

**GGT'S RECOMMENDATIONS  
ON THE AMENDMENT PROPOSALS  
FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING  
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO CITES  
(Johannesburg, 2016)**



**GLOBAL GUARDIAN TRUST**

**GGT' S RECOMMENDATIONS  
ON THE AMENDMENT PROPOSALS  
FOR CONSIDERATION AT THE SEVENTEENTH MEETING  
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO CITES  
(Johannesburg, 2016)**

**GLOBAL GUARDIAN TRUST**



## SUMMARY OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

No	Species	Amendment	Recommendation
1	<i>Bison bison athabascae</i>	II → 0	Yes
2	<i>Capra caucasica</i>	0 → II	No
3	<i>Vicugna vicugna</i>	Annotation	Yes
4	<i>Panthera leo</i>	II → I	No
5	<i>Puma concolor</i>	I → II	Yes
6	<i>Equus zebra zebra</i>	I → II	Yes
7	<i>Ceratotherium simum simum</i>	Annotation	Yes
8	<i>Manis crassicaudata</i>	II → I	No
9	<i>Manis crassicaudata</i>	II → I	No
10	<i>Manis culionensis</i>	II → I	No
11	<i>M. javanica, M. pentadactyla</i>	II → I	No
12	<i>Manis spp.</i>	II → I	No
13	<i>Macaca sylvanus</i>	II → I	No
14	<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	Annotation	Yes
15	<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	Annotation	Yes
16	<i>Loxodonta africana</i>	II → I	No
17	<i>Falco peregrinus</i>	I → II	Yes
18	<i>Lichenostomus melanops cassidix</i>		
	helmeted honeyeater	I → II	Yes
19	<i>Psittacus erithacus</i>	II → I	No

20	<i>Ninox novaeseelandiae undulate</i> Norfolk Island boobook		I → II	Yes
21	<i>Crocodylus acutus</i> American crocodile		I → II	Yes
22	<i>Crocodylus moreletii</i> Morelet's crocodile		Annotation	Yes
23	<i>Crocodylus niloticus</i> Nile crocodile		Annotation	Yes
24	<i>Crocodylus porosus</i> saltwater crocodile		I → II	Yes
25	<i>Abronia spp.</i> alligator lizards		0 → I,II	No
26	<i>Abronia spp.</i> alligator lizards		0 → II	Yes
27	<i>Rhampholeon spp. Rieppeleon spp.</i> pygmy chameleons		0 → II	Yes
28	<i>Rhampholeon spp. Rieppeleon spp.</i> pygmy chameleons		0 → II	Yes
29	<i>Cnemaspis psychedelica</i> psychedelic rock gecko		0 → I	Yes
30	<i>Lygodactylus williamsi</i> Turquoise dwarf gecko		0 → I	Yes
31	<i>Paroedula masobe</i> Masobe gecko		0 → II	No
32	<i>Lanthanotidae spp.</i> earless monitor lizards		0 → I	No
33	<i>Shinisaurus crocodilurus</i> Chinese crocodile lizard		II → I	Yes
34	<i>Atheris desaixi</i> Ashe's bush viper		0 → II	No
35	<i>Bitis worthingtoni</i> Kenya horned viper		0 → II	No
36	<i>Cyclanorbis spp. et al.</i> softshell turtles		0 → II	Yes

37	<i>Dyscophus antongilii</i>	tomato frog	I → II	Yes
38	<i>Dyscophus spp.</i>	false tomato frog	0 → II	Yes
39	<i>Scaphiophryne spp.</i>	burrowing frogs	0 → II	No
40	<i>Telmatobius coleus</i>	Titicaca water frog	0 → I	No
41	<i>Paramesotriton hongkongensis</i>	Hong Kong warty newt	0 → II	No
42	<i>Carcharhinus falciformis</i>	silky shark	0 → II	No
43	<i>Alopias spp.</i>	thresher sharks	0 → II	No
44	<i>Mobula spp.</i>	devil rays	0 → II	No
45	<i>Potamotrygon motoro</i>	ocellate river stingray	0 → II	No
46	<i>Pterapogon kauderni</i>	Banggai cardinalfish	0 → II	No
47	<i>Holacanthus clarionensis</i>	clarion angelfish	0 → II	No
48	<i>Nautilidae spp.</i>	nautilus	0 → II	No
49	<i>Polymita spp.</i>	Cuban landsnails	0 → I	Yes
50	<i>Beaucarnea spp.</i>	ponytail palm	0 → II	No
51	<i>Tillandsia mauryana</i>	Maury's tillandsia	II → 0	Yes
52	<i>Sclerocactus spp.</i>	fishhook cacti	II → I	Yes
53	<i>Dalbergia cochinchinensis</i>	Siamese rosewood	Annotation	Yes
54	<i>Dalbergia spp.</i>	rosewoods	0 → II	Yes
55	<i>Dalbergia spp.</i>	rosewoods	0 → II	Yes
56	<i>Guibourtia spp.</i>	bubingas	0 → II	Yes
57	<i>Pterocarpus erinaceus</i>	African rosewood	0 → II	Yes

58	<i>Adansonia grandidieri</i>	Grandidier's baobab	0 → II	No
59	<i>Abies numidica</i>	Algerian fir	0 → I	No
60	<i>Aquilaria spp., Gyrinops spp.</i>	agarwood	Annotation	Yes
61	<i>Siphonochilus aethiopicus</i>	Natal ginger	0 → II	Yes
62	<i>Bulnesia sarmientoi</i>	holy wood	Annotation	Yes

