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraphs A and B and Annex 2b, paragraph A): marked decline due to over-exploitation • CITES regulation under Appendix II needed to avoid qualifying for Appendix I in future</p>
<p>Prop. 19</p> <p>Northern Bluefin Tuna <i>Thunnus thynnus</i></p> <p>Monaco</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix I in accordance with RC 9.24 (Rev.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Throughout the North Atlantic Ocean and its adjacent seas, particularly the Mediterranean Sea; usually occupies surface and subsurface waters to 200m in coastal and open-sea areas. • Population: Globally Data Deficient (IUCN 2009; reviewed in 1996, needs updating); Western Atlantic stock Critically Endangered; Eastern Atlantic and Mediterranean stock Endangered (assessments IUCN 2009); absolute extent of decline in East Atlantic and Mediterranean between 1957 and 2007 estimated at 74.2%, 60.9% within the period 1997-2007 scientists estimate that the Eastern Atlantic and 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The northern bluefin tuna has suffered a marked decline in the size of its wild population due to overexploitation. • Currently managed under the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas (ICCAT) which has no means of ensuring that adopted quotas are enforced or reporting is accurate; 2007 total catch estimated to be more than double the Total Allowable Catch (TAC) adopted by ICCAT.

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
CoP14), Annex 1, paragraph A) iii) and v) and paragraph C) i) and ii)	<p>Mediterranean stock is near collapse; absolute extent of decline in Western Atlantic between 1970 and 2007 estimated at 82.4%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Threats: Overexploitation for legal trade; illegal, unregulated and underreported fishing (IUU) habitat destruction and degradation. • Trade: Detrimentially affected by massive international trade, including illegal trade, largely to satisfy demand for sushi and sashimi markets in Japan. Estimated annual catch 2004-2007 ranged from 44,948 – 61,000t. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During their meeting in October 2009, ICCAT's Standing Committee on Research and Statistics (SCRS) confirmed that there is virtual certainty (96% probability) that the 2009 Spawning Stock Biomass (SSB) of the eastern stock of Atlantic bluefin tuna has fallen to less than 15% of its long term potential (equivalent to "historical abundance"). The SCRS also found that there is greater than 90% probability that the SSB of the western stock of the species is less than 15% of long term potential (ICCAT Doc. No. PA2-604 / 2009). This is well within the suggested guideline of 5-20% of baseline for a marked recent rate of decline for a commercially exploited aquatic species given in RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14). • The northern bluefin tuna is particularly vulnerable to overexploitation because it is a late maturing, low productivity species, with two to three years between spawnings. • ICCAT members have repeatedly failed to adopt science-based conservation measures for bluefin tuna. For example, while ICCAT's SCRS recommended a TAC of 15,000 t for 2007, the members of ICCAT set a TAC of 29,500 t for that year. • At its annual meeting in November 2009, ICCAT set an annual catch limit for 2010 of 13,500 t and agreed that this may be reduced to zero if scientists predict a total stock collapse during 2010. This quota could be raised at the next annual ICCAT meeting which will be held after CITES CoP15. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix I (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 1, paragraph C (i)): marked decline of the size of the wild population • greatly overfished • significant presence in international trade</p>
<p>Prop. 20</p> <p>Satanas Beetle <i>Dynastes satanas</i></p> <p>Bolivia</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Very limited; endemic to rainforests from 900 to 2000 m elevation in the Regions of La Paz and Cochabamba, Bolivia. • Population: Proposal states that the species' habitat is very reduced and fragmented and that, according to local settlers, populations are also very reduced. • Threats: Illegal international trade; habitat loss due to agriculture expansion. • Trade: Not legally traded in Bolivia; significant illegal trade in both live and dead specimens for private collectors: 634 specimens seized in 	<p>NO OPINION</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently no beetles on Appendix II. <i>D. satanas</i> is a rhinoceros beetle; these are among the largest and most striking beetles and are in great demand by collectors; often sold as larvae. • SSN commends the Government of Bolivia for bringing this proposal forward, and accepts that the species may benefit from listing. However, the proposal lacks the population and trade data that may be needed to support listing on Appendix II.

