



Minnesota State Zoological Board.  
Zoo-Related Organizations Files.

## **Copyright Notice:**

This material may be protected by copyright law (U.S. Code, Title 17). Researchers are liable for any infringement. For more information, visit [www.mnhs.org/copyright](http://www.mnhs.org/copyright).

## Office Memorandum

DEPARTMENT           MZG          TO : ED, BEV, NANCY

DATE: June 24, 1980

FROM : RALPH WATERHOUSE *RW*PHONE:           x220          SUBJECT: MZG SPECIES LISTED BY CITES, IUCN AND U.S.D.I.

The list of species and their respective CITES, IUCN, or U.S.D.I. designations are current through January 1980. (See attachment.)

In all cases the designation refers to the species status in the wild. Several of the avian species exist in many captive collections, are readily bred, and are commonly traded among zoos and private breeders.

Following are very brief descriptions of these three organizations-- additional information is available in various zoo library documents; i.e., Federal Register.

CITES - Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species:

The Convention has produced a document signed by over 80 countries including the U.S., and lists animals as Appendix I (endangered-little foreign commerce is allowed) and Appendix II (threatened-foreign commerce is allowed provided proper export permits are acquired following legal capture).

IUCN - International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources:

IUCN is an independent non-governmental body founded in 1948 to promote scientifically based action for the conservation of wild living resources. It consists of 439 voting members in 105 countries: 51 States, 115 government agencies and 273 non-governmental organizations. It maintains a global network of more than 700 scientists and professionals organized into 6 Commissions. Species are listed as Endangered, Vulnerable, Rare, Out of Danger, and Indeterminate.

U.S.D.I. - United States Department of the Interior:

The Office of Endangered Species lists animals as Endangered and Threatened.

RW:gd

Att.

cc Brad House

## ANIMAL SPECIES LISTINGS

January, 1980

Species	CITES	U.S.D.I.	IUCN
Slow loris	Appendix II		
Japanese macaque	Appendix II		
White-cheeked gibbon	Appendix II	E	
Sloth bear			Indeterminate
N. A. river otter	Appendix II		
Leopard cat	Appendix I	E	
Canadian Lynx	Appendix II		
Leopard	Appendix I	E	Vulnerable
Cougar	Appendix II		
Siberian tiger	Appendix II	E	Endangered
Clouded leopard	Appendix I	E	Vulnerable
Przewalski horse	Appendix I	E	Endangered
Malayan tapir	Appendix I	E	Endangered
Nilgiri tahr			Vulnerable
Trumpeter swan	Appendix II		
Comb duck	Appendix II		
Great Argus pheasant	Appendix II		
Grey jungle fowl	Appendix II		
Edward's Pheasant	Appendix I	E	
Grey peacock pheasant	Appendix II		
Nicobar pigeon	Appendix I		
Bleeding heart pigeon	Appendix II		
Victoria crowned pigeon	Appendix II		
Greater Indian hornbill	Appendix II		
Rothschild's mynah	Appendix I	E	
False gaviel	Appendix I	E	Endangered
Burmese python			Vulnerable
	10 App. I 15 App. II	10	4 Endangered 4 Vulnerable

N=27

June 30, 1973

Donald D. Bridgwater, Director  
Minnesota State Zoological Gardens  
Veterans Service Building  
Columbus Circle  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155

Dear Don:

I hope all goes well with you in Minnesota. As you can see I have made my effort in contacting Mr. Walrod. We will see what develops.

You have undoubtedly heard that Senator Hatfield has introduced the Whitehurst Bill on the Senate side. It probably wouldn't hurt for you to contact HHH and Mondale. You will find enclosed a copy of the letter that I sent to the chairman of the committee considering this bill.

With best wishes to you, Glo and Vi, I remain

Sincerely yours,

  
P. W. Ogilvie, Ph. D.  
Executive Director

jah

Enc.

June 22, 1973

Honorable Howard W. Cannon  
Senate Office Building, Room 259  
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Cannon:

I am writing to support Senator Mark Hatfield's Bill 2042, which I understand will be considered by your committee on Rules and Administration. Some form of Federal support is desperately needed by our Nation's zoos if we are to retain this important educational resource. I certainly share Senator Hatfield's concern for humane treatment, but I am equally certain that until funds are available for improvement, many of our zoos will remain at a level that none of us can approve.

I do feel that there are some areas that could be strengthened with regard to this legislation and would hope that your committee might consider adding to the composition of the Trustees a representative of the American Association of Zoo Veterinarians, a representative of the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums and two aquarium directors. I would also hope that your committee might designate the accreditation program already adopted by the American Association of Zoological Parks and Aquariums as the accreditation program named by the Bill. Finally, it would be extremely desirable if the Bill envisioned direct grants similar to those available under the endowment for the arts.

Let me take this opportunity to thank you for the consideration given to this bill by your committee, and to assure you that I stand ready to supply your office with any information that they might request, to the best of my ability.

Sincerely yours,

P. W. Ogilvie, Ph. D.  
Executive Director

ab

June 30, 1973

Mr. Philip Walrod  
Planner-Coordinator  
Clackamas, Columbia, Washington Counties  
Agency on Aging  
Columbia County Courthouse  
P. O. Box 141  
St. Helens, Oregon 97051

Dear Mr. Walrod:

Mr. Don Bridgwater has brought your letter of June 6 to my attention indicating your interest in a possible survival center on your property. Let me assure you that should you have an interest in exploring this matter with me I shall be more than happy to meet with you in St. Helens or in my office in Portland. My office phone number is 226-2264. Please feel free to call and make arrangements with my secretary for a meeting at your convenience. Let me assure you that we share your interest and concern for the survival of endangered species.

Sincerely yours,

P. W. Ogilvie, Ph. D.  
Executive Director

jah

Blind carbon: Don Bridgwater

CITES

1979

REPORT OF THE  
U S. DELEGATION TO THE

Second Meeting of the  
Conference of the Parties  
to the

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE

IN

ENDANGERED SPECIES

OF

WILD FAUNA AND FLORA (CITES)

San Jose, Costa Rica

March 19 - 30, 1979

Representative:  
Robert S. Cook, Deputy Director  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE / UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

## CONTENTS

	Page
Background.....	1
General Outcome.....	2
Financing of the Secretariat..	3
The Standing Committee and Other Committees.....	12
CITES Implementation.....	16
Guidelines for Preparation and Shipment of Live Specimens.....	17
Development of an Identification Manual.....	18
Format for Proposals to Amend Appendix I or II.....	20
Standardization of Appendices Nomenclature.....	22
Other Issues Affecting the Appendices.....	24
1. The Berne Criteria .....	24
2. Higher Taxa Listings.....	26
3. Monitoring as a Basis for Listing.....	27
4. Listing of Rare Species.....	28
5. Appendix I "Look-a-likes".....	29
6. Extinct Species.....	30
7. National or Other International Protection Measures.....	31
8. Feral Species.....	31
9. Listing of Subspecies.....	32
10. Hybrids.....	33
11. Annotation of Appendix II Species.....	34
12. Seeds and Cut Flowers - Plant Defined.....	35

The Pre-Convention Exemption - Article VII.....	38
Bred in Captivity, Artificially Propagated. ....	40
Procedure for Exchange of Museum and Herbarium Specimens.....	44
Hunting Trophies.....	48
Pet Trade.....	51
CITES as it Relates to the International Whaling Convention.....	52
Time and Venue of the Next Meeting of the Conference of the Parties.....	54
The Species.....	55
Nations and Organizations Attending the Second Meeting of the CITES Parties.....	67
Annex.....	71
1. Com. 2.14 - Financing of the Secretariat	
2. Com. 2.12 - Format for Proposals to Amend Appendices I and II	

## BACKGROUND

The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) was negotiated in 1973 in Washington, D.C. It came into force on July 1 1975. CITES calls for a meeting of the Parties to be held at least every two years. The first meeting was held on November 2-6 1976, in Berne, Switzerland and was attended by delegates from 24 of the 33 nations that were Parties at that time, by observers representing 13 non-Party nations and by observers from various organizations concerned with CITES.

The Berne meeting called for a Special Working Session which was held in Geneva, Switzerland on November 19-31, 1977. It was to produce items of practical use for the implementation of CITES. In attendance were delegations from 20 Party nations and observers from 5 non-Party nations and 24 organizations. Several items produced by the Special Working Session were recommendations which were to be considered by the Parties at their second meeting in Costa Rica.

The second meeting of the Parties was held in San Jose, Costa Rica on March 19-30, 1979. Thirty-four of the 51 nations that are now Parties along with observers from 16 non-Party nations, and from the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), United Nations Development Program (UNDP), Commission of the European Communities (EEC); and 56 other organizations were in attendance. The U.S. delegation was led by the Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Robert S. Cook, with Richard M. Parsons, Chief, Federal Wildlife Permit Office, as his alternate.

### GENERAL OUTCOME

The Second Meeting of the Conference of the Parties took significant steps to improve the effectiveness of CITES. The specific items, such as the adoption of guidelines for transportation and the recommendation of a format for proposals to change the appendices, are discussed in the body of this report.

At least as significant as these items, however, was the incalculable value of the direct contact and discussion of shared problems by management and scientific authority representatives. This process strengthens the network of continuing contacts between these authorities, the Secretariat and other government officials which is the real strength of CITES.

It is clear that the process of data-gathering on international trade and serious attention to the implementation of CITES have been enhanced by this meeting. As far as the amendment of the appendices is concerned, there was clear agreement on the importance of adhering to the Berne criteria for additions and deletions. However, it was not clear that the process of consideration of the proposed amendments lent itself to full application of the Berne criteria.

## FINANCING OF THE SECRETARIAT

### Background

When CITES was negotiated in Washington in March of 1973, the signatories assigned UNEP the responsibility for providing a Secretariat. Article XII, Section 1 of the text of CITES states that "...a Secretariat shall be provided by the Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme. To the extent and in the manner he considers appropriate, he may be assisted by suitable inter-governmental or non-governmental international or national agencies and bodies technically qualified in protection, conservation and management of wild fauna and flora." Section 2 states that one of the functions of the Secretariat is "to arrange for and service meetings of the Parties."

When the UNEP Governing Council met in June of 1973, it authorized the Executive Director of UNEP "to provide Secretariat services for the implementation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna in accordance with its article XII " (Decision 1(1)VIII).

In April 1974, the Executive Director of UNEP delegated Secretariat functions under the Convention to the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) for an initial period of one year. This delegation of Secretariat functions to IUCN was

later extended, in several separate funding stages, through December 1977. During that period UNEP allocated a total of \$322,224 to IUCN for the purposes of the Convention, including the holding of the First Meeting of the Conference of the Parties in Berne, Switzerland in November 1976 and a Special Working Session of the Conference of the Parties in Geneva, Switzerland in October 1977. This paid for only one professional person in the Secretariat itself.

At their first meeting in Berne, the Parties prepared a paper analyzing Secretariat needs under the Convention and on November 6, 1976 adopted a resolution urging

- (a) "that the Executive Director of UNEP provide further Secretariat capabilities based on the analysis presented in the paper prepared for this purpose; and
- (b) that the Parties give strong support at the May 1977 meeting of the UNEP Governing Council for the question of a reinforced Secretariat to be considered and treated by the Council as a matter of high priority." (Conf. 1.8)

The Berne paper concluded that the minimum staffing level at that time was 11 people.