## RECOMMENDATIONS

**Prop. 1** Deletion of wood bison *Bison bison athabascae* from Appendix II (Canada)

The subspecies of the wood bison *Bison bison athabascae* is distributed in Canada and Alaska. The subspecies was transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II two decades ago. Although its distribution is fragmented, the total area is very large. The population of matured individuals is estimated to be 5,213-7,191. It is clear that the subspecies does not meet the Appendix II listing criteria. Since a century ago, the population has substantially recovered and Canada's conservation effort should be commended. Trade volume has been small and therefore, international trade is not an issue. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 2** Inclusion of western tur *Capra caucasica* in Appendix II, with a zero quota for wild-taken *Capra caucasica caucasica* exported for commercial purposes or as hunting trophies (EU and Georgia)

The western tur *Capra caucasica* consists of three subspecies. The proposal aims to prohibit export of one subspecies *C. c. caucasica* for commercial purposes or as hunting trophies. As far as this subspecies is concerned, the effect of an Appendix II listing is stricter than Appendix I provisions. Georgia prohibits hunting of the species but illegal hunting seems to occur. However, this problem should be solved by Georgia itself with the assistance of the co-proponent, European Union. Furthermore, the proponents mention that the scale of hunting and illegal trade is unknown. The Russian Federation declined to co-sponsor the proposal. The proposal is premature and unless the Russian Federation supports the proposal, it should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 3** Amendment to the CITES Appendices referring to annotations 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the populations of *Vicugna vicugna* in Appendix II (Peru)

Some populations of the vicuna in Argentina and Chile are listed in Appendix II and the whole populations of Ecuador, Peru and Bolivia are also listed in Appendix II. All other populations are included in Appendix I. The species was originally listed in Appendix I. Since the management of vicunas has been successful in South America, these populations were transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II with slightly different annotations. With the adoption of this proposal, the annotations will become identical among these five countries. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop.  
4**

Transfer of all African populations of lion *Panthera leo* from Appendix II to Appendix I (Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria and Togo)

While southern African countries have healthy lion populations, the population has decreased in the rest of the range States. The main threat is retaliatory or pre-emptive killing to protect human life and livestock. Habitat loss and alteration to agricultural land and livestock ranch have also contributed to a decline in lion populations. All of these elements are not affected by listing the lion in Appendix I and should be dealt with internally. Although international trade in lion specimens may have increased recently, most of them are from healthy populations. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
5**

Transfer of cougars *Puma concolor coryi* and *Puma concolor cougar* from Appendix I to Appendix II (Canada)

The cougar is distributed from North America through Central America to South America. The species is divided into several subspecies. Two subspecies in North America are listed in Appendix I and all other subspecies in North America in Appendix II. The proposal aims to simplify CITES listings by transferring these two subspecies from Appendix I to Appendix II. *P. c. cougar* is considered to have been extinct. *P. c. coryi* is fully protected and its population has recovered reaching carrying capacity. Since a transfer of the two subspecies has no adverse effect on their survival, the proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop.  
6**

Transfer of Cape mountain zebra *Equus zebra zebra* from Appendix I to Appendix II (South Africa)

The Cape mountain zebra is endemic to South Africa. The subspecies was first listed in Appendix I in 1973. Numbers on private ranches have been increasing. If this proposal is adopted by the Conference of the Parties, it would give more flexibility to private ranches which enable to create incentives for conservation. It is important to note that 31 % of the national population occurs on private ranches. In the 1950s, the national population of the subspecies was 80 approximately. Now, it is estimated a minimum of 4,791. South Africa's effort should be commended and therefore, the proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop.  
7**

Amendment of the annotation on the Appendix II listing of Swaziland population of the white rhino *Ceratotherium simum simum* (Swaziland)

The white rhino populations of South Africa and Swaziland are listed in Appendix II with an annotation. The proposal from Swaziland aims at allowing an international trade in rhino horns. By using proceeds from selling rhino horns, Swaziland wishes to enhance its effort to conserve its rhino population. Listing rhinos in Appendix I has proven to be a failure and innovative approaches need to be taken. This proposal is one of such approaches and as such, it should be



**adopted.** The adoption of the proposal is in the best interest of the conservation of the species. Those who oppose this proposal are encouraged to provide Swaziland with financial assistances.

**Prop. 8** Transfer of Indian pangolin *Manis crassicaudata* from Appendix II to Appendix I (Bangladesh)

The Indian pangolin is distributed in Bangladesh, India, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and China. The species is protected from hunting and trade under national legislation in all range States. The species was listed in Appendix II in 1973. India, Nepal, Sri Lanka and the US submitted a proposal to transfer the species from Appendix II to Appendix I at CoP11 (Gigiri, 2000) but the original proposal was not adopted. What was adopted is an Appendix II listing with an annotation of a zero export quota for wild specimens for commercial purposes. Since 2000, the species has been subject to stricter regulations. In practice, there is no difference between an Appendix I listing and the present status. Transfer of the species to Appendix I will not change the current situation. We see no rationale behind the proposal and therefore, recommend that the proposal be **rejected**. However, both range States and potential importing countries should strengthen their enforcement effort.

**Prop. 9** Transfer of Indian pangolin *Manis crassicaudata* from Appendix II to Appendix I (India, Nepal, Sri Lanka, USA)

This proposal is almost identical to the previous one. For the same reason, the proposal should be **rejected**. We reiterate that both range States and potential importing countries should strengthen their enforcement effort. In addition, we are concerned that programmes to manage wild populations do not exist in any range States. As a matter of urgency, the range States need to develop such management programmes, perhaps with the assistance of one of the proponents, i.e., the US.

**Prop. 10** Transfer of Philippine pangolin *Manis culionensis* from Appendix II to Appendix I (Philippines, USA)

Prior to 1998, the Philippine pangolin was considered to be a subspecies of *Manis javanica*, which was first listed in Appendix II in 1973. The Philippine pangolin was then recognized as a distinct species. The species is endemic to the Palawan region of the Philippines. Little is known of the population size because of difficulties in population estimates. The population may have declined during the recent decades. It seems however that the species does not meet the Appendix I criteria. In 2000, a zero export quota was set. In practice, there is no difference between an Appendix I listing and the present status. Transfer of the species to Appendix I will not change the current situation. We see no rationale behind the proposal and therefore, recommend that the proposal be **rejected**.