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>2007 alone; though no exports authorized from Bolivia, specimens are advertised for sale on the Internet for up to USD220 from suppliers in Canada, China, France, Germany, Japan and Russia.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN recommends that, should the proposal be unsuccessful, Bolivia should list the species on Appendix III. • SSN also recommends that, in that case, the Parties direct the AC to work with the Government of Bolivia to address the situation of this species, in order to determine if a revised listing proposal should be brought forward at CoP16. • SSN also urges the Parties to direct the AC to investigate the commercial trade in beetles generally, a trade that involves many rare and valuable species but remains largely unregulated.
<p>Prop. 21</p> <p>Pink and Red Coral Coralliidae (<i>Corallium</i> spp. and <i>Paracorallium</i> spp.)</p> <p>Sweden on behalf of the Member States of the European Community and USA</p> <p>Inclusion of all species in the family in Appendix-II with the following annotation: “The entry into effect of the inclusion of species in the family Coralliidae in Appendix II of CITES will be delayed by 18 months to enable Parties to resolve the related technical and administrative issues.”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Includes over 30 pink and red coral species; found worldwide in tropical, subtropical and temperate oceans; only known populations of <i>Corallium</i> large enough to support commercial harvest found north of 19° N latitude, including 7 Pacific and 1 Mediterranean species. • Population: Life-history characteristics (extreme longevity, late age of maturity, slow growth and low fecundity) make these corals particularly vulnerable to overexploitation; global harvest statistics (1950-2001) indicate rapid decline of Mediterranean and Pacific species following inception of commercial fishing, increase in landings and overexploitation; most western Pacific populations of <i>Corallium</i> depleted within 4–5 years of their discovery; Mediterranean <i>C. rubrum</i> populations have decreased dramatically in size, age structure and reproductive output over last 20 years; only remaining commercially valuable beds now found along African coasts from Morocco to Tunisia, in the Bonifacio Strait off western Sardinia and along Spain’s Mediterranean coast. • Threats: Greatest threat worldwide is harvest to supply international trade; secondary human impacts include pollution, sedimentation, tourism and recreational diving (Mediterranean), and incidental take and habitat degradation associated with longline fishing and bottom trawling (Western Pacific). • Trade: Traded as whole, dried colonies; unworked branches and branch fragments; beads and polished stones; manufactured jewelry; and powder, pills, granules, ointment and liquid. USA is the largest consumer of all precious corals; from 2001 to 2008, USA imported over 26 million worked pieces and 51,456 kg of manufactured items, mostly from China, Taiwan (Province of China), and Italy (proposal Annex Fig. 4). These imports consisted mainly of <i>C. elatius</i>, <i>P. japonicum</i>, <i>C. rubrum</i> and <i>C. secundum</i>. <i>Corallium</i> is the most valuable genus of precious coral and is highly valued for jewelry and art objects; superior beads fetch prices of up to USD50 per gram and necklaces cost up to USD25,000. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International demand has contributed to serial depletions of most known populations of pink and red corals; new stocks have been rapidly exhausted shortly after their discovery. • Overexploitation has shifted population size and age structure; populations now dominated by small colonies lacking the recruitment potential necessary to sustain themselves. • Since 1990, no new large commercially viable beds have been discovered; landings have remained at historically low levels, 10-20% of that reported in the late 1980s, evidence that populations are severely depleted. • There are no international trade control or management measures for the genus <i>Corallium</i>. • The delay in implementation of the listing will allow Parties to resolve any related technical and administrative issues. <p>■ <i>C. rubrum</i>, <i>C. secundum</i>, <i>C. lauuense</i> (<i>C. regale</i>), <i>P. japonicum</i>, <i>C. elatius</i>, <i>C. konojoi</i>, and <i>C. sp. nov</i> meet the criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraph B): declining wild populations • overexploited for international trade • slow growth rates and late reproductive maturity. The other 24 described species satisfy RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2b, paragraph A for look-alike reasons</p>