The Governing Council of UNEP responded to this plea at its fifth session in Nairobi on May 25, 1977. In Decision 86(V)C, the Governing Council said that it

- 1. "Recognizes, with appreciation, the contribution made by the United Nations Environment Programme to date in providing Secretariat services for the Convention...;

2. Resolves that adequate means are essential for proper implementation of the Convention

3. Requests the Executive Director to provide further Secretariat capabilities based on the analysis presented in the resolution concerning the Secretariat of the Convention adopted by the First Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention."

However, the actual allocation of funds did not increase significantly.

When the Conference of the Parties met in Special Working Session in October 1977 it decided to request the assistance of the Executive Director of UNEP in further strengthening the Secretariat in the spirit of the Berne resolution and decision 86(V)C, and in perfecting a means of providing an adequate and effective Secretariat for the implementation of CITES. That request was made in a letter dated October 28, 1977 from Dr. Peter Gafner, Chairman of the Special Working Session.

In March of 1978, the Deputy Executive Director of UNEP responded to Dr Gafner's letter and confirmed the intention of UNEP's Executive Director to enlarge the Secretariat with funds provided under the terms of a UNEP project. At the same time, stressing the catalytic role of the Fund of UNEP, the letter conveyed to the Parties the proposal for an agreed cost-sharing arrangement including direct financial support by the Parties for the operation of the Secretariat and the convening of meetings of the Conference of the Parties.

A reversal came at the 6th UNEP Governing Council meeting in Nairobi in May, 1978, when UNEP decided to withdraw its support for the administrative functions of the CITES Secretariat after 1983 as well as for all meetings of the Conference of the Parties after the March 1979 meeting in Costa Rica. While the Parties were told that UNEP support of the Secretariat's administrative functions would cease, they were nevertheless invited to apply to UNEP for special project funding.

The result of the UNEP decision was to place the financial responsibility for supporting the administration and Conference functions of the Convention squarely on the Parties. UNEP's decision was seen as a firm challenge to the Parties to demonstrate their own commitment to the Convention by providing financial support for its activities.

Recognizing the importance of this issue for San Jose, the U.S. Management Authority prepared a discussion paper on the financing issue which was considered by the CITES Steering Committee at a meeting in Berne in early October 1978. Essentially three options were discussed in the paper:

- 1) at San Jose, the Parties could agree to amend the text of CITES by removing UNEP and substituting another financial agent;
- 2) the Parties could resolve at San Jose to ask UNEP to reconsider the position it took in May 1978 in Nairobi;
- 3) the Parties could resolve at Costa Rica to ask UNEP to provide, under United Nations rules, a trust fund to receive the voluntary contributions of the Parties. UNEP would administer the trust fund

and would continue its present agreement with IUCN whereby IUCN would provide the actual Secretariat staff and services.

The U.S. favored option three. This option, with variations, relating to funding formulae was presented to the Parties in a pre-Conference paper (Doc. 2.9) prepared and circulated by the Secretariat in December 1978. The Parties were asked to send their comments on Doc. 2.9 to the Secretariat by January 31, 1979. The U.S. was unable to comment by the deadline because it had not received public comment on the question of financing the Secretariat and it wished to have the benefit of public discussion of the issue before drafting comments.

Of the comments received from Party nations and circulated prior to the San Jose meeting, those of the Federal Republic of Germany caused the most concern. The Germans reported that their government could not contribute to the financing of the Secretariat unless the Convention were amended to show that this was a responsibility of the Parties under the treaty.

While the United States was sympathetic to the legal problem faced by Germany, it was concerned that opening the Convention to amendment would raise other controversial issues and result in an amended treaty which was "re-ratified" in part by some countries and not by others.

#### Action by the Parties at San Jose

The issue of financing the Secretariat came up on the Conference agenda on the morning of March 20. The German delegation explained its dilemma

and asked the Parties to consider calling an extraordinary meeting in Bonn in June 1979 to amend the Convention text to provide for Party responsibility for funding.

After several days of consideration both in formal debate and informal discussions 17 of the Party nations signed a request to convene an extraordinary meeting of the Parties at Bonn in June to amend subparagraph 3(a) of article XI of the Convention by adding the words "and to adopt financial provisions." After determining that the extraordinary meeting would be limited to the single item of business the United States signed the request, although it pointed out in plenary that it did not need the amendment in order to provide financial support to the Secretariat.

The request, was sufficient to call an extraordinary meeting under the terms of article XVII of CITES. Invitations were promptly sent to all member nations inviting their participation at the extraordinary meeting.

The Parties then turned their attention to the development of a financing plan. Dr. Mostafa Tolba, Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme, asked the Parties to reflect on the implications of amending the Convention. While not objecting to the convening of an extraordinary meeting and the subsequent adoption of an amendment to the Convention, Dr. Tolba expressed concern over financial arrangements for the interim period before the proposed amendment to CITES would come into force. Voluntary contributions from the parties would be required during this period and he explained

that it would be extremely helpful to have some indication from the Parties as to the level of contribution they would be prepared to assume. Dr. Tolba said he needed to know this so that he could inform the UNEP Governing Council. He then suggested that the best method to discuss interim arrangements would be through the appointment of a small working group of nations. Dr. Tolba said UNEP would be pleased to participate in such a group.

As the Parties discussed interim funding and possible voluntary contributions, the United States indicated its intention to make a voluntary contribution of \$50 000, subject to the approval of the U S. Congress in fiscal year 1980. The U.S. said it also could contribute \$50,000 in fiscal year 1979 if that were necessary.

The Chairman appointed a working group to specify the details of an interim financial plan and to propose voluntary funding levels for the Parties to use as a guide.

The United States served on the working group charged with developing interim financial arrangements. The working group, which was chaired by Canada, was comprised of the following countries: Sweden, the United Kingdom, the Federal Republic of Germany, France, Zaire, Botswana, Pakistan, India, and the United States. Representatives of Bangladesh and UNEP participated in the group as observers.

The working group met evenings after the close of the regular plenary sessions. They studied funding tables based upon United Nations

assessment scales, general and specific U.N. regulations for the establishment of trust funds, and terms of reference for the administration of U.N. trust funds. They consulted with UNEP's observers.

On March 28, the Chairman of the working group presented its recommendations to the plenary session. On March 29, after vigorous discussion, the Parties adopted Com. 2.14, which contains the following provisions:

1. that the Executive Director of UNEP establish, with the approval of UNEP's Governing Council, a trust fund to provide financial support for the aims of CITES in accordance with appropriate terms of reference based upon United Nations requirements;
2. that the terms of reference adopted by the Parties serve as a basis for contributions during the financial period beginning January 1, 1980 and ending December 31, 1981.
3. that voluntary contributions be made by the Parties in light of the U.N. percentage scale.

The U.S. made a floor statement (Plen. 2.17) of its willingness to make a voluntary contribution of \$100,000 for IUCN's 1980 fiscal year, subject to any necessary legislative approvals.

Further, the Parties agreed to review their provisional funding arrangement, including the request for creation of the UNEP Trust Fund, at the next Conference of the Parties in early 1981. By that time,

the Parties will have had some experience with the provisional voluntary funding arrangements and they will have some idea of the effect of the proposed financial amendment to the Convention.

Com. 2.14 and its annexes are attached for the reader's information.

## THE STANDING COMMITTEE AND OTHER COMMITTEES

### Background

The 1976 Berne meeting adopted a U.S. proposal to establish a small provisional steering committee to coordinate with the Secretariat the organization of the 1977 Geneva Special Working Session and the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties (San Jose). Representatives from Canada, Ecuador, Ghana, Switzerland and the U.S. were selected to serve on the committee.

The Steering Committee fulfilled its mandate and also carried out other important functions subsequently entrusted to it by the Parties at the Special Working Session, including appointment of a committee of experts to draft a standardized nomenclature; informal discussions with a UNEP representative on behalf of the Parties; and guidance on procedures to be followed for the preparation of an identification manual prototype.

The mandate of the Steering Committee was to expire at the end of the San Jose meeting. The Secretariat recommended to the Conference of the Parties the establishment of a permanent Standing Committee.

The U.S. position was to favor its establishment, with expanded and rotating membership, which would meet regularly with the Secretariat to ensure continuity of projects undertaken by the Parties and to advise the Secretariat on matters arising between regular meetings of the Parties.

## San Jose

At San Jose, discussion centered around the number and geographic distribution of committee members, and the financing of committee meetings.

The Parties decided to establish a nine member standing committee having these functions:

1. to provide guidance and advice to the Secretariat on the implementation of the Convention, on preparation of meetings and on relations with the host government of the Secretariat headquarters;
2. to act as bureau at meetings of the Conference of the Parties in accordance with the rules of procedure;
3. to perform any other function as may be entrusted to it by the Conference of the Parties.

The Standing Committee will have members from Africa, Asia, Central/South America, Europe, North America and Oceania. Also represented will be the immediate past and future host Parties of any meeting of the Conference of the Parties and the depositary country. The term of office of "geographic" members expires at the close of the second regular meeting following the meeting at which they were nominated (normally a four year term). In order to provide for continuity of membership, one-half of the geographic members appointed at San Jose will have terms which expire at the close of the next regular meeting. The following countries are currently members of the Standing Committee:

Zaire (Africa)  
Nepal (Asia)  
Brazil (Central/South America)  
United Kingdom (Europe)\*  
United States of America (North America)\*  
Australia (Oceania)\*  
Costa Rica (Immediate Past)  
India (Future Host, tentative)  
Switzerland (Depositary)

\*two year term

The Parties also provided that the Secretariat should consult with the Standing Committee before submitting proposals for funding to external funding institutions. In this regard the Parties requested that the Secretariat request funds from UNEP for development of the identification manual, and from UNEP or another appropriate institution for the further refinement of a standardized nomenclature of vertebrates and plants.

The United States accepted the Chairmanship of the Standing Committee until the close of the next regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

Other Committees established by or continued after the meeting are:

1. A committee of technical experts to guide the progressive harmonization of permit forms and procedures and to analyze and

discuss patterns of illegal trade and develop enforcement measures to alleviate such trade.

2. An ad hoc committee for the development of a standardized nomenclature (continuing).

3. Committee of Experts for the development of an identification manual (continuing).

4. Committee to be formed by the Secretariat to consider the problem of ranching of Appendix I species as it relates to CITES requirements.

5. Committee of experts to examine subspecies on the appendices and recommend to the Parties whether or not they should be retained as such on the appendices.

## CITES IMPLEMENTATION

### Background

Informal discussions at the 1977 Geneva Special Working Session centered around problems of importations and exportations by travelers and the need for standardized permit forms and issuance procedures. U.S. positions developed for the San Jose meeting dealt with strengthening controls on trade with countries not Parties to CITES, the need for better port controls and for higher standards of permit administration, including the need for standardization of permit and certificate forms.

### San Jose

The Parties adopted a recommendation made by the Secretariat that a committee of technical experts be formed to guide the progressive harmonization of permit forms. The necessary preparations and coordinating arrangements for the convening of the committee are to be done by the Secretariat. The mandate of this committee was later expanded to deal with the problems involved with trade in Appendix II and III species. This issue was originally the subject of a Swedish proposal calling for stricter national measures to be taken by importing nations to stem the flow of trade in these species. The Parties also asked the Secretariat to maintain its cooperation with Interpol for the enforcement of CITES and for detection of illegal traffic in controlled wildlife species and products.

## GUIDELINES FOR PREPARATION AND SHIPMENT OF LIVE SPECIMENS

### Background

Prior to issuing a permit allowing shipment of live specimens of animals or plants, a Management Authority of the country of export must be satisfied that the specimens will be shipped so as to minimize the risk of injury, damage to health, or cruel treatment.