**Prop. 11** Transfer of Malayan pangolin *Manis javanica* and Chinese pangolin *M. pentadactyla* from Appendix II to Appendix I (USA, Vietnam)

The Malayan pangolin *Manis javanica* and Chinese pangolin *Manis pentadactyla* widely occur mainly in Southeast Asia. Although both species are declining, the population size does not seem small. As mentioned above, a zero export quota was set for both species in 2000. In practice, there is no difference between an Appendix I listing and the present status. Transfer of the species to Appendix I will not change the current situation. We see no rationale behind the proposal and therefore, recommend that the proposal be **rejected**.

**Prop. 12** Transfer of long-tailed pangolin *Manis tetradactyla*, white-bellied pangolin *M. tricuspis*, giant pangolin *M. gigantea* and South African pangolin *M. temminckii* from Appendix II to Appendix I (Angola, Botswana, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Gabon, Guinea, Kenya, Liberia, Nigeria, Senegal, South Africa, Togo, USA)

The Temminck's pangolin is distributed mainly in Eastern Africa and Southern Africa. Three other species occur sympatrically mainly in Central Africa. Currently, all the four species are listed in Appendix II without annotations. African and Asian pangolins have been subject to in-depth discussions by the Animals Committee and Standing Committee. At its 66th meeting, the Standing Committee agreed to submit the draft resolution on "Conservation of and trade in pangolins" for consideration at CoP17. The submission of the present proposal (Prop.12) is contrary to this development, thus undermining the efforts made so far. All the proposals relating to African and Asian pangolins should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 13** Transfer of barbary macaque *Macaca sylvanus* from Appendix II to Appendix I (EU, Morocco)

The species is distributed in Morocco and Algeria. The animals were also introduced to Gibraltar. The main threat is habitat loss and degradation. According to the supporting statement, there is illegal international trade in live specimens. In Morocco and Algeria, the species is protected. Even if the species is transferred to Appendix I, habitat loss and illegal trade would continue. An Appendix I listing would not contribute to the conservation of the species without improving the CITES implementation of range States. In addition, the species does not meet the Appendix I criteria. Therefore, there is no justification for listing in Appendix I and as such, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 14** Deletion of the annotation to the listing of the Namibian African elephant *Loxodonta africana* population in Appendix II (Namibia)

We welcome this proposal from a conservation point of view. The proposal should be **adopted**. Rejection to this proposal will have a negative impact on the elephant population and local communities that live with elephants on a daily

basis. We are of the opinion that 'one-off trade' was a failure. The best interest of the conservation of the African elephant will be achieved through allowing international trade in ivory with an annual quota which may be established by a range State itself. By permitting ivory trade annually, exporting countries will be able to establish more pragmatic, long-term elephant conservation programmes. By continuing to reject proposals on the African elephant submitted by southern African countries, the Conference of the Parties is driving the elephant to follow the same destiny as being taken by rhinos. Therefore, the Conference of the Parties needs to make the right decision.

**Prop.  
15**

Deletion of the annotation to the listing of the Zimbabwe population of African elephant *Loxodonta africana* in Appendix II (Namibia, Zimbabwe)

We welcome this proposal from a conservation point of view for the same reason as the previous proposal Prop. 14 submitted by Namibia. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop.  
16**

Transfer of African elephant *Loxodonta africana* populations of Botswana, Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe from Appendix II to Appendix I (Benin, Burkina Faso, Central African Republic, Chad, Ethiopia, Kenya, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Uganda)

The plight now faced by African elephants started in 1989 when the Conference of the Parties adopted a transfer of the species as a whole from Appendix II to Appendix I despite the recognition that southern African populations did not meet the Appendix I criteria. Those who supported an Appendix I listing need to take the responsibility because that decision brought about the present situation. The populations of Botswana, Namibia and Zimbabwe were transferred back to Appendix II in 1997 and that of South Africa in 2000. Since then, international ivory trade took place twice, but both were 'one-off trade'. This decision exacerbated the situation. According to the supporting statement, the proposal aims at extending the proponents' hand to their brothers and sisters in the Southern African range States, referring to a Swahili proverb, "Unity is strength, division is weakness." Consultations were made with southern African range States. Ironically, Namibia and Zimbabwe opposed the proposal and South Africa was not in favour of the proposal. Namibia stressed that they were not convinced the transfer would prevent the illegal killing of the species and that populations in Appendix I were facing far greater levels of illegal killing than Appendix II populations. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that division was created by those who promoted a blanket ban on ivory trade in 1989, not by southern African countries. The proponents criticized Japan on its domestic ivory control based on unsubstantiated allegations made by Environmental Investigation Agency. The proponent countries and Japan have enjoyed a good working relationship and therefore, the proponents should have asked Japan for

the authenticity of allegations. In conclusion, the proposal should be **rejected**. However, the adoption of this proposal may be in the best interest of the conservation of the African elephant if both range States and importing countries enter a reservation with regard to the African elephant. It should also be pointed out that most of the proponents are classified as Category 2 or 3 under the CITES national legislation project, while Namibia, South Africa and Zimbabwe are classified as Category 1 and Botswana as Category 2. What the proponents need to do is not to submit this proposal but to improve their national legislations.