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 22</p> <p>Jabihy <i>Operculicarya decaryi</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic to xerophytic forests, especially on limestone (Rauh 1998), in Madagascar's Toliara Province. ● Population: Proposal states that the species meets the criteria for listing as Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List; in 2006, 440 plants counted in the Tongobory site; other areas reported to have a similar number of specimens. ● Threats: Overcollecting for international ornamental plant trade; loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures. ● Trade: Traded live as potted plants, including as bonsai; traded internationally as seedlings; trade is increasing; between 2003 and 2006, 3398 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; exports increased from 56 seedlings in 2003 to 2,647 in 2006; found for sale on various Internet websites (typical price is 27 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Population apparently small; plants are slow-growing; propagation from seed is very slow and modest-sized plants require several years growth (Rauh 1998). ● There is a high demand for the species in trade, reflected by the widespread offer of sale of the species on the Internet. ● Significant recent increase in exports suggests that current trade may not be sustainable. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • small wild population • high global demand • high levels of reported international trade</p>
<p>Prop. 23</p> <p>Sakoakomba <i>Operculicarya hyphaenoides</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic species restricted to a few sites in Southern Madagascar. ● Population: Proposal states that, based on 2006 field research, the species meets the criteria for listing as Endangered in the IUCN Red List; in 2006, 550 plants counted on the Toliara table mountain. ● Threats: Overcollection for international trade; exploitation for medicinal use (bark used locally after childbirth); habitat loss and degradation; anthropomorphic pressures (fires). ● Trade: Traded as potted plants, including as bonsai; also traded internationally as seedlings; trade is increasing; between 2003 and 2006, 581 plants legally exported from Madagascar, 395 of these in 2006 alone, up from 25 seedlings exported in 2003; found for sale on the Internet (typical price is 186 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grows in non-protected areas subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressures. ● Concentrated geographically in a few sites. ● Small population. ● High demand reflected by availability on the Internet. ● Significant recent increase in exports suggests that current trade may not be sustainable. ● Species would qualify for listing in Appendix I. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a): endangered • internationally traded • small wild population • concentrated geographically • global demand</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 24</p> <p><i>Operculicarya pachypus</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic to the Toliara table mountain in southern Madagascar. • Population: Proposal states that, based on 2006 field research, the species meets the criteria for listing as Critically Endangered in the IUCN Red List; 705 plants counted over 1 hectare in Andatabo (total site area 15 ha); a second site holds a similar number of individuals. • Threats: Overcollection for international trade; exploitation for medicinal use (bark used locally to treat diarrhea); continuing habitat loss due to fires. • Trade: Traded as potted plants, including as bonsai; also traded internationally as seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 1853 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; reported exports rose from 70 in 2003 to 1,212 in 2004, then fell sharply to 312 in 2005 and 259 in 2006; prized by collectors; occasionally advertised on the Internet; high market value (sample price is 407 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small population found only in a few sites; grows in non-protected areas subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressures (fires); may be Critically Endangered. • Collectors reportedly take all specimens they find. • High demand for the species in trade, reflected by high market value and offers of sale on the Internet. • Decrease in the number of specimens exported (from 1,212 in 2004 to 259 in 2006) may be evidence of acute recent population decline. • Species would qualify for listing in Appendix I. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a): possibly Critically Endangered • internationally traded • small wild population • concentrated geographically • global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 25</p> <p>CACTACEAE spp. and all taxa with annotation #1</p> <p>Mexico and the United States of America, on behalf of the Plants Committee</p> <p>Delete annotations #1 and #4 and replace them both with the following new annotation for plant taxa listed in Appendix II: All parts and derivatives, except: a) seeds (including seedpods of Orchidaceae), spores and pollen (including pollinia) except those seeds from Cactaceae spp. exported from Mexico; b) seedlings or tissue cultures obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers; c) cut flowers of artificially propagated plants; d) fruits and parts and derivatives thereof of naturalized or artificially propagated plants of the genera</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decision 14.130 directed the PC to: analyze the amendments of annotations #1, #4 and #8 of CoP14 Prop. 26 in order to decide whether there is merit in further developing and refining them; and if appropriate, prepare a proposal on annotations for CoP15. • Annotation 8 was eliminated at CoP14. • PC17 asked the working group on this issue to clarify the translation of "cactus without chlorophyll" from footnote 6 of the Appendices, since this phrase is not technically accurate and results in enforcement problems. • This proposal is the outcome of the PC debate on these issues. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SSN supports the recommendations of the PC.

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><i>Vanilla</i> (Orchidaceae), <i>Opuntia</i> subgenus <i>Opuntia</i> (Cactaceae), <i>Hylocereus</i> and <i>Selenicereus</i> (Cactaceae); e) stems, flowers, and parts and derivatives thereof of naturalized or artificially propagated plants of the genera <i>Opuntia</i> subgenus <i>Opuntia</i> and <i>Selenicereus</i> (Cactaceae); and f) finished products of <i>Euphorbia antisyphilitica</i> packaged and ready for retail trade.</p> <p>Amend footnote 6 as follows (delete struck-through text): Artificially propagated specimens of the following hybrids and/or cultivars are not subject to the provisions of the Convention:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>Hatiora x graeseri</i> – <i>Schlumbergera x buckleyi</i> – <i>Schlumbergera russelliana x Schlumbergera truncata</i> – <i>Schlumbergera orssichiana x Schlumbergera truncata</i> – <i>Schlumbergera opuntioides x Schlumbergera truncata</i> – <i>Schlumbergera truncata</i> (cultivars) – Cactaceae spp. colour mutants lacking chlorophyll, grafted on the following grafting stocks: <i>Harrisia 'Jusbertii'</i>, <i>Hylocereus trigonus</i> or <i>Hylocereus undatus</i> – <i>Opuntia microdasys</i> (cultivars) 		
<p>Prop. 26</p> <p><i>Zygosicyos pubescens</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic to the Ekodida forest in South Amboasary, Madagascar. ● Population: Proposal states that, based on 2006 field research, the species meets the criteria for listing as Endangered in the IUCN Red List; 150 plants counted in 3 hectares in the Ekodida forest. ● Threats: Overcollection for international trade; small, very localized distribution; habitat subject to high anthropomorphic pressures. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The species is endemic to one small non-protected area that is subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressures. ● Known population very small (150 total). ● High demand for the species in trade, reflected by its availability for sale on the Internet. ● Exports (25 in 2004 and 2005, 32 in 2006) represent a