The 1977 Geneva Special Working Session developed a detailed set of principles and asked the Secretariat to produce guidelines on the basis of the International Air Transport Association's live animal regulations and with the assistance of the IUCN's Survival Service Commission (TRAFFIC Group) as well as other organizations. The U.S. delegation volunteered to provide the Secretariat with a set of plant shipping guidelines; additional contributions in the plant area were made by the United Kingdom and Australia.

The draft animal shipping guidelines were prepared under the direction of Bill Jordan, Chief Wildlife Officer of the United Kingdom's Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA), by Charles Harley, with assistance from representatives of the RSPCA and TRAFFIC as well as a number of consultants.

### San Jose

At San Jose, a number of changes to the draft guidelines were suggested by two working committees and the guidelines were adopted as changed. Which mechanisms to employ in implementing the guidelines is a matter left to each Party.

## DEVELOPMENT OF AN IDENTIFICATION MANUAL

### Background

At the Special Working Session the U.S. had proposed an outline and format for a species identification manual. The Special Working Session asked the Secretariat of CITES to coordinate an international committee of technical experts in the preparation of such a manual for use of border officials in the enforcement of CITES. Soon after the Session, the Secretariat realized it did not have the means to carry out the request. After consultations with the Steering Committee and the Parties, the Secretariat asked the U.S. Management Authority to prepare a prototype of the identification manual for presentation at San Jose. An international committee of technical advisors was established to assist in the prototype development.

### San Jose

The U.S. delegation presented the prototype it had developed, and the Swiss delegation submitted an alternate format it had prepared. The U.S. delegation also submitted to the Secretariat a proposal for the further development of the manual including a proposed budget.

After some discussion on the style and development of the manual, the Parties decided that the Secretariat, in the light of a recent UNEP Governing Council resolution inviting the CITES Parties to submit proposals for projects which would assist in the implementation of CITES, should submit a project proposal to UNEP for assistance in the

development of the identification manual. The Parties also gave the Secretariat general authority to prepare suitable projects which would assist in the effective implementation of CITES and to submit, after consulting with the Standing Committee, such proposals to appropriate funding institutions.

Finally, the Parties agreed to continue the international committee of technical advisors.

## FORMAT FOR PROPOSALS TO AMEND APPENDIX I OR II

### Background

At the Special Working Session, few of the Parties were adequately prepared to undertake the detailed review of species listed on Appendices I and II recommended by the Parties at the 1976 Berne meeting. This was due in part to the lack of a method for presenting proposals, which would help assure that adequate information was transmitted and reviewed in advance of the Parties' actions on such proposals. Largely at the urging of the U.S. delegation, the Parties drafted for consideration at San Jose a Standard Format for use by the Parties when submitting proposals for amending Appendices I and II. Even though this draft had yet to be adopted, the Parties almost without exception used it in making their proposals for San Jose. The United States' experience with the draft led to its position of support for its adoption at San Jose with certain changes in the format's instructional footnotes. These footnotes relate to several important topics: (1) monitoring as a basis for listing, (2) listing of large taxa and the need for detailed information for listing proposals for species; (3) requiring proposals to specify whether species proposed for Appendix II for "biological" or "control" reasons; and (4) requiring proposals for inclusion of plants in Appendix II specify those parts that should be controlled. Topics 1-3 are discussed in "ISSUES AFFECTING THE APPENDICES" and topic 4 is discussed in "SEEDS AND CUT FLOWERS."

San Jose

Most of the discussions centered around the instructional footnotes.

Much of the U.S. position was accepted by the Parties. The format for Proposals to amend Appendix I or II was adopted. A copy is appended to this report. (See Com. 2.12 in Annex)

## STANDARDIZATION OF APPENDICES NOMENCLATURE

### Background

In accordance with a recommendation of the 1977 Special Working Session, a committee of experts, chaired by the U.S. was appointed by the Steering Committee to draft a provisional standard taxonomy and to compile a list of taxonomic bibliographic source materials for circulation to the Parties. The Chairman of the committee requested assistance from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which funded the production of a world list of vertebrate species by its Fish and Wildlife Laboratory in Gainesville, Florida.

Limits of time and money prevented inclusion of authors and dates for the taxa, or of synonyms or bibliographic sources. The world list was circulated to the Parties for their review prior to the San Jose meeting.

The purpose of having a standardized appendices taxonomy (nomenclature) is to eliminate doubt as to which species is meant to be controlled by any appendix listing. With its adoption it should be possible to remove taxonomic synonyms, sub-genera and other parenthetical taxa from the appendices.

### San Jose

The discussions focused on other similar projects in other countries and on the need for funding to enable completion of the nomenclature.

The Parties agreed to the further development and refinement of the standardized nomenclature for vertebrates and plants, and to continuing the committee of experts. In addition, they requested the Secretariat to seek funding in consultation with the committee from UNEP.

## OTHER ISSUES AFFECTING THE APPENDICES

### 1. The Berne Criteria

#### Background

The Berne Criteria were adopted at the 1976 Berne meeting in order to provide further guidance to the Parties on the requirements for adding or deleting species from the CITES appendices. Their adoption was a response to certain wholesale listing proposals made at Berne. The Parties at Berne also expressed the need to review the species listed on Appendices I and II using the Berne Criteria in order to insure the integrity of the appendices. The review was to have taken place at the 1977 Special Working Session in Geneva.

Few of the Parties at the Special Working Session were prepared for a review of the species. This was due in part to the lack of a Standard Format for presenting proposals to amend the appendices. Such a format was proposed by the U.S. delegation and the Parties recommended its adoption by the second meeting at San Jose. The Parties were to conduct the review for San Jose using the Berne Criteria, and as a matter of convenience, the proposed Standard Format.

In the course of carrying out its share of the review the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service became convinced that application of the deletion section of the Berne Criteria might result in the retention of some species on the appendices which may not be qualified in light of the

Berne Criteria for addition as applied to the fundamental principles of the Convention. This was particularly so with regard to the Bobcat.

To overcome this problem, the U.S. decided to advance a proposal that would maintain the integrity of the Berne criteria while providing a method whereby some species for which the current data appear to indicate no need for CITES protection can be removed.

The proposal was that, for a limited time, if a careful review of all available information on the status of a species does not lead to the conclusion that the species would be eligible for inclusion in its present appendix under the criteria for addition, the species should be removed from that appendix. This limited "suspension" of the deletion criteria would terminate after the fourth regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

#### San\_Jose

The U.S. resolution for a temporary suspension of the deletion criteria came up on Friday afternoon of the first week. The delegation had been lobbying on it all week, to explain what we were doing and why, especially to clarify that we were not "weakening" the Berne criteria. When the item came to the floor, the U.S. led off with a speech in which we reaffirmed our support for the Berne criteria, and explained what our proposal would do. Switzerland and Canada supported the proposal and South Africa offered qualified support, saying any such move was too hasty, in their opinion.

The U.K. then offered a series of amendments, the primary of which was to require that any deletion proposal must meet the deletion criteria. (The U.S. proposal was to delete on the basis that the addition criteria could not be (had never been) met. The World Wildlife Fund immediately supported the U.K. amendment. Other NGO's and Party countries followed suit rapidly.

At the request of the U.S., the U.K. explained that under its amendment, "...the absence of sufficient data to support the original listing should be taken into account when the Parties decide whether a deletion has met the appropriate criteria." (Plen. 2.10) We then caucused within the delegation and decided to accept the U.K. amendment. Our reasoning was that this would preserve all the preambular language which recognized that certain listings were supported with little or no information and called for a review of such listings. One other feature of the U.K. amendment was that it removed any time limit (the U.S. proposal was limited to a 4-year period) for such a review. The U.S. announced that it agreed to the U.K. amendment, and a vote was taken on the amended proposal. It passed 16 to 12.

## 2. Higher Taxa Listings

### Background

Some parties believe that the listing of taxa higher than species level, such as a genus, family or order simplifies the appendices and may

facilitate enforcement of taxa where species are similar in appearance or where use of synonyms for species names is likely. One disadvantage of higher taxa listings is the possibility that they include species that are not currently or potentially threatened with extinction, or that do not need to be subject to regulation to effectively control trade in other species in need of protection. The U.S. position for the San Jose meeting was to require that proposals to amend the appendices contain detailed information to support the listing of each species contained in the proposal, under the Berne criteria for addition.

#### San Jose

The Parties adopted a statement (part of the Standard Format for proposals) that when a proposal concerns a taxon above species level, sufficient information to justify the inclusion of any representative species selected from that taxon should be provided, and where the proposal concerns vertebrate animals, detailed information should be provided on each species.

### 3. Monitoring as a Basis for Listing

#### Background

The basic rules for listing of species are contained in Article II, Fundamental Principles, of CITES. The Berne Criteria contain a statement that Appendix II serves as a monitoring tool to gather such data. Also the proposed Standard Format for proposed appendices amendments contained similar language indicating that the need to monitor is

by itself sufficient grounds for listing species. However, the Fundamental Principles do not support this view. It was the U.S. position for San Jose to seek agreement that species not be included in Appendix II for monitoring purposes alone, and to amend the Berne Criteria and the proposed Format to reflect this.

#### San Jose

The U.S. delegation succeeded in amending the proposed format to eliminate reference to monitoring as a basis for listing. The U.S. attempt to eliminate the reference to monitoring in the Berne Criteria was withdrawn because of strong opposition to any changes at all in the Berne criteria.

#### 4. Listing of Rare Species

##### Background

The Special Working Session adopted a recommendation to the San Jose meeting that extremely rare species be considered as satisfying the biological and trade aspects for addition of species to Appendix I. The recommendation was proposed by the United Kingdom in relation to its proposal to list the Seychelles black magpie robin, of which there are only about 20 specimens currently alive. The U.S. position was to support this proposal with minor amendments to limit it to extremely rare species.

## San Jose

The Parties agreed that extremely rare species do qualify for listing on Appendix I and satisfy the Berne Criteria, and that listings should not always be made, however, when serious harm could come to the species as a result of publicity attendant on the listing.

### 5. Appendix I "Look-alikes"

#### Background

The Parties at the 1976 Berne meeting agreed in establishing the criteria for additions to Appendix I, that species similar in appearance with those on Appendix I which must be listed in order to control trade in such species should be shown on Appendix I with an asterisk indicating the control purpose of the listing. Because this procedure did not appear to be supported in the text of the Convention itself, the U.S. developed a proposal that control species of Appendix I species should be listed in Appendix II. This would assure legally adequate grounds to regulate Appendix I "look-alikes."

#### San Jose

There was strong opposition to any change at all in the Berne criteria. Although the U.S. attempted to explain the logic of our proposal, we stated that our main goal was to assure adequate protection of Appendix I species. Therefore, we withdrew our proposal on the basis that the record reflected the Parties' understanding that the annotation provisions

of the Berne criteria were legally adequate for the listing of Appendix I "look-alikes." (Plen 2.10)

## 6. Extinct Species

### Background

The Australians raised the question of how the Parties could uniformly determine when a species was extinct. In most instances an extinct species would not qualify for listing on the appendices (although there is a possibility it could qualify as a control species). The Australians suggested that a species be considered extinct if it had not been recorded during a standard period of time. The U.S. position sought to further protect the species by requiring that positive efforts to locate the species be made during the standard period.

### San Jose

The Parties generally agreed that there was a need for a mechanism to relist an extinct species upon rediscovery. Fearing that the methods for relisting provided by the CITES were not quick enough to respond in this situation, they agreed that at the end of a 50 year period, if despite repeated surveys, the species could not be located, its listing in the appendices should be annotated, p.e. (possibly extinct). They also noted that the Standard Format would ensure that extinct species are not added to the appendices. This, however, does not take into account the possibility of listing an extinct species for control purposes.