**Prop. 17** Transfer of peregrine falcon *Falco peregrinus* from Appendix I to Appendix II (Canada)

The peregrine falcon is a cosmopolitan species and its total population is extremely large. Most of the birds subject to international trade are from captive breeding facilities. Transfer of the species from Appendix I to Appendix II will not have a negative impact on wild populations. In addition, an Appendix II listing requires a non-detriment finding under the Article IV of the Convention. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 18** Transfer of helmeted honeyeater *Lichenostomus melanops cassidix* from Appendix I to Appendix II (Australia)

The helmeted honeyeater is endemic to Australia and its subspecies *Lichenostomus melanops cassidix* occurs only in south-central Victoria with estimated 100- mature individuals. The subspecies is fully protected under Australian laws. International trade is almost non-existent. Even if the subspecies is downlisted to Appendix II, the conservation status will remain unchanged. Victorian State is supportive of the proposal and as such, it should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 19** Transfer of grey parrot *Psittacus erithacus* from Appendix II to Appendix I (Angola, Chad, EU, Gabon, Guinea, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo, USA)

The grey parrot is distributed in West and Central Africa. Since its inclusion in Appendix II in 1981, a large number of the grey parrots have been traded internationally. Little is known of the population size because of the difficulty of estimating the population size. In most of the range States, national export quotas are set at zero. An annual quota was established by Cameroon (3,000) and DRC (5,000). The proponents consulted with range States. Most of the range States were in favour of the proposal but Equatorial Guinea and DRC opposed the proposal. Cameroon has not taken its specific position. It seems unlikely that the species meets the Appendix I listing criteria. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 20** Transfer of Norfolk Island boobook owl *Ninox novaeseelandiae undulata* from Appendix I to Appendix II (Australia)

The Norfolk Island boobook *Ninox novaeseelandiae* occurs in New Zealand and parts of Australia. Its subspecies *N. n. undulata* was endemic to Norfolk Island. Genetically pure form of *N. n. undulata* is believed to be extinct and the population on Norfolk Island is considered a hybrid between *N. n. undulata* and *N. n. novaeseelandiae*. This proposal is of the same nature as Prop. 18. No trade in the subspecies has been recorded since 1976 when all owl species were listed in Appendix II. International trade was not a threat to the subspecies. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 21** Transfer of the population of *Crocodylus acutus* of the Distrito Regional de Manejo from Appendix I to Appendix II (Colombia)

The American crocodile widely occurs from Florida through Caribbean islands to South America. The species was first listed in Appendix II in 1976. The population of the US was transferred to Appendix I in 1979 and the rest remained in Appendix II. In 1981, the species as a whole was listed in Appendix I and international trade in the American crocodile was prohibited. In 2004, the Cuban population was transferred back to Appendix II. Colombia proposes to transfer the population of the Distrito Regional de Manejo. The American crocodile has been well studied in Cispata Bay. The population there has recently increased exponentially. The proponent intends to develop a ranching programme if the proposal is adopted. Among crocodile conservation communities, ranching is encouraged as the most preferable conservation tool. In this regard, Colombia and local communities surrounding Cispata Bay should be commended. An Appendix II listing will further contribute to the conservation of the American crocodile and as such, the proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 22** Deletion of the zero quota for wild specimens from Mexican population of Morelet's crocodile *Crocodylus moreletti* in Appendix II (Mexico)

The Morelet's crocodile is distributed in Mexico, Belize and Guatemala. Mexico submitted a proposal to transfer some population of the species to Appendix II in 2000 but that proposal was withdrawn. In 2010, Mexico resubmitted a proposal which was approved with a zero quota for wild specimens traded for commercial purposes. At that time, we recommended that Mexico again submit a downlisting proposal subject to ranching. Mexico's proposal is to delete the "zero quota for wild specimens traded for commercial purposes" aimed at developing ranching programme. We welcome the decision made by Mexico. As mentioned under Prop. 21, ranching is the most preferable crocodile conservation tool. Therefore, we recommend that the proposal be **adopted**.

**Prop. 23** Maintenance of the Malagasy population of Nile crocodile *Crocodylus niloticus* in Appendix II (Madagascar)

The Nile crocodile is widely distributed in Africa. The species as a whole was originally included in Appendix I. Several national populations are afterwards transferred to Appendix II. In 1985, the Malagasy population was transferred from Appendix I to Appendix II with some conditions attached. The present proposal aims to maintain the Malagasy population in Appendix II. Madagascar has been recognized as problematic country by the Conference of the Parties and the Standing Committee. Although some deficiencies are found in the supporting statement, the proposal should be **adopted**. The population does meet unqualified Appendix II listing criteria. The Conference of the Parties should seek clarification from Madagascar for final approval of the proposal. Technical and financial assistance from other countries may be required.

**Prop. 24** Transfer of saltwater crocodile *Crocodylus porosus* in Malaysia from Appendix I to Appendix II (Malaysia)

The saltwater crocodile was transferred from Appendix II to Appendix I in 1979 except the population of Papua New Guinea. At that time, the poorly documented proposal was submitted by India. We are of the opinion that the saltwater crocodile should not have been listed in Appendix I. The populations of Australia and Indonesia were then transferred to Appendix II. The species as a whole does not meet the Appendix I listing criteria and probably should be listed in Appendix II. The wild population in Sarawak has increased significantly over the three decades thanks to conservation measures. As a result, human-crocodile conflict has increased. The wild population decreased in the past in Sarawak, but the population does not any more meet the Appendix I listing criteria. Malaysia's effort to conserve the saltwater crocodile should be rewarded and as such, the proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 25** Inclusion of alligator lizards *Abronia anzuetoi*, *A. campbelli*, *A. fimbriata*, *A. frosti* and *A. meledona* in Appendix I and *A. aurita*, *A. gaiophasma*, *A. montecristoi*, *A. salabadorensis* and *A. vasconcelosii* in Appendix II (Guatemala)

The proponent proposes to list five *Abronia* species in Appendix I and another five *Abronia* species in Appendix II. These species are distributed in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras. According to the supporting statement, there is no quantitative data on the population size and trends for most of these species. It is impossible to evaluate whether these species meet the Appendices listing criteria, in particular in the case of Appendix I listings. However, it is also clear that illegal trade in these species exists. It may be more appropriate to list these species in Appendix II. If this is the case, the next proposal (Prop. 26) covers these ten species. We recommend that this proposal be **rejected** and Prop. 26 be adopted instead.