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Trade: Traded as potted plants; also traded internationally as seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 82 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; offered for sale on various Internet websites (typical price is 18-33 Euro). 	<p>significant proportion of the present known population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Species would qualify for listing in Appendix I. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a): endangered • internationally traded • small wild population • concentrated geographically • global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 27</p> <p><i>Zygosicyos tripartitus</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic species restricted to southern and central regions of Madagascar. ● Population: Proposal states that the species is considered vulnerable based on 2006 field research; 900 plants counted in Ambarazy and Andrahomana forests. ● Threats: Overcollection for international trade; fragmentation and loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures; trampling of young plants by cattle prevents regeneration. ● Trade: Traded as potted plants; also traded internationally as seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 4865 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; exports increased from 250 seedlings in 2003 to 1845 in 2006; found for sale on Internet websites (typical price is 30-101 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Grows in non-protected areas subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressures. ● Habitat fragmented. ● Small population size. ● High demand in trade reflected by widespread offer of sale on the Internet. ● Increase in exports of concern given small population size. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a): internationally traded • small wild population • high global demand and high levels of reported international trade</p>
<p>Prop. 28</p> <p>Cliff Spurge <i>Euphorbia misera</i></p> <p>Mexico and the United States of America</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Native to xeric and maritime scrub in primarily coastal areas of north-western Mexico and the south-western USA, including offshore islands; distribution highly fragmented; USA range reduced prior to 1990s; more than half of known localities in protected areas. ● Population: No estimate; 26 sites in the USA with populations ranging from 10-20 to over 1,000 plants; “locally common” on seaside cliffs in Baja California, Mexico. ● Threats: Fragmented distribution; low reproductive output; habitat destruction (erosion, coastal development); herbivory by introduced rabbits and ungulates; species considered to be at “moderate risk” of extinction. ● Trade: Listed on Appendix II in 1975; locally used as medicine by Seri Indians in Mexico; domestic trade in artificially propagated specimens for ornamental use in USA; illegal to harvest wild plants without a permit in USA; no known illegal or international trade except for single export from USA of 5 cultivated plants in 1990s. 	<p>OPPOSE</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Although there may be little reason to retain this species on the Appendices as international trade in wild specimens is minimal to nonexistent (although harvest for local use occurs in Mexico), the PC has yet to discuss this species as part of its review of succulent <i>Euphorbia</i> spp.; although USA submitted a document on this species to the PC, the Committee was not able to discuss it. ● Delisting should be deferred until after the PC review, particularly to confirm that no look-alike problems exist, particularly with species outside of USA and Mexico.