## 7. National or other International Protection Measures

### Background

In its review of the species in preparation for the San Jose meeting, the U.S. considered any national or other international protection afforded a species as relevant in determining the degree of threat to, and the likelihood of trade in, the species subject of a proposal to amend the appendices. The Secretariat on the other hand, in its comments on a postal vote taken prior to the meeting, stated that the existence of such protection was not relevant since its continued application is always subject to doubt.

### San Jose

The Parties did not directly address this issue although the Standard Format for proposed appendices amendments adopted at San Jose contains an element requiring information concerning national and other international protection status.

## 8. Feral Species

### Background

As a result of a difference of interpretation between Australia and Denmark, the Australians raised the issue of whether a feral house cat is covered by the Appendix II listing for Felidae approved in Berne.

## San Jose

Discussions centered around the differences between feral species and feral specimens of domesticated species. The Parties noted that it was not the intention of the Parties at Berne to include the house cat in the Appendices, but recognized the possibility of listing feral species in the appendices.

### 9. Listing of Subspecies

#### Background

A document submitted by Sweden proposed that the Parties abandon the listing of subspecies because of their doubtful biological significance and because they often raise difficult administrative and identification problems. Thus, according to this proposal, the entire species containing the subspecies needing the protection of CITES would have to be listed. The Secretariat in commenting on this proposal generally agreed with it but noted that the same problems exist with geographically isolated populations which are also eligible for listing in their own right.

#### San Jose

The U.S. delegation was instrumental in drafting a resolution adopted by the Parties which provided that only subspecies which are valid and readily distinguishable taxa should be included in the appendices. Where they are valid but difficult to distinguish from other subspecies, then

the entire species should be included (where eligible) in Appendix I or II when listing in Appendix III would not be appropriate. The Parties were aware of the fact that this resolution did not deal with listings of geographically separate populations.

## 10. Hybrids

### Background

In the United States there has been a growing concern that specimens could be represented as hybrids of CITES protected species, when in fact they were the protected species. By such representations, persons could avoid CITES controls. Different species of crocodilians are being hybridized and ocelots and margays (felid species) are being crossed. The United States prepared a resolution for the San Jose meeting which made the following points:

1. Hybrids may be specifically included in the CITES appendices, but only if they form distinctive and stable populations in the wild.
2. Hybrids specimens are subject to the provisions of CITES even though not specifically included in the appendices if one or both of their parents are of taxa included in the appendices.
3. If the parents of a hybrid specimen are included in different appendices, the provisions of the more restrictive appendix shall apply.

4. Determinations of whether trade in hybrid specimens will not be detrimental to the survival of the species should be made with reference to the survival of the included parental taxa or to survival of other taxa that were meant to be protected by inclusion of the parental taxa.

#### San Jose

With some minor modifications the U.S. proposal was adopted by the Parties.

### 11. Annotation of Appendix II Species

#### Background

The need for proposals amending Appendix II to indicate whether species are included because of actual or potential threat of extinction or because of the need to control trade in other such species is related to the type of findings that Scientific Authorities must make. The finding that export of a particular species will not be detrimental to its survival will obviously be more critical for species actually or potentially threatened with extinction than for species included for "control" purposes. The U.S. position for San Jose was to require that proposals to add species to Appendix II specify the reasons for the proposed listing.

#### San Jose

Many Parties objected to any annotation of the appendices, on the grounds that this would "clutter" their appearance and make them harder

to work with. the U.K. suggested language for the format for proposals which requires that the reason for listing a species (biological status or "look-alike" status) be specified. Species proposals form a part of the documentary record of CITES. This was agreed to by the U.S. and adopted by the Parties in lieu of annotation. In keeping with the sense of this agreement, the Parties which were proposing the listing of the orders Cetacea, Falconiformes and Strigiformes noted the reasons for proposing the listing of the species contained in those orders.

The U.S. then raised the problem of specifying the same information for species already listed. Many Parties felt that this was an internal matter, and that the Convention allowed flexibility for scientific authorities to make their own determinations based on an appraisal of the species' status. However, the Parties agreed to recognize, on the record, that certain U.S. populations of some species had been listed for "look-alike" reasons. This recognition was based on documentation which had been submitted by the U.S. in connection with the review of the appendices.

## 12. Seeds and Cut Flowers - Plant Defined

### Background

At the 1977 Geneva Special Working Session, some delegations expressed a need to clarify the terms "plant" and "readily recognizable part or derivative thereof" as they appear in CITES. The U.S. volunteered to

submit a discussion paper for use at San Jose. Under the Convention, the term "specimen" generally includes any animal or plant, whether alive or dead, and any readily recognizable part or derivative thereof. However for plant species listed on Appendices II and III, parts and derivatives are treated as specimens only if specifically listed in the appendices. Thus, it is important to know with regard to these plants whether a specimen is a plant or a part or derivative, for if it is a part or derivative it is only subject to CITES if it is specified in the appropriate appendix.

Although CITES distinguishes between plants and parts or derivatives, it does not provide any guidance as to what a plant is. The morphology indeterminate growth, and variety of methods of vegetative reproduction sometimes make it difficult to classify a plant specimen as a plant or part. This is particularly so with grasses and bulb producing plants as well as with seeds. Discussions between interested U.S. agencies on this problem proved lively and produced the definition of a plant which formed the centerpiece of the U.S. position at San Jose. The theoretical basis for the definition of the term plant was that a plant is any specimen that when living constituted a self-sustaining organism. On the other hand, in general, those plant specimens which did not constitute when living a self-sustaining organism would be considered to be parts or derivatives.

San Jose

This issue became intertwined with an issue raised by Australia. The Australian view of Appendices II and III was that if no parts or derivatives were specified, all readily recognizable parts and derivatives were included in the listing of a species. This directly conflicted with the U.S. view of the definition of the term "specimen," which was the basis of the U.S. position. A working group was formed to recommend a solution for the differing views on the matter of the impact of specification or nonspecification on the coverage of CITES. The committee produced a draft proposal which after some debate was adopted by the Parties. The substance of the proposal was to recommend that:

After Costa Rica,

1. When proposing amendments to Appendix III for animals and to Appendix II or III for plants, it will be accepted that all readily recognizable parts and derivatives are to be regulated unless particular parts or derivatives are specified as being exempt.
2. For those animals currently listed in Appendix III and plants currently listed in Appendix II or III, the Parties should agree at the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties that all readily recognizable parts and derivatives are subject to regulation unless particular parts or derivatives are specified as exempt.

The Parties took no action with regard to defining plant or plant parts or derivatives.

## THE PRE-CONVENTION EXEMPTION - ARTICLE VII

### Background

Article 7, para. 2 of CITES provides a certificate of exemption from the strict controls of CITES where a Management Authority is satisfied that a specimen was acquired prior to the time that CITES applied to the specimen. At the 1977 Geneva Special Working Session, there was some concern expressed that if the word "acquired" included acquisition of ownership rights, the exemption could seriously undermine the purposes of CITES. This would be especially so in the case of plants in the wild which are usually considered to be part of the land and thus usually owned by someone. Another issue which arose in the U.S. is the determination of the date when CITES applies to a specimen, especially when the status of the species under CITES has changed.

### San Jose

Discussion focused on the second of these issues. There are two sub-issues: first, does a change in the appendix status of a species change the applicable date; and second, is the fact that the country of origin was or was not a Party to CITES at the time of acquisition relevant to determining CITES applicability to the specimen? This latter issue found the U.S. delegation at odds with a position put forward by several European countries which favored the view that applicability of CITES to a specimen depended on whether or not a country was a Party to CITES.

Since no agreement could be reached on this important issue, the Parties adopted a U.S resolution which urges Parties experiencing significant problems administering or enforcing the exemptions of Article VII to take stricter national measures where appropriate to eliminate those problems; and which requested the Secretariat to undertake a study of the nature and extent of the problems of administering and enforcing each of the exemptions and to report its findings and recommendations to the third regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties.

## BRED IN CAPTIVITY, ARTIFICIALLY PROPAGATED

### Background

Paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article VII of CITES provide for the issuance of a certificate of exemption from the strict controls of CITES for animals bred in captivity and for plants which were artificially propagated. At the 1977 Geneva Special Working Session informal discussions as to the meaning of the term "bred in captivity" indicated that various meanings were being given to the term. Some thought it meant raised in captivity, which raised the possibility that the offspring of wild caught pregnant females or of wild collected eggs would be eligible for the exemption. The Federal Republic of Germany volunteered to present a paper on this point to the Parties at San Jose.

The U.S. position for San Jose was designed to provide the exemption for those specimens which were the product of a transfer of gametes in a controlled environment and to require that the breeding methods be demonstrably capable of reliably producing second-generation offspring. A controlled environment would be one that is intensively manipulated by man and has boundaries designed to prevent the controlled animals from intermingling with other animals of the same species.

### San Jose

At the meeting, concern was expressed by some Parties that a narrow interpretation of the term would discourage some breeding programs

which if not successful would result in more pressure on the species in the wild. Also, it was feared that commercial ranching of Appendix I species, which probably would not qualify for the bred in captivity exemption, would be adversely impacted. Instead of reshaping the definition proposed by the U.S. delegation the Parties decided to have the Secretariat form a committee to examine the ranching problem and report its recommendations to the third regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties. With minor amendments, the Parties adopted the U.S. proposed definition.

Bred in captivity as defined by the Parties means:

"...progeny including eggs, born, or otherwise produced in a controlled environment either of parents that mated or otherwise transferred gametes in a controlled environment, if reproduction is sexual, or of parents that were in a controlled environment when development of the progeny began, if reproduction is asexual.

The parental breeding stock must be to the satisfaction of the competent government authorities of the relevant country (1) established in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the wild, (2) maintained without augmentation from the wild, except for the occasional addition of animals, eggs or gametes from wild populations to prevent deleterious inbreeding, with the magnitude of such addition determined by the need for new genetic material and not by other

factors, and (3) managed in a manner designed to maintain the breeding stock indefinitely. A controlled environment for animals is an environment that is intensively manipulated by man for the purpose of producing the species in question, and that has boundaries designed to prevent animals, eggs or gametes of the selected species from entering or leaving the controlled environment. General characteristics of a controlled environment may include but are not limited to artificial housing, waste removal, health care, protection from predators, and artificially supplied food. A parental breeding stock shall be considered to be "managed in a manner designed to maintain the breeding stock indefinitely" only if it is managed in a manner which has been demonstrated to be capable of reliably producing second-generation offspring in a controlled environment."

The U.S. delegation also proposed and the Parties agreed to a definition of the term "artificially propagated" as it relates to the exemption from the strict controls of CITES:

"...plants grown by man from seeds, cuttings, callus tissue, spores or other propagules under controlled conditions. The artificially propagated stock must be (1) established and maintained in a manner not detrimental to the survival of the species in the

wild, and (2) managed in a manner designed to maintain the artificially propagated stock indefinitely. Controlled conditions for plants is under an environment that is intensively manipulated by man for the purpose of producing selected species. General characteristics of controlled conditions may include but are not limited to tillage, fertilization, weed control, irrigation, or nursery operations such as potting, bedding, or protection from weather "

The Parties also dealt with an interpretative problem related to these exemptions. Paragraph 4 of Article VII provides that Appendix I animals and plants which are bred in captivity or artificially propagated shall be deemed to be Appendix II specimens. However, paragraph 5 which provides a full exemption from the permit/certificate requirements of Articles III, IV or V for any specimen bred in captivity or artificially propagated, appeared to render paragraph 4 useless. The Parties agreed that paragraph 4 deals with Appendix I captive bred and artificially propagated specimens bred or propagated for commercial purposes and that paragraph 5 deals with all other cases.