**Prop. 26** Inclusion of the genus *Abronia* (29 species) in Appendix II (EU, Mexico)

The alligator lizards are distributed in Mexico, Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. The genus *Abronia* comprises 29 species. The proponents propose to list all species in Appendix II. Although the population size is not well understood, the density of some species is considered low. In addition, the populations of some species are considered to be in decline. Some of the species have been subject to international trade, both legally and illegally. It is clear that some of the species meet the Appendix II listing criteria. It is appropriate to list the genus *Abronia* as a higher taxon. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 27** Inclusion of the genera *Rhampholeon* spp. and *Rieppeleon* spp. in Appendix II (Central African Republic, Chad, Gabon, Kenya, Nigeria, USA)

African pygmy chameleons in the genera *Rhampholeon* and *Rieppeleon* are not listed in CITES Appendices. Pygmy chameleons are commonly traded in the international pet trade. Tanzania is the main exporting country, followed by Equatorial Guinea, Cameroon and Guinea. The proponents sent consultation letters to range States. According to the supporting statement, none of the countries mentioned above have not shown their positions. Therefore, the proposal should be **adopted** on the condition that these countries support the proposal.

**Prop. 28** Inclusion of the genera *Rhampholeon* spp. and *Rieppeleon* spp. in Appendix II (Kenya)

This proposal is almost identical to the previous one. For the same reason, the proposal should be **adopted** on the condition that Tanzania and other main exporting countries support the proposal.

**Prop. 29** Inclusion of psychedelic rock gecko *Cnemaspis psychedelica* in Appendix I (EU, Viet Nam)

The psychedelic rock gecko is endemic to a small island in Viet Nam. The population size is small and the distribution area is restricted. It seems that collection for the pet trade is the main threat to the species. The species meets the Appendix I listing criteria and as such, the proposal should be **adopted**. However, habitat loss/alteration is also recognized as another threat and therefore, Viet Nam should establish an overall management programme with the assistance from EU.



**Prop. 30** Inclusion of Turquoise dwarf gecko *Lygodactylus williamsi* in Appendix I (EU, Tanzania)

The Turquoise dwarf gecko is endemic to Tanzania. Due to its unique coloration, the species is popular as pets. Demand for pet trade has recently increased. As a result, the total population is rapidly decreasing. Over-collection for the pet trade is the main threat to the species. It is clear that the species meets the Appendix I listing criteria. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 31** Inclusion of Masobe gecko *Paroedura masobe* in Appendix II (EU, Madagascar)

The Masobe gecko is endemic to Madagascar. No information is available on the population size and trends of the species. The species is fully protected throughout Madagascar and can not be hunted, captured or possessed. The species' main distribution areas are Betampona Reserve and Zahamena National Park, both of which are not open to the public. However, many live specimens have been exported from Madagascar for unknown reasons. In 2014 only, 505 individuals were exported. Under para 11 'Additional remarks', the proponents stated that "listing a species in Appendix I encourages illicit trafficking of all genera, as well as hunting." As mentioned above, the species is already protected throughout Madagascar. We see no rationale behind the proposal. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 32** Inclusion of earless monitor lizard Lanthanotidae spp. in Appendix I (Malaysia)

The earless monitor lizard *Lanthanotus borneensis* is the only species belonging to the family Lanthanotidae. The species occurs in Brunei Darussalam, Sarawak and Kalimantan on Borneo Island. In these three countries, the species are fully protected. According to the supporting statement, the species meets one of the Appendix I listing criteria concerning a restricted area of distribution. On the other hand, the proponent indicated that the species meets the Appendix II listing criteria. No information is available on the population size and trends and as such, it is difficult to evaluate if the species is qualified for an Appendix I listing. Under the circumstances, the proposal should be **rejected**. It is more appropriate to list the species in Appendix II.

**Prop. 33** Transfer of Chinese crocodile lizard *Shinisaurus crocodilurus* from Appendix II to Appendix I (China, EU, Viet Nam)

The Chinese crocodile lizard is distributed in southern China and northern Viet Nam with a restricted area of distribution. There seems to be sufficient information on the population size and trends. The species is protected in China and regulated in Viet Nam. It seems the species meets the Appendix II listing criteria. China and Viet Nam, the two range States are the co-proponents of the



proposal. The proposal should be **adopted**. Viet Nam needs to expedite a process to designate the species as protected.

**Prop.  
34**

Inclusion of Ashe's bush viper *Atheris desaixi* in Appendix II (Kenya)

The Mt. Kenya bush viper is endemic to Kenya. Little is known of the population size and trends. The supporting statement is poorly documented. It is difficult to evaluate whether the species meets the Appendix II criteria. It seems that the main threat is habitat alteration caused by the expansion of human population. The proposal is premature and as such, should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
35**

Inclusion of Kenya horned viper *Bitis worthingtoni* in Appendix II (Kenya)

The Kenya horned viper is endemic to Kenya. Little is known of the population size and trends. As is the case with the previous proposal, the supporting statement is poorly documented. It is difficult to evaluate whether the species meets the Appendix II criteria. It seems that the main threat is habitat alteration caused by the expansion of human population. The proposal is premature and as such, should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
36**

Inclusion of soft-shell turtles *Cyclanorbis elegans*, *C. senegalensis*, *C. aubryi*, *C. frenatum*, *Trionyx triunguis* and *Rafetus euphraticus* in Appendix II (Burkina Faso, Chad, Gabon, Guinea, Liberia, Mauritania, Nigeria, Togo, USA)

The proposal is to list six species of softshell turtles in Appendix II. They are distributed widely in Africa and Middle East. The rationale of this proposal is that as Asian softshell turtles received greater CITES protection at CoP16, exploitation and trade shifted from Asian softshell turtle species to African species. It is ironical that CITES listings have a negative impact on other species. However, the proponents' concern is understandable. The proposal should be **adopted**. In many of the range States, softshell turtles are protected or regulated. Without enhancing their enforcement activities, Appendix II listings would not contribute to the conservation of softshell turtles. It is advisable that the co-proponents, in particular the US assist the range States in developing management programmes.