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>Prop. 29</p> <p>Brazilian Rosewood, Pau Rosa <i>Aniba rosaeodora</i></p> <p>Brazil</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “#11 Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood, powder and extracts”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Tropical rainforest in the Amazon Basin; range States include Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guiana, Guyana, Peru, Suriname, and Venezuela. ● Population: Endangered (IUCN 2009); occurs in low densities; populations exhausted in French Guiana and Peru by past overexploitation; extinct in Colombia and Suriname; in Brazil considered an overexploited species being driven towards economic extinction. In recent years, the production of rosewood oil has diminished despite increasing value because of exhaustion of the resource. ● Threats: Intense overexploitation to extract rosewood essential oil, a valuable ingredient in the international perfume industry; trees of all sizes harvested indiscriminately; also threatened by clear-cutting for agriculture which opens access to additional populations. ● Trade: Brazilian rosewood oil production is presently 38 tons per year, worth USD2.8 million, representing an unsustainable loss of 4,000 rosewood trees per year (Barata 2001); exports of the essential oil are significantly higher than the amount that can be produced from legally extracted timber, indicating high-volume illegal logging; currently Brazil is only legal exporter. Also in demand for veneer, turning and furniture. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Intense exploitation means that areas with easy access have been largely depleted; demand continues to grow. ● Harvesting is taking place in increasingly remote locations concentrated around Amazon tributaries. ● Where exploitation has occurred, no mature trees remain and signs of regeneration are absent. ● Though there are synthetic alternatives to rosewood oil, the natural oil is considered to be of higher quality. ● Participation of importing countries needed to ensure that trade and use of rosewood oil for the perfume industry are both legal and sustainable. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraph A): endangered and in decline because of trade • trade regulation needed to avoid Appendix I listing and ensure sustainable and legal harvests and trade</p>
<p>Prop. 30</p> <p><i>Senna meridionalis</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic species with very fragmented range in southern and southwestern Madagascar. ● Population: Proposal states that the species is considered vulnerable based on 2006 field research; in 2006, 420 plants (150 mature specimens) counted in Ahaviro in the Toliara table mountain area. ● Threats: Overcollection for international trade; fragmentation and loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures (fires). ● Trade: Traded as seeds or potted plants including as bonsai; also traded internationally as seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 672 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; exports fell from 483 in 2004 to 23 in 2006; offered for sale on various Internet websites (typical price is USD85). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Most specimens grow in non-protected areas subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressures. ● Habitat very fragmented. ● Population small with few mature plants. ● Decrease in number of international traded seedlings may be a sign of depletion. ● Species is considered the most attractive Madagascan Senna (Rauh 1998); high demand reflected by offers for sale on the Internet. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 31</p> <p>ORCHIDACEAE spp. included in Appendix I</p> <p>United States of America</p> <p>Amend the annotation to the listing of Orchidaceae included</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The current annotation states: “For all of the following Appendix-I species, seedling or tissue cultures obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, transported in sterile containers are not subject to the provisions of the Convention.” ● Currently, this annotation and RC 11.11 (Rev. CoP14), Regulation of trade in plants, regarding flasks seedlings of Appendix-I orchids, are inconsistent, creating confusion and inconsistency in the implementation of the Convention for trade in flasks seedlings of these species. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed amendment is needed to better control illegal trade in Appendix I orchid species by clarifying the annotation for Appendix-I orchids and assisting enforcement officers with greater guidance on application of the exemption.

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p>in Appendix I, as follows: Delete the current annotation and replace with the following new annotation: "For all of the following Appendix-I species, seedling or tissue cultures obtained <i>in vitro</i>, in solid or liquid media, and transported in sterile containers are not subject to the provisions of the Convention only if the specimens meet the definition of 'artificially propagated' agreed by the Conference of the Parties."</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This inconsistency has led to flaked seedlings of newly discovered Appendix-I orchid species (and their hybrids) entering legal trade that have been produced from illegally acquired and exported parental stock. • It has been documented that this illegal collection and trade has had a detrimental impact on wild populations of some species, including the near-extirpation of <i>Paphiopedilum vietnamense</i>. • PC17 supported the submission of this amendment proposal. 	
<p>Prop. 32</p> <p><i>Beccariophoenix madagascariensis</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion of seeds in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic to East Madagascar. • Population: Critically Endangered (IUCN 2009); distribution highly fragmented; of 3 sub-populations studied: 16 mature plants found in Saint Luce and on average only 10 mature plants at other sites. • Threats: Overcollection of seeds and mature individuals for international trade; exploitation of leaves for basketry; exploitation of mature plants for terminal buds; loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures. • Trade: Species currently listed on Appendix II with annotation #1, excluding seeds from CITES control; traded as potted plants, seeds and seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 3 seedlings, 2 kg of seeds and 200 seeds were legally exported from Madagascar. Seeds offered for sale on the Internet (sample prices: 100 seeds for 18 Euro; 1000 seeds for 110 Euro; 5 seeds for 3.5 Euro). UNEP-WCMC CITES Trade Database shows that between 2000 and 2008, exports amounted to 6 dried plants, 40 leaves, 69 live specimens, 40 kg of seeds, and 4002 seeds. Main exporter of seeds was Madagascar (36 kg of seeds and 4002 seeds exported by Madagascar from 2000 to 2008). Main importers of seeds were USA and UK. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is a request to amend the current annotation to the listing of this species in Appendix II (#1, which removes seeds from CITES controls) so that trade in seeds will be regulated under the listing. • There is a demand for the seeds as reflected by their availability on the Internet. Decrease in exports between 2005 and 2008 (from 4000 seeds and 2 kg of seeds exported by Madagascar in 2005 to 0 exported in 2008) is a strong signal of a sudden and acute decline in population size over a short period of time. • Unregulated exports of seeds likely to further jeopardize the species.
<p>Prop. 33</p> <p>Triangle Palm <i>Dypsis decaryi</i> [<i>Neodypsis decaryi</i>]</p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion of seeds in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic species with very small range; found only in southern Madagascar. • Population: Vulnerable (IUCN, 2009; assessed 1998; includes annotation that assessment needs updating); about 100 populations; 120 plants counted in Andohahela National Park. • Threats: Overcollection of seeds for international trade; local exploitation of leaves to make roofs and fruits for local drinks; loss of habitat. • Trade: Species currently listed on Appendix II with annotation #1, excluding seeds from CITES control; traded as potted plants, seeds and seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 2 seedlings and 341 kg of seeds 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is a request to amend the current annotation to the listing of this species in Appendix II (#1, which excludes seeds from CITES controls) so that trade in seeds will be regulated under the listing. • Some plants grow in a non-protected area and are subject to unrestricted collecting of seeds. • High demand for seeds reflected by availability on the Internet. • Unregulated exports of seeds likely to further jeopardize the