PROCEDURE FOR THE EXCHANGE OF MUSEUM AND HERBARIUM SPECIMENS

Background

Article VII, paragraph 6 of CITES provides that the provisions of CITES requiring documents shall not apply to the non-commercial loan, donation or exchange between scientists or scientific institutions registered by a Management Authority of herbarium specimens, other preserved, dried or embedded museum specimens, and live plant material which carry a label issued or approved by a Management Authority.

At the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties at Berne in 1976, it was recommended that existing customs declaration forms be used for the exchange of registered herbarium specimens, that the exporters should write on the form the word CITES in manuscript and a description of contents such as "herbarium specimens" and the code letter for the institution involved as designated in the "Index Herbariorum " a book containing in part a listing of many of the world's herbaria. The Special Working Session dealt with the possibility of applying a similar procedure to exchanges of preserved animal specimens by registered scientific institutions.

At the Special Working Session, the Parties took a more restrictive attitude than at Berne with regard to the scientific institutions which might be authorized to apply the simplified procedure. As opposed to merely relying on a non-governmental list of eligibles, the Parties recommended that with regard to museums, a uniform set of authorization

criteria to be administered by the Management Authorities be adopted. The Parties also felt that the exemption should be limited to registered scientific institutions and to those scientists who were affiliated with them.

Due to the disparities between registration procedures adopted for scientific exchange of plant specimens at Berne and for animal specimens adopted at Geneva, it was apparent that the Parties at San Jose would have to find a uniform registration system.

#### San Jose

The U.S. delegation to San Jose took the position that:

1. uniform standards more detailed than those proposed by the Special Working Session be adopted;
2. the use of customs declaration forms bearing the CITES acronym, with appropriate identification of contents be continued;
3. the exemption be limited to registered institutions and their affiliated scientists;
4. where trade is to or from a non-Party country, the Party country involved should ensure that the institution in the non-Party country meets the standards for registration as indicated by the competent authorities of the non-Party government;
5. the exception be applied to include those species that are collected in one country for shipment to another as noncommercial loans, donations or exchanges.

At San Jose the Parties adopted the following detailed uniform standards for registration of scientific institutions:

"(1) collections of animals or plant specimens and records ancillary to them shall be permanently housed and professionally curated; (2) specimens shall be accessible to all qualified users, including those from other institutions; (3) all accessions shall be properly recorded in a permanent catalogue; (4) permanent records be maintained for loans and transfers to other institutions; (5) specimens shall be acquired primarily for purposes of research that is to be reported in scientific publications; (6) specimens shall be prepared and the collections arranged in a manner that insures their utility; (7) data on specimen labels, permanent catalogues and other records should be accurate; (8) acquisitions and possession of specimens shall accord with the laws of the State in which the scientific institution is located; and (9) all specimens of species included on Appendix I shall be permanently and centrally housed under the direct control of a responsible registered scientific institution, and shall be managed in a manner to preclude the use of such specimens for decoration, trophies, or other purposes incompatible with the principles of the Convention."

The Parties also agreed that the exemption should be limited to scientists affiliated with registered scientific institutions; that the exemption should be applied to include frozen museum specimens, that shipments must be between registered scientific institutions

and that the Secretariat shall ensure that non-Party institutions meet the same standards for registration as indicated by competent authorities of the non-Party government. Use of Customs Declaration or other approved labels bearing the acronym CITES and identification of contents as herbarium, preserved, dried or embedded museum specimens or live plant material for scientific study and the name and address of the sending institution as well as the codes of both sending and receiving institutions over the signature of a responsible officer of the sending institution were also approved.

It was agreed that the exemption should be applied to include those scientific specimens that are legally collected in one country for shipment to another as non-commercial loans, donations or exchanges.

## HUNTING TROPHIES

### Background

The question as to whether hunting trophies were covered by CITES surfaced at the 1976 Berne meeting. The question centered on hunting trophies of Appendix I species, trade in which, according to the Fundamental Principles (Article II) of CITES, must be subject to particularly strict regulation in order not to endanger further their survival and must only be authorized in exceptional circumstances. The 1977 Geneva Special Working Session determined that several such trophies were clearly covered by CITES. Informal discussions revealed that several Parties completely forbid importation of trophies while others, including the U.S., have strict limitations of one kind or another which would allow imports only where it could be shown that it would benefit the species. Still others relied on the findings of the exporting country.

### San Jose

The same positions appeared at San Jose. The U.S. position was to allow importation of Appendix I trophies only where there is clear and convincing evidence of countervailing benefits to the species that would offset the reasonable expectation that importation would stimulate further demand.

The Parties at San Jose determined that such trophies were clearly covered by CITES, and recommended that both the importing and the

exporting country should have the opportunity for comprehensive examination concerning the question of whether the shipment is serving a purpose which is not detrimental to the survival of the species. Such examination should, if possible, also cover the question of whether the killing of animals whose trophies are intended for import would enhance the survival of the species.

Finally, the Parties recommended that the scientific examination of the importing country on a request for importation of an Appendix I trophy be carried out independently of the scientific examination made by the exporting country.

## CITES IMPLEMENTATION

### Background

Informal discussions at the 1977 Geneva Special Working Session centered around problems of importations and exportations by travellers and the need for standardized permit forms and issuance procedures. U.S. positions developed for the San Jose meeting dealt with strengthening controls on trade with countries not Parties to CITES, the need for better port controls and for higher standards of permit administration, including the need for standardization of permit and certificate forms.

### San Jose

The Parties adopted a recommendation made by the Secretariat that a committee of technical experts be formed to guide the progressive harmonization of permit forms. The necessary preparations and coordinating arrangements for the convening of the committee are to be done by the Secretariat. The mandate of this committee was later expanded to deal with the problems involved with trade in Appendix II and III species. This issue was originally the subject of a Swedish proposal calling for stricter national measures to be taken by importing nations to stem the flow of trade in these species. The Parties also asked the Secretariat to maintain its cooperation with Interpol for the enforcement of CITES and for detection of illegal traffic in controlled species.

## PET TRADE

### Background

The Parties at the 1976 Berne meeting urged exporting countries to gradually restrict the collection of wild animals for the pet trade and urged Parties to encourage the breeding of animals for this purpose, with the objective of eventually limiting the keeping of pets to those species which can be bred in captivity.

### San Jose

South Africa stated that as CITES is increasingly enforced as to listed species, dealers are turning their attention to other wild species not so listed. The need for pets could largely be served by captive breeding of species easily bred. The Parties agreed to give increasing attention to this matter and to report back on this subject at their next regular meeting.

CITES AS IT RELATES TO THE INTERNATIONAL WHALING CONVENTION (IWC)

Background

At a special meeting of IWC held in Tokyo on December 19-20, 1978, it was resolved that the Parties to CITES take all possible measures to support the IWC's ban on commercial takings of certain species and stocks of whales. Since some of these whales are listed on Appendix II of CITES, there was a possibility that a Party to CITES which was not also a member of IWC could approve trade in IWC banned whales. The problem was how to prevent this from occurring.

The U.S. position on this issue was developed after extensive discussions among several agencies which centered on two possible positions: one, that the Parties should put all IWC banned whales on Appendix I (which prohibits commercial trade), and two, that the Parties should place IWC whales in Appendix I or II as appropriate with agreement of the Parties that those whales in Appendix II would not be commercially traded. The purpose of both positions was to ban all commercial trade in IWC banned whales. The differences in the positions centered on the question of whether species which did not satisfy the criteria for listing on Appendix I could still be so listed. The second view prevailed and was adopted as the U.S. position.

San Jose

At San Jose the Parties adopted, with minor changes, the U.S. position. The Secretariat will circulate to the Parties a list of IWC banned

species. The Parties also approved Special Working Session recommendations that the Secretariat consult with IWC and other sources concerning proposals for listing of Cetaceans, and that Parties which have not done so, adhere to the IWC.

TIME AND VENUE OF THE NEXT MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

San Jose

The discussion of the time and venue of the next regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties came up on the meeting agenda on March 20, 1979.

The Secretary-General stated that consultations were held in December 1978 on a possible location for the third meeting of the Parties, and that no replies had been received. He then asked the Parties represented for comments.

The delegate of India mentioned that his country was interested in hosting the third meeting of the Parties. However, he said it would take at least three months before India could officially commit itself to act as the host government.

The delegate from India suggested the tentative dates of February 2-13, 1981 for the third meeting.

The Secretary-General asked the Standing Committee to work with him on resolving that issue. He also announced that both Kenya and Tanzania had made tentative offers to host the next meeting, if India could not.

## THE SPECIES

### Background

Appendices I and II were developed in 1973 when the Convention was negotiated at a plenipotentiary conference of 80 nations in Washington, D.C. The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN), which prepared the original draft of the Convention, also helped develop a list of wildlife species in need of protection. The final composition of Appendices I and II (containing about 419 and 264 taxa respectively) was negotiated at the Conference, with many nations proposing changes in the original list.

Subsequent changes in Appendices I and II were not made until the nations party to CITES met in November 1976 in Berne Switzerland.

The Berne meeting gave rise to a call for a general review of the validity of the species listed on Appendices I and II to be made at a Special Working Session in Geneva in the following year. The Special Working Session review did not produce many formal recommendations regarding species status because of a lack of sufficient data in the proposals. The Parties, at the urging of the U.S. delegation, did recommend the adoption of a Standard Format for proposals to amend Appendices I and II. It was hoped that this would solve the problem of lack of sufficient data. They also recommended that the Parties review these appendices for action at San Jose.

Under the terms of this review, each Party was to survey the status of all species of wildlife listed in Appendices I and II that were native to its country. In cases where a species occurred in more than one Party country, the Secretariat of CITES was to designate one of the Parties to coordinate the review. Species not native to any Party were to be reviewed by Switzerland.

In the United States, a series of public notices requesting comments, and several public and interagency meetings led to the development of U.S. proposals on a number of native species and positions on species proposals resulting from foreign country reviews.

#### San Jose

The Parties considered 251 proposals. Those that were adopted will enter into force on June 28, 1979 except for those Parties which make reservations as to any species so adopted. Of the 251 proposals, 134 resulted from the review and 117 were new proposals. Many of these proposals were withdrawn before or during the meeting and others were rejected by the assembled Parties.

Appendices I and II were amended as follows:

Table I. Amendments to the appendices. I = Appendix I, II = Appendix II  
 O = not listed in either appendix, pe = possibly extinct, c =  
 listed for purposes of controlling trade in other species, sub-  
 species or geographically distinct populations.