**Prop.  
37**

Transfer of tomato frog *Dyscophus antongilii* from Appendix I to Appendix II (Madagascar)

The tomato frog is endemic to Madagascar. The species was first listed in Appendix I in 1987 without sufficient data. Little is known of the population size but it is believed to be locally abundant. The species does not meet the Appendix I listing criteria. By transferring the species from Appendix I to Appendix II,

Madagascar would be given more flexibility in order to manage this species. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 38** Inclusion of false tomato frogs *Dyscophus guineti* and *D. insularis* in Appendix II (Madagascar)

The genus *Dyscophus* consists of three frog species, which are endemic to Madagascar. Madagascar proposes to transfer *D. antongilii* from Appendix I to Appendix II and to include other two species in Appendix II. If Prop. 37 and 38 are adopted, all three species in the genus *Dyscophus* will be listed in Appendix II. *D. guineti* is similar to *D. antongilii* in morphology and coloration. It is appropriate to list the genus *Dyscophus* as a higher taxon. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 39** Inclusion of burrowing frogs *Scaphiophryne marmorat*, *S. boribory* and *S. spinosa* in Appendix II (Madagascar)

The genus *Scaphiophryne* comprises eleven frog species, which are endemic to Madagascar. No information is available on the population size and trends. The proponent suggests that the main threat is habitat loss. Therefore, listing in Appendix II will not change the current situation. According to the supporting statement, there are no species-based management measures in place. What the proponent needs is not to list the three species in Appendix II but to develop species specific management programmes. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 40** Inclusion of Titicaca water frog *Telmagobius culeus* in Appendix I (Bolivia, Peru)

The Titicaca water frog is distributed in Peru and Bolivia, occurring on the Lake Titicaca basin. Although the population may have decreased, the population is still large and healthy. The species is protected in both Peru and Bolivia but still, a large number of the frog are subject to exploitation. In practice, there is no difference between an Appendix I listing and the current situation. Even if listed in Appendix I, illegal trade for local consumption would continue. Under the circumstances, we recommend that the proposal be **rejected**. However, the proponents may wish to amend the proposal to the effect that the species is listed in Appendix II.

**Prop. 41** Inclusion of Hong Kong newt *Paramesotriton hongkongensis* in Appendix II (China)

The Hong Kong newt is endemic to China, occurring only in Hong Kong Island and Guangdong Province. The species is protected in both mainland China and Hong Kong. In order to collect newts, it is necessary to obtain approval from local departments. A large number of newts were exported legally to the US and EU. Management measures do not exist in China except in protected areas.

Early in 2016, the US ceased the importation of the species. It may be appropriate to see the effect of US's decision. We understand that demand for different species of newts not only in China but other countries have been increasing recently. Restriction on the collection of Hong Kong newt may have a negative impact on other species. Under the circumstances, it is recommended that the proposal be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
42**

Inclusion of silky shark *Carcharhinus falciformis* in Appendix II (Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Egypt, EU, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Ukraine)

The silky shark is globally distributed in tropical and sub-tropical waters. Almost all the distribution area is covered by regional fisheries management organizations such as WCPFC, IATTC, ICCAT, IOTC and CCSBT. In addition, it seems that the species does not meet the Appendix II listing criteria. Most of the RFMOs have implemented finning bans. FAO and RFMOs should be the prime organization responsible for shark fisheries. Like other shark species, listing the silky shark will create unnecessary implementation burden on Management Authorities and Customs, thus depriving such CITES-related authorities of resources, which could otherwise be utilized for other species of more conservation priority. More importantly, several shark species have already been listed in Appendix II and more species are expected to be proposed for CITES listings. Indeed, by adopting Resolution Conf. 9.24, the Conference of the Parties resolved that “to monitor the effectiveness of protection offered by the Convention, the status of species included in Appendices I and II should be regularly reviewed by the range States and proponents. This is urgently needed for shark species.” Before listing shark species, it is essential to examine the effectiveness of such listings in relation to the conservation of sharks and influence on livelihood of coastal communities. In other words, it is premature to list any shark species in CITES Appendices. Under the circumstances, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
43**

Inclusion of the genus *Alopias* spp. thresher sharks in Appendix II (Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Dominican Republic, Egypt, EU, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, Ukraine)

The proponents proposes the inclusion of *Alopias superciliosus* in accordance with the Appendix II listing criteria Criterion A2a and other two species, *A. vulpinus* and *A. pelagicus* in accordance with Criterion A2b. They are distributed in tropical to temperate waters. Almost all of the distribution area is covered by RFMOs. In addition, it seems that the species does not meet the Appendix II listing criteria. Most of the RFMOs have implemented finning bans. FAO and

RFMOs should be the prime organization responsible for shark fisheries. Like other shark species, listing the thresher shark will create unnecessary implementation burden on Management Authorities and Customs, thus depriving such CITE-related authorities of resources, which could otherwise be utilized for other species of more conservation priority. More importantly, several shark species have been listed in Appendix II and more species are expected to be proposed for CITES listings. Indeed, by adopting Resolution Conf. 9.24, the Conference of the Parties resolved that “to monitor the effectiveness of protection offered by the Convention, the status of species included in Appendices I and II should be regularly reviewed by the range States and proponents.” This is urgently needed for shark species. Before listing shark species, it is essential to examine the effectiveness of such listings in relation to the conservation of sharks and influence on the livelihood of coastal communities. In other words, it is premature to list any shark species in CITES Appendices. Under the circumstances, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
44**