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	<p>were legally exported from Madagascar. Seeds offered for sale on Internet (sample prices: 5 seeds for 2.6 Euro or 100 seeds for 26 Euro; sale of seeds by auction for starting price of 2.07 Euro per seed). The UNEP WCMC CITES Trade Database shows that between 2000 and 2008 exports included 60 kg of derivatives, 40,000 leaves, 6804 kg of live specimens, 381,471 live specimens, 250 kg of seeds and 4 seeds. Main exporters were non-range States: Costa Rica, Guatemala, and Honduras. Main importers were the Netherlands, Spain and Japan. Proposal states that listing the seeds on Appendix II will allow the Management Authority to ensure that only seedlings deriving from ex-situ propagation are exported.</p>	<p>species.</p>
<p>Prop. 34 <i>Adenia firingalavensis</i> Madagascar Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic species with wide distribution in Madagascar. ● Population: Proposal states that, based on 2006 field research, the species meets criteria for listing as Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List; 150 plants counted in the Andoharano forest. ● Threats: Overcollection for international ornamental plant trade; exploitation for medicinal use (bark used locally to treat scabies); fragmentation and loss of forests due to anthropomorphic pressures. ● Trade: All <i>Adenia</i> species are caudiciform (stem) succulents, in trade as live adult specimens (IUCN/SSC Cactus and Succulent Specialist Group 1997); also traded internationally as seedlings; 554 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar between 2003 and 2006; exports declined from 358 in 2004 to 10 in 2006; species found for sale on the Internet (typical price is 25 Euro for a small specimen and 89 Euro for a larger plant). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Species is vulnerable due to very slow natural growth and poor regeneration; unregulated exploitation is likely to lead to depletion and prevent natural regeneration. ● Small population size reported; significant decrease in number of exported seedlings may be a sign of depletion of the population. ● High demand for the species in trade, reflected by widespread offers of sale on the Internet. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • small wild population • low regeneration rates • poor management due to lack of regulations • high global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 35 <i>Adenia olaboensis</i> Madagascar Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic species with wide distribution in Madagascar; found in the district of Betioky in Ampandrandava, in the North of Belo in Tsiribihina, in Antsalova and in Toliara, Mahajanga and Fianarantsoa provinces. ● Population: Proposal states that the species is considered vulnerable based on 2006 field research; 250 plants counted in South from Tongobory in the Andriamananga forest to Ambovombe. ● Threats: Overcollection for ornamental plant trade; fragmentation and loss of forests due to anthropomorphic pressures. ● Trade: All <i>Adenia</i> species are caudiciform (stem) succulents, in trade as adult specimens (IUCN/SSC Cactus and Succulent Specialist Group, 1997); also traded internationally as seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 680 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; exports declined from 387 in 2004 to 0 in 2006; found for sale on the Internet (typical prices: 10 seeds for 11 Euro, or plants approximately 1 m high for 49.50 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Unregulated exploitation is likely to lead to depletion and prevent natural regeneration. ● Small population reported; significant decrease in number of exported seedlings may be a sign of depletion of the population. ● High demand for the species in trade, reflected by the widespread offer of sale on the Internet. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • small wild population • poor management due to lack of regulations • high global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 36</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic species with wide but fragmented and localized 	<p>SUPPORT</p>