Species	Common name	Current status	Status effective June 28, 1979
<u>MAMMALIA</u>			
MARSUPIALIA			
Macropodiidae			
Bettongia spp.	Rat kangaroos	O	I c
Caloprymnus campestris	Desert rat kangaroo	I	I pe
Dendrolagus spp.	Tree kangaroos	O	II (II c f New Guinea spp.)
Macropus parma	Parma wallaby	I	I pe
Phalangeridae			
Phalanger maculatus	Spotted cuscus	O	II
Phalanger orientalis	Gray cuscus	O	II
Wyulda squamicaudata	Scaly-tailed possum	II	O
Peramelidae			
Chaeropus eucaudatus	Pig-footed bandicoot	I	I pe
Dasyuridae			
Antechinomys laniger	Kultarr	II	O
Myrmecobius fasciatus rufus	Numbat	I	O
Planigale tenuirostris	Narrow-nosed planigale	II	O
PRIMATES			
Callithricidae			
Cebuella pygmaea	Pygmy marmoset	I	II

RODENTIA

Castoridae

Castor fiber birulai Mongolian beaver I 0

Muridae

Notomys spp. Australian hopping mice I II

Notomys aquilo Australian hopping mouse I II

Pseudomys fieldi Alice Springs mouse I 0

Pseudomys novae-hollandiae New Holland mouse I 0

Pseudomys occidentalis Western mouse I 0

Pseudomys shortridgei Shortridge's native mouse I II

CETACEA

Whales, porpoises and dolphins 0 Entire order in II, except those spp. in App 1\*

Platanistidae

Lipotes vellixifer White flag dolphin 0 I

Platanista minor Indus River dolphin 0 I

Delphinidae

Sotalia spp. Humpbacked dolphins 0 I

Sousa spp. Humpbacked dolphins 0 I

Phocaenidae

Neophocaena phocaenoides Finless porpoise 0 I

Phocoena sinus Cochito 0 I

CARNIVORA

Canidae

Dusicyon culpaeus Colepo fox 0 II

Dusicyon fulvipes Chiloe fox 0 II

<i>Dusicyon griseus</i>	Argentine gray fox	0	II
<i>Canis lupus</i> (Alaska and Canada pops.)	Gray wolf	II	IIc
<i>Canis lupus</i> (India, Pakistan, Bhutan and Nepal pops.)	Gray wolf	II	I
<b>Ursidae</b>			
<i>Helarctos malayanus</i>	Sun bear	II	I
<i>Selenarctos thibetanus</i>	Himalayan black bear	0	I
<i>Ursus arctos isabellinus</i>	Brown bear	0	I
<i>Ursus arctos</i> (Alaska and Canada pops.)	Grizzly and brown bears	II	IIc
<b>Mustelidae</b>			
<i>Conepatus humboldti</i>	Hognose skunk	0	II
<b>Felidae</b>			
<i>Felis caracal</i> (Asian pop.)	Caracal	II	I
<i>Felis concolor</i> (U.S. and Canada pops.)	Mountain lion	II	IIc
<i>Felis lynx</i> (Southwest Asian pops.)	Indian lynx	II	I
<i>Felis rubiginosa</i>	Rusty spotted cat	II	I
<b>Phocidae</b>			
<i>Mirounga angustirostris</i>	Northern elephant seal	I	II
<b>Otariidae</b>			
<i>Arctocephalus townsendi</i>	Guadalupe fur seal	II	I
<b>ARTIODACTYLA</b>			
<b>Camelidae</b>			
<i>Camelus bactrianus</i>	Bactrian camel	I	0

**Bovidae**

<b>Kobus leche</b>	<b>Lechwe</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>Ovis canadensis</b> (U.S. and Canada pops.)	<b>Bighorn sheep</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>IIc</b>
<b>Pantholops hodgsonii</b>	<b>Tibetan antelope</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Saiga tatarica</b> <b>mongolica</b>	<b>Mongolian saiga</b> <b>antelope</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>0</b>

**PERISSODACTYLA****Equidae**

<b>Equus grevyi</b>	<b>Grevy's zebra</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Equus zebra hartmani</b>	<b>Hartman's zebra</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>II</b>

**AVES****CICONIIFORMES****Threskiornithidae**

<b>Geronticus eremita</b>	<b>Hermit ibis</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>I</b>
---------------------------	--------------------	----------	----------

**Phoenicopteridae**

<b>Phoenicopterus ruber</b> <b>ruber</b>	<b>Caribbean flamingo</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>II</b>
---	---------------------------	----------	-----------

**ANSERIFORMES****Anatidae**

<b>Nettapus coromandelianus</b> <b>albipennis</b>	<b>White pygmy goose</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>Anas diazi</b>	<b>Mexican duck</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>0</b>

**FALCONIFORMES**

<b>All spp. except</b> <b>Cathartidae and those</b> <b>spp. in App. I</b>	<b>Hawks, kites and</b> <b>eagles</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>II and</b> <b>IIc*</b>
---	--	----------	------------------------------

**Accipitridae**

<b>Circus cyaneus</b> (U.S. pop.)	<b>Harrier</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>IIc</b>
<b>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</b> (Alaska pop.)	<b>Bald eagle</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>Ic</b>
<b>Pandion haliaetus</b> (U.S. pop.)	<b>Osprey</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>IIc</b>

**Falconidae**

<b>Falco rusticolus</b>	<b>Gyr Falcon</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Falco sparverius</b> (U.S. pop.)	<b>Kestrel</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>IIc</b>
<b>Falco peregrinus</b>	<b>Peale's peregrine falcon</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>Ic</b>

**GALLIFORMES**

**Tetraonidae**

<b>Tympanuchus cupido</b> <b>pinnatus</b>	<b>Greater prairie chicken</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>0</b>
--	--------------------------------	-----------	----------

**Phasianidae**

<b>Catreus wallichii</b>	<b>Cheer Pheasant</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Cyrtonyx montezumae</b> <b>mearnsi</b> (U.S. pop.)	<b>Mearns's quail</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Cyrtonyx montezumae</b> <b>merriami</b>	<b>Merriam's Montezuma quail</b>	<b>I</b>	<b>0</b>

**GRUIFORMES**

**Otididae**

<b>Chlamydotis undulata</b>	<b>Houbara bustard</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>I</b>
<b>Choriotis nigriceps</b>	<b>Great Indian bustard</b>	<b>II</b>	<b>I</b>

**Turnicidae**

<b>Turnix melanogaster</b>	<b>Black-breasted button quail</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>II</b>
----------------------------	------------------------------------	----------	-----------

**Pedionomidae**

<b>Pedionomus torquatus</b>	<b>Collared hemipode</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>II</b>
-----------------------------	--------------------------	----------	-----------

**COLUMBIFORMES****Columbidae**

<i>Caloenas nicobarica</i>	Nicobar pigeon	O	I
----------------------------	----------------	---	---

**STRIGIFORMES**

All species except those in App. I	Owls	O	II and IIc*
------------------------------------	------	---	-------------

**Strigidae**

<i>Athene blewitti</i>	Forest spotted owlet	O	I
------------------------	----------------------	---	---

**PSITTACIFORMES****Psittacidae**

<i>Cyanoliseus patagonus byroni</i>	Patagonian conure	O	II
-------------------------------------	-------------------	---	----

**CORACIIFORMES****Bucerotidae**

<i>Buceros bicornis homarai</i>	Great pied hornbill	II	I
---------------------------------	---------------------	----	---

**PASSERIFORMES****Estrilidae**

<i>Emblema oculata</i>	Red-eared firetail	O	II
------------------------	--------------------	---	----

**Muscicapidae**

<i>Amytornis goyederi</i>	Grass wren	I	O
---------------------------	------------	---	---

<i>Dasyornis broadbenti littoralis</i>	Rufous bristlebird	I	Ipe
--	--------------------	---	-----

<i>Psophodes nigrogularis</i>	Western whipbird	I	II
-------------------------------	------------------	---	----

**REPTILIA****TESTUDINATA****Testudinidae**

<i>Gopherus flavo-marginatus</i>	Bolson tortoise	II	I
----------------------------------	-----------------	----	---

**CROCODYLIA****Alligatoridae**

<b>Alligator mississippiensis</b>	American alligator	I	II and IIc
-----------------------------------	--------------------	---	------------

**Crocodylidae**

<b>Crocodylus acutus (U.S. pop.)</b>	American crocodile	II	I
--------------------------------------	--------------------	----	---

<b>Crocodylus porosus (except Papua New Guinea pop.)</b>	Saltwater crocodile	II	I
--	---------------------	----	---

**OSTEICHTHYES****Acipenseriformes**

<b>Acipenser oxyrinchus</b>	Atlantic Sturgeon	I	II
-----------------------------	-------------------	---	----

**MOLLUSCA****Lamellibranchiata**

<b>Mytilus chorus</b>	Chilean mussel	O	II
-----------------------	----------------	---	----

**FLORA****ARAUCARIACEAE**

<b>Araucaria araucana (Chile pop.)</b>	Monkey puzzle tree	II	I
--	--------------------	----	---

**ASCLEPIADACEAE**

<b>Ceropegia spp.</b>	Ceropegias	O	II
-----------------------	------------	---	----

<b>Frerea indica</b>	None?	O	II
----------------------	-------	---	----

**BYBLIDACEAE**

<b>Byblis spp.</b>	Byblis	O	II
--------------------	--------	---	----

**CEPHALOTACEAE**

<b>Cephalotus follicularis</b>	Albany pitcher plant	O	II
--------------------------------	----------------------	---	----

## CHLOANTHACEAE

All spp.	Lambstails	0	II
----------	------------	---	----

## HAEMODORACEAE

Anigozanthos spp.	Kangaroo paws	0	II
-------------------	---------------	---	----

Macropedia fuliginosa	Black kangaroo paw	0	II
--------------------------	--------------------	---	----

## MYRTACEAE

Berticordia spp.	Featherflowers	0	II
------------------	----------------	---	----

## ORCHIDACEAE

Renanthera imschoetiana	None?	II	I
----------------------------	-------	----	---

Vanda coerulea	Blue vanda	II	I
----------------	------------	----	---

## PROTEACEAE

Banksia spp.	Banksias	0	II
--------------	----------	---	----

Conospermum spp.	Smoke bushes	0	II
------------------	--------------	---	----

Dryandra formosa	Showy dryandra	0	II
------------------	----------------	---	----

Dryandra polycephala	None?	0	II
-------------------------	-------	---	----

Xylomelum spp.	Woody pears	0	II
----------------	-------------	---	----

## RUTACEAE

Boronia spp.	Boronias	0	II
--------------	----------	---	----

Crocea spp	Croceas	0	II
------------	---------	---	----

Geleznovia verrucosa	None?	0	II
-------------------------	-------	---	----

## THYMELAEACEAE

Pimelea physodes	Qualup bell	0	II
------------------	-------------	---	----

\*Listing of entire Order means that all species in the Order except those included in Appendix I are now included in Appendix II either because they are potentially threatened by trade or because they must be regulated to effectively control trade in other species. Listing of Order Cetacea includes Bryde's, Minke and Sperm Whales for trade threat reasons; balance of listing, except those species already included in Appendix I, were listed for control reasons.

All adopted amendments to Appendices I and II, including those proposed by the United States, were summarized in the preceding Table 1. Here, because the U.S. proposals are of particular interest to this country, are summarized the final action of the Parties at San Jose on all U.S. proposals.

Table II. Final action of the Conference of the Parties on United States proposals to amend the appendices.