Inclusion of the genus *Mobula* spp. devil rays in Appendix II (Bahamas, Bangladesh, Benin, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Comoros, Costa Rica, Ecuador, Egypt, EU, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Maldives, Mauritania, Palau, Panama, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sri Lanka, USA)

The genus *Mobula* comprises nine species, i.e., *M. mobular*, *M. japanica*, *M. thurstoni*, *M. tarapacana*, *M. eregoodootenkee*, *M. kuhlii*, *M. hypostoma*, *M. rochebrunei* and *M. munkiana*. The proposal is to list the genus *Mobula* as a higher taxon. *M. tarapacana* and *M. japanica* are for Criterion A2a and the rest for look-alike reasons. The former two species are distributed from tropical to temperate waters, showing fragmented distribution. No reliable information is available on the global population size. Therefore, it is difficult to evaluate if the species meet the Appendix II listing criteria. We are of the opinion that commercially exploited aquatic species should be managed by FAO, RFMOs and individual State. For the same reason as Prop. 42 and 43, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
45**

Inclusion of ocellate river stingray *Potamotrygon motoro* in Appendix II (Bolivia)

The ocellate river stingray is widely found in freshwaters in Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, French Guyana, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela. The proponent fails to provide any scientific data on the population size and trends. No concrete data is given but it seems unlikely that the main threat to the species is international trade in ornament fishes. The species does not meet the Appendix II criteria. Despite its wide distribution, the proponent did not consult other range States. The species was subject to discussions at CoP16. Previously, listing in Appendix III was proposed at CITES fora. Nevertheless, no action has been taken by range States. Under the

circumstances, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 46** Inclusion of Banggai cardinalfish *Pterapogon kaudemi* in Appendix II (EU)

This marine fish species is endemic to Indonesia. The proposal to list in Appendix II was submitted for consideration at CoP14 in 2007 by the US. The proposal was withdrawn after Indonesia and several others expressed their opposition. Indonesia was consulted and indicated that the species did not deserve a CITES listing. Since Indonesia as only range State opposes the proposal, its sovereign rights must be respected. Rather than listing in Appendix II, the proponent, i.e., EU should further extend its assistance to Indonesia. Since Indonesia does not support, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 47** Inclusion of clarion angelfish *Holacanthus clarionensis* in Appendix II (Mexico)

The clarion angelfish is distributed mainly in Baja California Sur, Mexico. This angelfish is captured for the aquarium trade. Fishery targeting this species is controlled by Mexico. If Mexico is to conserve this species, it should strengthen its management effort. The US should assist its neighboring country because the US has been a main importing country. In addition, it seems that the species does not meet the Appendix II listing criteria. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 48** Inclusion of the family Nautilidae nautilus in Appendix II (Fiji, India, Palau, USA)

The family Nautilidae consists of two species in the genus *Allonautilus* and four species in the genus *Nautilus*. These marine invertebrates are found from India through Southeast Asia and Australia to Fiji, but showing patchy distribution. Little is known of the population size and trends. According to the supporting statement, where fisheries for chambered nautilus are absent, the populations are stable. Where fisheries exist, the populations may have declined. The situation varies from country to country. Since 1990, Indonesia has prohibited the take of nautilus but nevertheless, harvests are going on. An Appendix II listing will not change the situation and therefore, Indonesia is encouraged to strengthen its enforcement effort. Consultations were made with range States but it is not clear that the main harvesting countries such as the Philippines and Indonesia support the proposal. Unless Indonesia and the Philippines support the proposal, it should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 49** Inclusion of the genus *Polymita* Cuban landsnails in Appendix I (Cuba)

The genus *Polymita* comprises six species. All of these land snail species are endemic to Cuba, some of which have a restricted distribution area. Habitats are

fragmented. The snails in the genus *Polymita* has long been protected in Cuba but there have been illegal trade in these species, mainly destined for the US and Canada. Due to the recent progress in the relationship between Cuba and the US, many tourists are expected to visit Cuba. Inclusion of the genus in Appendix I would contribute to the conservation of these snails. The proposal should be **adopted**. Habitat destruction and fragmentation are main threats to the species. Therefore, listing in Appendix I itself will not solve the problem the snails are facing. Cuba should develop an overall management programme to conserve these species.

**Prop. 50** Inclusion of the genus *Beaucarnea* ponytail palms in Appendix II (Mexico)

The genus *Beaucarnea* consists of eleven species. These species are distributed in Mexico, Honduras and probably in Nicaragua. They are planted as ornament plants mainly in Europe and North America. Insufficient information is provided by the proponent on the population size, trends and trade status. In addition, it seems unlikely that the species meets the Appendix II listing criteria. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop. 51** Deletion of Maury's tillandsia *Tillandsia mauryana* from Appendix II (Mexico)

The Maury's tillandsia is endemic to Mexico. There are no records of national utilization. In addition, no export was recorded. Therefore, the species does not meet the Appendix II listing criteria. The Plants Committee endorsed the deletion of the species from Appendix II at its 21st meeting. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 52** Transfer of fishhook cacti *Sclerocactus spinosior* ssp. *blainei*, *S. cloverae* and *S. sileri* from Appendix II to Appendix I (USA)

The three fishhook cacti species are endemic to the US with a restricted range. As is the case with the previous proposal (Prop. 51), these species have been subject to the Periodic Review process. The Plants Committee recommended a transfer of the three species from Appendix II to Appendix I. The proponent consulted all range States (Arizona, Colorado, Navajo Nation, Nevada, New Mexico and Utah) but it is not clear from the supporting statement whether the range States support the proposal. On the condition that these range States support the proposal, it should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 53** Amendment of the annotation to the listings of Siamese rosewood *Dalbergia cochinchinensis* listed in Appendix II (Thailand)