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
<p><i>Adenia subsessifolia</i> [<i>Adenia subsessilifolia</i>]</p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<p>range in Madagascar.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Population: Proposal states that, based on 2006 field research, the species meets the criteria to be listed as Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List; 100 plants counted in the Toliara table mountain,; in the two other sites (Réserve Spéciale de Cap Sainte Marie, and Behara), total population amounts to no more than 50 mature plants. ● Threats: Overcollection for ornamental plant trade; exploitation for medicinal use (powder made from the stem is used to heal wounds); disturbance of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures. ● Trade: All <i>Adenia</i> species are caudiciform (stem) succulents, in trade as adult specimens (IUCN/SSC Cactus and Succulent Specialist Group, 1997); also traded internationally as seedlings; between 2003 and 2006, 126 seedlings legally exported from Madagascar; exports declined from 115 in 2004 to 8 in 2006; found for sale on the Internet (typical price is 10 Euro). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Unregulated exploitation is likely to lead to depletion and prevent natural regeneration. ● Small population size reported; significant decrease in number of exported seedlings may be a sign of depletion of the population. ● High demand for the species in trade, reflected by the widespread offer of sale on the Internet. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • small wild population • global demand</p>
<p>Prop. 37</p> <p>Marsh Rose <i>Orothamnus zeyheri</i></p> <p>South Africa</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II in accordance with precautionary measure A.1. as specified in Annex 4 of RC 9.24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic to mountain fynbos vegetation in the Kogelberg and Klein River Mountains of Western Cape Province, South Africa; no decline in overall range known. ● Population: 18 subpopulations; number of individuals fluctuates but probably no more than 2000 (highest number counted is 1956). ● Threats: Heavily collected as a cut flower in first half of 20th century (picking all flowers and leaves kills plant); harvesting from wild now illegal; fungus disease and consumption by rodents now chief threats. ● Trade: Listed on Appendix I in 1975; transferred to Appendix II in 1997; no international trade recorded since 1981; only trade in artificially propagated material now allowed under South African law. 	<p>SUPPORT WITH CONCERNS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN commends South Africa for observing precautionary measure A (1) of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) by waiting 12 years after species was transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II before proposing deletion from the Appendices. ● Species was historically in trade for its attractive flowers; proponent states that domestic laws now prevent this. ● SSN is concerned that deletion will result in species moving to a lower level of protection under South African domestic law, and urges the South African government to take steps to mitigate this situation should the species be deleted.
<p>Prop. 38</p> <p>Swartland Sugarbush <i>Protea odorata</i></p> <p>South Africa</p> <p>Deletion from Appendix II in accordance with precautionary measure A.1 as specified in Annex 4 of RC 9.24</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic to renosterveld vegetation in Western Cape Province of South Africa; formerly in 5 populations between Paarl and Malmesbury. ● Population: Currently (since 2000) one population on privately-owned land containing an estimated 27 wild plants. ● Threats: Loss of habitat to agriculture and burning for cattle pasture; habitat degradation from invasive <i>Acacia saligna</i>; fungal disease. ● Trade: Listed on Appendix I in 1975; transferred to Appendix II in 1997; no historical or recent trade recorded. 	<p>SUPPORT WITH CONCERNS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SSN commends South Africa for observing precautionary measure A.1 of RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) by waiting 12 years after species was transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II before proposing deletion from the Appendices. ● No evidence of any trade or horticultural interest in this species, except for limited efforts by one grower in early 1980s. ● Although species is at serious risk of extinction, this is due entirely to habitat loss and disease; trade not a factor. ● SSN is concerned that deletion will result in species moving to a lower level of protection under South African domestic law, and urges the South African government to take steps to mitigate this situation should the species be deleted. ● SSN urges the South African government to ensure that