Species	U.S. proposal	Final action
Mexican duck	Delete from App. I	Accept proposal
Marsh hawk	Delete U.S. pop. from App. II	Retain in App. II for control purposes*
Trumpeter swan	Delete from App. II	Proposal withdrawn
Mearn's quail	Delete from App. II	Accept proposal
Sparrow hawk	Delete U.S. pop. from App. II	Retain in App. II for control purposes*
Bobcat	Delete from App. II	Proposal withdrawn
Osprey	Delete U.S. pop. from App. II	Retain in App. II for control purposes*
Greater prairie chicken	Delete from App. II	Accept proposal
Atlantic sturgeon	Transfer from App. I to App. II	Accept proposal
American alligator	Transfer from App. I to App. II	Accept proposal
Southern sea otter	Transfer from App. I to App. II	Proposal withdrawn

Peale's peregrine falcon	Transfer from App. I to App. II	Retain in App. I for control purposes
Bald eagle	Transfer Alaska pop. from App. I to App. II	Retain in App. I for control purposes
Northern elephant seal	Transfer from App. I to App. II	Accept proposal
Golden eagle	Transfer eastern U.S. pop. from App. II to App. I	Proposal withdrawn
Guadalupe fur seal	Transfer from App. II to App. I	Accept proposal
American crocodile	Transfer U.S. pop. from App. II to App. I	Accept proposal
Bolson tortoise	Transfer from App. II to App. I	Accept proposal
Goshawk	List U.S. pop. in App. II for control purposes	Proposal withdrawn
Golden eagle	List western U.S. pop. in App. II for control purposes	Proposal withdrawn
Gray wolf	List Alaska pop. in App. II for control purposes	Accept proposal with* addition of Canada pop.
Puma	List U.S. and Canada pops. in App. II for control purposes	Accept proposal*
Bighorn sheep	List. U.S. and Canada pops. in App. II for control purposes	Accept proposal*
Grizzly and brown bears	List Alaska and Canada pops. in App. II for control purposes	Accept proposal*

\*Inclusion in Appendix II for control purposes was agreed by the Parties, but it will not result in formal amendment of the appendices.

NATIONS AND ORGANIZATIONS ATTENDING THE SECOND MEETING OF CITES PARTIES

Delegations from CITES Parties (39)

Australia	Ghana	Papua New Guinea
Botswana	India	Peru
Brazil	Indonesia	Senegal
Canada	Iran	South Africa
Chile	Jordan	Sweden
Costa Rica	Kenya	Switzerland
Denmark	Madagascar	Togo
Ecuador	Mauritius	Union of Soviet Socialist Rep.
Egypt	Morocco	
Finland	Nepal	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
France	Niger	
Gambia	Nigeria	United States of America
German Democratic Rep.	Norway	Zaire
Germany, Federal Rep. of	Pakistan	

Observers from Non-Party Nations (16)

Argentina	Israel	Netherlands
Bangladesh	Japan	Philippines
China, Peoples Rep. of	Korea, Rep. of	Surinam
Guatamala	Liberia	Tanzania
Indonesia*	Mexico	Thailand
		Zambia

\*Became Party during meeting

ORGANIZATION OBSERVERS (55)

American Association of Zoological Parks & Aquariums

American Orchid Society

Arizona Sonora Desert Museum

Association of Systematic Collections

Butterfield Laboratories

Canadian Association of Zoological Parks & Aquariums

Caribbean Conservation Corporation

Centro Agronomico Tropical De Investigacion Y Ensemanza

Chelonia Institute

Cicnic

Conseil International De La Chasse Et De La Conservation Du Gibier

Defenders of Wildlife

Environmental Defense Fund

Fauna Preservation Society

Florida Audubon Society

Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission

Friends of Animals

Friends of Earth

Funds for Animals

Fur Conservation Institute

International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies

International Bird Institute

International Council for Bird Preservation

International Foundation for Game and Wildlife Conservation/  
Fondation Internationale Pour La Sauvegarde Du Gibier

International Fund for Animal Welfare  
International Pet Trade Organization  
International Primate Protection League  
International Society for the Protection of Animals  
International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources  
International Whaling Commission  
Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries  
Mississippi State University  
Monitor Consortium  
Monitor International  
Museum of Comparative Zoology  
National Audubon Society  
National Consortium for Plant Conservation  
New York Zoological Society  
People's Trust for Endangered Species  
Pet Industry Joint Advisory Council  
Pet Trade Association  
Rare Animal Relief Effort  
Royal Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals  
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds  
Safari Club International  
Sierra Club  
Southeastern Alligator Association  
Universidad Nacional De Colombia  
Whale Center  
Wild Bird Society of Japan

World Wildlife Fund, International

World Wildlife Fund, U.K.

World Wildlife Fund, U.S.

World Pheasant Association

Zoological Society of San Diego

The sources of the above information concerning participants in the San Jose meeting were documents Part 2.1 and Part 2.2 which were produced and distributed by the CITES Secretariat at San Jose.

ANNEX

*approved as amended*

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

SECOND MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

San José (Costa Rica), 19 to 30 March 1979

FINANCING OF THE SECRETARIAT AND OF MEETINGS OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

RECALLING Resolution Conf. 1.8 adopted at its first meeting in Berne in 1976;

NOTING Decisions 86 C (V) and 6/5/D adopted by the Governing Council of UNEP in 1977 and 1978;

ACKNOWLEDGING with appreciation the services of the Secretariat provided by UNEP with the assistance of IUCN;

ACKNOWLEDGING that the procedure for amendment of the Convention has been initiated with a view to adoption of financial regulations;

RECOGNIZING that the Parties meanwhile should formulate interim procedures regarding their financial participation, ~~pending the adoption and entry into force of such an amendment;~~ *until the*

RECOGNIZING the need for an arrangement between ~~the Executive Director of UNEP, pursuant to his responsibilities under Article XII (1) of the Convention and Decision 6/5/D of the UNEP Governing Council (and the Parties pursuant to Article XI (3)(a) of the Convention;~~ *the parties and* ~~delete~~

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

REQUESTS that the Executive Director of UNEP establish, with the approval of the Governing Council of UNEP, a Trust Fund to provide financial support for the aims of the Convention in accordance with the Terms of Reference for the administration of the Trust Fund for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, attached as Annex;

RECOMMENDS that the Terms of Reference attached as Annex serve as a basis for contributions during the financial period beginning 1 January 1980 and ending 31 December 1981.

\* This document was informally corrected to conform it to certain changes adopted by the Parties at San José, Costa Rica.

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF  
THE TRUST FUND FOR THE CONVENTION ON  
INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA

1. A Trust Fund for the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (hereinafter referred to as the Trust Fund) shall be established for an initial period of two years to provide financial support for the aims of the Convention.
2. Pursuant to the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations, the Executive Director of UNEP, with the approval of the Governing Council, shall establish the Trust Fund for the administration of the Convention. The Executive Director may delegate the administration of the Trust Fund to the Secretary General of the Convention.
3. The financial period shall be for two calendar years beginning 1 January, 1980, and ending 31 December, 1981. The appropriations of the Trust Fund for the financial period shall be composed of:
  - a. the contributions made by the Parties ~~in accordance with~~ *in accordance with* <sup>General from</sup> ~~Table 1;~~ <sup>by reference to</sup> *incl. contr. from any new countries which are to be added to Table 1.*
  - b. a contribution from the Fund of UNEP in accordance with the Decisions of its Governing Council;
  - c. (voluntary) contributions from States not Party to the Convention, other governmental, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and other sources.
4. The budget estimates covering the income and expenditure for each of the two calendar years constituting the financial period to which they relate, prepared in US \$, shall be submitted to the regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention.
5. The estimates for each of the calendar years covered by the financial period shall be divided into sections and chapters, as shown in attached Table 2, shall be specified according to budget lines, shall include references to the programme of work to which they relate, and shall be accompanied by such information as may be required by, or on behalf of, the contributors, and such further information as the Executive Director of UNEP may deem useful and advisable.

6. The proposed budget shall be despatched by the Secretariat to all Parties at least ninety days before the date fixed for the opening of the regular meeting. *of the Conf. of the Parties*
7. The budget shall be adopted by a 3/4 majority of the Parties present and voting at the regular meeting.
8. The Executive Director of UNEP may make transfers from one chapter to another within the same section of the budget. At the end of the first calendar year of a financial period, the Executive Director may proceed to transfer any uncommitted balance of appropriations; to the same section in the second calendar year, provided that such transfers do not exceed 20% of the smaller amount of the two annual appropriations for the sections concerned.
9. At the close of the calendar year to which they relate, the uncommitted appropriations shall be cancelled unless required for transfer or carry over. At the close of the financial period to which they relate, the uncommitted appropriations shall be cancelled.
10. All contributions shall be paid in convertible currencies. *cont'd. from p. 1*
11. *that (some parties) after the beginning of the financial period - should be made*  
At the end of the first calendar year of a financial period, the Executive Director shall submit to the Parties the accounts *a provision* for the year. He shall also submit, as soon as practicable, the audited accounts for the financial period *remains of the* (BIENNIAL). *of the*
12. Except as otherwise defined in the foregoing, the general procedures governing the operations of the FUND of UNEP and the Financial Regulations and Rules of the United Nations shall govern the financial operations of the Convention.
13. These Terms of Reference shall be effective from the date of their approval by the Parties.

Table 2.

## 1980-81 BUDGET ESTIMATE

Budget/Programme Position		Estimated costs in US\$	
		1980	1981
11	<u>EXPERTS</u> Professional Staff (39 man/months per annum) (Secretary General, 2 Scientific/Technical Officers, and part-time translators *)  Consultants - long-term (14 m/m p.a.) (continuing consultancy agreement for trade monitoring and statistics, with IUCN/SSC TRAFFIC Group)  Consultants - short-term (3 m/m p.a.) (technical assistance missions, development of guidelines for legislation and administration, preparation of identification manual and taxonomy)	184,800  42,000  9,000	193,600  44,100  9,450
13	<u>ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT PERSONNEL</u> Secretarial Staff (27 m/m p.a.) (2 full-time secretaries and part-time support personnel) *	68,300	71,400
16	<u>TRAVEL ON OFFICIAL BUSINESS</u> (Staff and Consultants)	22,000	26,500
32	<u>GROUP TRAINING, MEETINGS</u> Third meeting, Conference of the Parties Steering Committee and expert meetings	- 15,000	108,000 5,000
41	<u>EXPENDABLE EQUIPMENT</u> Incl. purchasing/leasing of office furniture/equip- ment and photocopying	12,000	12,600
51	<u>OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF EQUIPMENT</u> (incl. telex)	3,600	3,800
52	<u>REPORTING COSTS</u> Proceedings, 3rd meeting Conference of Parties Identification Manual Other reports and publications (including editing, translation, printing, distribution)	- 18,000 25,000	8,500 10,300 26,250
53	<u>SUNDRY</u> Basic support services, incl. accommodation, lighting heating, cleaning, maintenance, telephone, postage	32,000	33,600
99	SUB-TOTALS	431,700	553,100
	GRAND-TOTAL for <u>biennium</u>	US\$ 984,800	

\* Permanent staff cover the three working languages of the Secretariat, requiring part-time external translation and typing during peak periods only.