The proposal aims to replace the current annotation (#5) with #4. The annotation #5 is only for logs, sawn wood and veneer sheets. The Siamese rosewood was

listed in Appendix II in 2013 with an annotation restricting the listing to “log, sawn wood and veneer sheets.” An analysis of the exports from range States revealed that the species were exported in the form of processed products such as furniture, which are not covered by the current annotation. If the proposal is adopted, these products will also be subject to CITES control. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 54** Inclusion of thirteen species in the genus *Dalbergia* in Appendix II (Mexico)

The proponent aims to include thirteen species in the genus *Dalbergia* in Appendix II that occur in Mexico, Belize, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica and Nicaragua. Four species are endemic to Mexico. Many *Dalbergia* species are listed in CITES Appendices. Although little information is available on the population size and trade status, there seems to be international trade in these species. Due to their resemblance, it is difficult to distinguish between those in CITES Appendices and non-listed species. It should be noted that at its 22nd meeting held in 2016, the Plants Committee endorsed listings of these thirteen species in Appendix II. It is recommended that the proposal be **adopted**.

**Prop. 55** Inclusion of non-CITES species in the genus *Dalbergia* in Appendix II (Argentina, Brazil, Guatemala, Kenya)

The genus *Dalbergia* comprises about 250 species. The genus occurs in the tropical regions of Central and South America, Africa and Asia. Sixty-one species in the genus *Dalbergia* are already included in CITES Appendices. In addition, Mexico proposes to list another thirteen species at CoP17. Because of identification problem, it is appropriate to list all *Dalbergia* species in Appendices. By doing so, it becomes easier for CITES authorities to control these species. The proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop. 56** Inclusion of bubingas *Guibourtia tessmannii*, *G. pellegriniana* and *G. demeusei* in Appendix II (EU, Gabon)

The proposal aims to list three species in the genus *Guibourtia* in Appendix II. The species are traded internationally, destined mainly for China where the timber of these species is used. *G. tessmannii* and *G. pellegriniana* are proposed in accordance with the Appendix II listing criteria Criterion A2a and *G. demeusei* in accordance with Criterion A2b. Little is known of the population size of these three species but *G. tessmannii* and *G. pellegriniana* are considered to be in decline. There is increased demand for the timbers of these species. The three species meet the Appendix II listing criteria and as such, the proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop.  
57**

Inclusion of African rosewood *Pterocarpus erinaceus* in Appendix II (Benin, Burkina Faso, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, EU, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Nigeria, Senegal, Togo)

The African rosewood is currently listed in Appendix III. An Appendix III listing was made at the request of Senegal early this year. The species occurs not only in Senegal but in Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Guinea, Mali, Cote d'Ivoire, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Niger, Benin, Togo, Nigeria and Cameroon. Senegal made extensive consultations with these range States. At its 22nd meeting, the Plants Committee recommended that a proposal to list the species in Appendix II be submitted. This proposal should be **adopted**.

**Prop.  
58**

Inclusion of Grandidier's baobab *Adansonia grandidieri* in Appendix II (Madagascar)

Seven baobab species occur in Madagascar, six of which are endemic. The proponent proposes to list *A. grandidieri* in Appendix II. According to the supporting statement, no data on illegal trade have been recorded. The main threats are local consumption and habitat loss, which can not be regulated by CITES. It seems unlikely that the species meets the Appendix II listing criteria. The proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
59**

Inclusion of Algerian fir *Abies nimidica* in Appendix I (Algeria)

The proponent proposes to list the Algerian fir in Appendix I. The supporting statement is poorly documented. There is no explanation why an Appendix I listing is necessary. The proponent does not indicate any relationship with international trade. Even if the species is listed in CITES Appendices, CITES has nothing to do to assist the proponent. The problem Algeria is facing with regard to this species must be solved internally. Under the circumstances, the proposal should be **rejected**.

**Prop.  
60**

Amendment of the annotation to the listings of agarwoods *Aquilaria* spp. and *Gyrinops* spp. in Appendix II (USA)

The proposal aims to amend the current annotation to the listing of *Aquilaria* spp. and *Gyrinops* spp. in Appendix II. Under the current annotation, finished products packaged and ready for retail trade are exempted from an Appendix II listing. The proponent's intention is to include wood chips in Appendix II even though they are packaged, so that wood chips can become subject to CITES control. The proposal should be **adopted**.



**Prop.  
61**

Inclusion of Natal ginger *Siphonochilus aethiopicus* populations of South Africa, Swaziland, Mozambique and Zimbabwe in Appendix II (South Africa)

The Natal ginger is widely distributed in Africa. Its rhizomes are used as herbal medicine. The proponent proposes to list the populations of South Africa, Swaziland, Mozambique and Zimbabwe in Appendix II. Although the total population is unknown, international trade in rhizomes exists, in particular among these countries. Listing the populations in Appendix II will allow South Africa and others to monitor trade levels. The proposal should be **adopted**. The proponent consulted all range States of the species. Kenya suggested that all populations should be included in Appendix II. The proponent may wish to submit a proposal to this effect at CoP18.

**Prop.  
62**

Amendment of the annotation to the listing of holy wood *Bulnesia sarmientoi* in Appendix II (USA)

At CoP15, Argentina proposed to include *Bulnesia sarmientoi* in Appendix II, which was adopted with the annotation “logs, sawn wood, veneer sheets, powder and extracts.” The species occurs in Brazil, Bolivia, Paraguay and Argentina. The term ‘extracts’ has been subject to discussions at the Standing Committee, Plants Committee and Conference of the Parties. This proposal is in line with the outcome of such discussions. The proposal should be **adopted**.





For the benefit of species and people  
( GGT's motto )

**A publication of the Global Guardian Trust. 2016**

**Global Guardian Trust**

Higashikanda 1-2-8, Chiyoda-ku,

Tokyo 101-0031

Japan