SPECIES/PROPONENT/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
		deletion will not reduce role of species as a “standard bearer” for its highly endangered ecosystem.
<p>Prop. 39</p> <p><i>Cyphostemma elephantopus</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic to southern and southwestern Madagascar. • Population: Proposal states that, based on 2006 field research, the species meets the criteria for listing as Vulnerable in IUCN Red List; about 500 plants counted in Andatabo and in Tsingoritelo (North of Toliara and in surrounding areas). • Threats: Overcollection for international trade; degradation and loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures (construction of hotels, existence on privately owned land). • Trade: Traded as seeds, potted plants and seedlings; international trade is increasing; between 2003 and 2006, 749 seedlings were legally exported from Madagascar; exports declined from 563 in 2004 to 70 in 2006. The species is advertised for sale on the Internet (typical prices: 7.50 Euro for potted plants, seeds for 2.79 Euro each, large specimen for 305 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exists in non-protected areas; habitat is quickly disappearing due to anthropomorphic pressures. • The number of plants reported in surveys is low; significant decrease in number of exported seedlings may be a sign of depletion of wild populations. • High demand reflected by availability on Internet. • Continuing uncontrolled exports likely to further jeopardize the species. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • small wild population • poor management due to lack of regulations • global demand and reported exports</p>
<p>Prop. 40</p> <p><i>Cyphostemma laza</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic to two Madagascar regions: in the North (Antsiranana) and in the South (Toliara). • Population: Proposal states that species meets the criteria for listing as Vulnerable in the IUCN Red List; about 250 plants counted in Andoharano forest (North of Toliara), Tongobory Betioky forest, and in forest of South Elomaka Amboasary. • Threats: Overcollection for international trade; degradation and loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures (fires, collection of stones as building materials). • Trade: Traded as seeds, potted plants and seedlings; trade is increasing; between 2003 and 2006, 11,897 seedlings were legally exported from Madagascar; exports increased from 419 seedlings in 2003 to 7915 seedlings in 2006. The species is advertised for sale on the Internet (typical prices: potted plants for 11.80 Euro; sale by auction of 3 seeds for 4.4 Euro). 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species grows in non-protected areas and is subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressure. • Habitat is degraded and decreasing. • Number of plants reported in surveys is low. • High demand reflected by availability on the Internet. • Large increase in recent export levels. • Trade likely to jeopardize the survival of the species in the short term if not regulated. <p>■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2 a, paragraphs A and B): internationally traded • small wild population • poor management due to lack of regulations • high global demand • high levels of reported international trade</p>
<p>Prop. 41</p> <p><i>Cyphostemma montagnacii</i></p> <p>Madagascar</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distribution: Endemic to Madagascar with very small range. • Population: Proposal states that the species meets the criteria for listing as Critically Endangered in the IUCN Red List; about 50 plants were counted in the Toliara table mountain and its surroundings in 2006. • Threats: Overcollection for international trade; degradation and loss of habitat due to anthropomorphic pressures (fires, collection of stones as building materials). • Trade: Traded as seeds, potted plants and seedlings; trade is increasing; between 2003 and 2006, 202 seedlings were legally exported from Madagascar; exports declined from 200 exported in 2004 to 0 in 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Species grows in non-protected areas and is subject to heavy anthropomorphic pressure. • Species is very rare and is concentrated geographically in one area. • Demand in trade reflected by availability for sale on the Internet; decrease in exports between 2004 and 2006 may signal a sudden and acute decline in population size. • Species would qualify for listing in Appendix I.

SPECIES/PROponent/ PROPOSAL	CURRENT STATUS OF SPECIES	SSN VIEW
	2005 and 2 in 2006. The species is offered on the Internet (typical price: potted plants for up to 27 Euro).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14), Annex 2a, paragraphs A and B): critically endangered • internationally traded • small wild population, decline projected • concentrated geographically • poor management due to lack of regulations • global demand
<p>Prop. 42</p> <p>Palo Santo <i>Bulnesia sarmientoi</i></p> <p>Argentina</p> <p>Inclusion in Appendix II with the following annotation: “#11 Logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, plywood, powder and extracts”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Distribution: Endemic to the Gran Chaco of Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, and Paraguay; small distribution in Brazil; one of the last and also the largest unexploited subpopulation is said to occur in the Kaa-lya del Gran Chaco National Park in Bolivia. ● Population: Lower Risk/conservation dependent (IUCN 2009, reviewed in 1998); populations of this slow-growing species reduced as a result of significant overexploitation in the last five years. ● Threats: Intense exploitation for international trade; habitat loss due to agricultural expansion. ● Trade: Currently listed on Appendix III (Argentina); levels of export have increased significantly in recent years; Argentina is major exporter; Paraguay was previously a significant exporter but now (since 2006) lists species as endangered and does not export; no information on trade from Bolivia or Brazil; exported to China for use as wood flooring; also used as essential oil by the perfume industry, for wood crafts and products, and for medicine; one exporter claims on the Internet to be able to provide 300 metric tons per month; inclusion in Appendix III in 2008 has assisted Argentina in detecting irregularities and illegal trade. 	<p>SUPPORT</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● International trade controls with participation of importing countries are needed to ensure that trade and use are both legal and sustainable. ● Populations reduced as a result of significant overexploitation. ● Supported by Brazil; PC has congratulated Argentina on preparing the proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Meets criteria for Appendix II (RC 9.24 (Rev. CoP14) Annex 2a, paragraph A): declining populations due to trade • trade regulation needed to avoid Appendix I listing in the future



SPECIES SURVIVAL NETWORK

2100 L Street NW, Washington, DC 20037 USA Tel: +1 301-548-7769 Fax: +1-202-318-0891

E-mail: info@ssn.org

www.SSN.org