# Reference list.

Table 1

## UN Scale of Contributions

Party	1980-81 share	Annual share	Annual Share *
	%	%	\$
Australia	1.54	0.770	7,582.96
Botswana	0.01	0.005	49.24
Brazil	1.04	0.520	5,120.96
Canada	3.04	1.520	14,968.96
Chile	0.09	0.045	443.16
Costa Rica	0.02	0.010	98.48
Cyprus	0.01	0.005	49.24
Denmark	0.64	0.320	3,151.36
Ecuador	0.02	0.010	98.48
Egypt	0.08	0.040	393.92
Finland	0.44	0.220	2,166.56
France	5.82	2.910	28,657.68
Gambia	0.01	0.005	49.24
GDR	1.33	0.665	6,548.92
FRG	7.70	3.850	37,914.80
Ghana	0.02	0.010	98.48
Guyana	0.01	0.005	49.24
India	0.68	0.340	3,348.32
Indonesia	0.14	0.070	689.36
Iran	0.40	0.200	1,969.60
Jordan	0.01	0.005	49.24
Kenya	0.01	0.005	49.24
Madagascar	0.01	0.005	49.24
Malaysia	0.09	0.045	443.16
Mauritius	0.01	0.005	49.24
Monaco	0.01	0.005	49.24
Morocco	0.05	0.025	246.20
Nepal	0.01	0.005	49.24
Nicaragua	0.01	0.005	49.24
Niger	0.01	0.005	49.24
Nigeria	0.13	0.065	640.12
Norway	0.45	0.225	2,215.80
Pakistan	0.07	0.035	344.68
Panama	0.02	0.010	98.48
Papua - N. Guinea	0.01	0.005	49.24
Paraguay	0.01	0.005	49.24
Peru	0.06	0.030	295.44
Senegal	0.01	0.005	49.24
Seychelles	0.01	0.005	49.24
South Africa	0.42	0.210	2,058.08
Sweden	1.24	0.620	6,105.76
Switzerland	0.96	0.480	4,727.04
Togo	0.01	0.005	49.24
Tunisia	0.02	0.010	98.48
USSR	11.60	5.800	57,118.40
U.A. Emirates	0.07	0.035	344.68
U.K.	4.52	2.260	22,256.48
U.S.A.	25.00	12.500	123,100.00
Uruguay	0.04	0.020	196.96
Venezuela	0.39	0.195	1,920.36
Zaire	0.02	0.010	98.48

336,407

\* Based on 1980-81 budget as shown in Table 2.

2.92  
Table A

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

SECOND MEETING OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

San José (Costa Rica), 19 to 30 March 1979

FORMAT FOR PROPOSALS TO AMEND  
APPENDIX I OR II

DRAFT RESOLUTION  
OF THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES

CONSIDERING the criteria for amendment of Appendices I and II adopted at the first meeting of the Conference of the Parties, (Berne, Suisse, November 1976);

CONSIDERING the difficulty of submitting usable information for consideration of proposals by the Parties;

RECOGNIZING the desirability of the establishment of a standard format for the compilation and submission of such information;

RECOGNIZING also that the Parties may wish to re-evaluate the placement of certain species in Appendix I or Appendix II;

DESIRING to maintain integrity in the amendment of the appendices;

THE CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION

RECOMMENDS

- a) that any proposal for amendment of Appendix I or II be accompanied by a memorandum written by the proponent with a view to its submission to the Parties at the same time as the proposal;
- b) that this memorandum correspond, when feasible, to the following format:
  - A. Proposal
  - B. Proponent
  - C. Supporting statement
    1. Taxonomy
      11. Class
      12. Order
      13. Family
      14. Genus, species or subspecies, including author and year
      15. Common name(s), when applicable
      16. Code numbers, when applicable

2. Biological data
  21. Distribution (current and historical)
  22. Population (estimates and trends)
  23. Habitat (trends)
3. Trade Data
  31. National utilization
  32. Legal international trade
  33. Illegal trade
  34. Potential trade threats
    341. Live specimens
    342. Parts and derivatives
4. Protection status
  41. National
  42. International
  43. Additional protection needs
5. Information on similar species
6. Comments from countries of origin
7. Additional remarks
8. References

Instructional footnotes

1. All data should be supported by reference to published literature or *other evidence* the latter should be appended to the proposal.
2. When there are no data or information available on a particular format subject, or when this is not relevant, the fact should be clearly stated.
3. a) When the proposal concerns a taxon above the species level, sufficient information should be provided, according to the standard format, to justify the inclusion of any representative species selected from that taxon.

When the proposal concerns vertebrate animals, detailed information should be provided on each species according to that format (it will be permissible to list species on one form where the same information applies).
- b) When the proposal concerns Appendix II, please indicate in item 7 whenever possible whether the proposal is made under Article II 2(a) or II 2 (b) of the Convention, and, in cases where groups of species or subspecies are entered for the same reason it will be sufficient so to indicate i.e. species a, b, and c under II 2(a), the remainder of the higher taxon under II 2(b). If the latter information on the need to control trade in such species should be included in item 5 (Information on similar species).
4. The proponent, item B, can be only a State Party to the Convention, in accordance with Article XV of the Convention.

5. It would be useful if the common names, item C. 15, are provided in as many languages as possible, but particularly in the official languages of the Convention and in those of the countries of origin.
6. Code numbers, item C. 16, can refer to computerized systems being developed in the field of systematics, to Red Data Book or FAO Coding.
7. In order that item C. 6 be as complete as possible, countries of origin should be consulted whether they are Parties to the Convention or not.
8. Under item C. 2 (Biological data), it is essential that the world status of the ~~species~~  
taxon be assessed in addition to the national status.

\* This document was informally corrected to conform it to certain changes adopted by the Parties at San Jose, Costa Rica.

APPENDIX TWO  
I U C N RED DATA BOOK - AVES  
1966, 1969, 1971

ENDANGERED

In immediate danger of extinction; continued survival unlikely without the implementation of special protective measures.

THREATENED

Not as rare as those taxa endangered, but believed to be threatened. Requires watching.

RARE

Not under immediate threat of extinction, but occurring in such small numbers and/or in such a restricted or specialized habitat that it could quickly disappear. Requires careful watching.

VERY RARE

Very rare but believed to be stable or increasing.

DEPLETED

Although still occurring in numbers adequate for survival, the species has been heavily depleted and continues to decline at a rate which gives cause for serious concern.

INDETERMINATE

Apparently in danger, but insufficient data currently available on which to base a reliable assessment of status. Needs further study.

OUT OF DANGER

Those forms which were formerly rare but have recovered to an extent that they are no longer in danger.

BOX BINDER BOND

APPENDIX TWO  
I U C N RED DATA BOOK - AVES

1327001005001001	PSEUDOCALYPTOMENA GRAUERI GRAUER'S BROADBILL	OUT OF DANGER
1327003021021001	THRIPOHAGA (ASTHENES) SCLATERI CORDOBA CANASTERO (SCLATER'S SPINETAIL)	INDETERMINATE
1327009045007002	EMPIDONAX EULERI JOHNSTONEI EULER'S FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327009053001001	NESOTRICCUS RIDGWAYI COCOS ISLAND FLYCATCHER	INDETERMINATE
1327012001014001	PITTA KOCHI KOCH'S PITTA	INDETERMINATE
1327013002003002	XENICUS LONGIPES LONGIPES NEW ZEALAND BUSH WREN	ENDANGERED
1327013002003003	XENICUS LONGIPES STOKESI NEW ZEALAND BUSH WREN	ENDANGERED
1327013002003004	XENICUS LONGIPES VARIABILIS NEW ZEALAND BUSH WREN	ENDANGERED
1327014001003001	NEOPREPANIS HYPOXANTHA SMALL-BILLED FALSE SUNBIRD	INDETERMINATE
1327016001002001	ATRICHORNIS CLAMOSUS NOISY SCRUB-BIRD	ENDANGERED
1327016001003001	ATRICHORNIS RUFESCENS RUFIOUS SCRUB-BIRD	ENDANGERED
132701700401101	CALANDRELLA (ALAUDA) RAZAE RAZA ISLAND LARK	VERY RARE
1327020004016001	CORCACINA GRAUERI TANZANIAN (GRAUER'S) CUCKOO-SHRIKE	INDETERMINATE
1327020004028001	CORACINA (COQUUS) NEWTONI REUNION CUCKOO-SHRIKE	ENDANGERED
1327020004042001	CORACINA (COQUUS) TYPICA MAURITIUS CUCKOO-SHRIKE	ENDANGERED
1327021006004002	HYPSPIPETES BORBONICUS BORBONICUS REUNION OLIVACEOUS BULBUL	OUT OF DANGER

BOX BINDER BOND

1327021006004003	HYPSSIPETES BORBONICUS OLIVACEUS MAURITIUS OLIVACEOUS BULBUL	ENDANGERED
1327021010015002	PHYLLASTREPHUS OROSTRUTHUS AMANI DAPPLED BULBUL	INDETERMINATE
1327021010015003	PHYLLASTREPHUS OROSTRUTHUS OROSTRUTHUS DAPPLED BULBUL	INDETERMINATE
1327023009004001	TELOPHORUS (MALACONOTUS) KUPEENIS KUPE BUSH SHRIKE	INDETERMINATE
1327028005001001	FERMINIA CERVERAI ZAPATA WREN	OUT OF DANGER
1327028010003003	SALPINCTES OBSOLETUS GUADELOUPENSIS GUADELOUPE ROCK WREN	THREATENED
1327028013002017	TROGLODYTES AEDON GUADELOUPENSIS GUADELOUPE HOUSE WREN	ENDANGERED
1327028013002021	TROGLODYTES AEDON MESOLEUCUS ST. LUCIA WREN	ENDANGERED
1327028013002023	TROGLODYTES AEDON MUSICUS ST. VINCENT WREN	ENDANGERED
1327028013006002	TROGLODYTES TROGLODYTES ALASCENSIS PRIBILOV WREN	THREATENED
1327028013006006	TROGLODYTES TROGLODYTES FRIDARIENSIS FAIR ISLE WREN	VERY RARE
1327028013006011	TROGLODYTES TROGLODYTES HIRTENSIS ST. KILDA WREN	VERY RARE
1327029002001002	CINCLOCERTHIA RUFICAUDA GUTTURALIS MARTINIQUE BROWN TREMBLER	ENDANGERED
1327029010001009	NESOMIMUS TRIFASCIATUS TRIFASCIATUS CHARLES ISLAND MOCKINGBIRD	THREATENED
1327029012001002	RAMPHOCINCLUS BRACHYURUS BRACHYURUS MARTINIQUE WHITE-BREASTED THRASHER	ENDANGERED
1327029012001003	RAMPHOCINCLUS BRACHYURUS SANCTAE-LUCIAE ST. LUCIA WHITE-BREASTED THRASHER	ENDANGERED
1327031011001005	CICHLHERMINIA LHERMINIERI SANCTAE-LUCIAE ST. LUCIA FOREST THRUSH	RARE
1327031014005002	COPSYCHUS NIGER CEBUENSIS CEBU BLACK SHAMA	ENDANGERED

1327031014008001	COPSYCHUS SEYCHELLARUM SEYCHELLES (MAGPIE-ROBIN) SHAMA	ENDANGERED
1327031019023001	ERITHACUS RUFICEPS RUFIOUS-HEADED ROBIN	INDETERMINATE
1327031028002003	MYADESTES ELISABETH RETRUSUS ISLE OF PINES SOLITAIRE	ENDANGERED
1327031028003006	MYADESTES GENIBARBIS SIBILANS ST. VINCENT THRUSH	THREATENED
1327031033001002	NESOCICHLA EREMITA EREMITA TRISTAN STARCHY	THREATENED
1327031033001003	NESOCICHLA EREMITA GORDONI TRISTAN STARCHY	THREATENED
1327031033001004	NESOCICHLA EREMITA PROCAX TRISTAN STARCHY	THREATENED
1327031035002003	PHAEORNIS OBSCURUS MYADESTINA KAUAI THRUSH	ENDANGERED
1327031035002004	PHAEORNIS OBSCURUS OBSCURUS HAWAII THRUSH	OUT OF DANGER
1327031035002005	PHAEORNIS OBSCURUS RUTHA MOLOKAI THRUSH	ENDANGERED
1327031035003001	PHAEORNIS PALMERI (PUAIOHI) SMALL KAUAI THRUSH	ENDANGERED
1327031047022001	TURDUS HELLERI TEITA OLIVE THRUSH	THREATENED
1327031048004001	ZOOTHERA CINEREA ASHY GROUND THRUSH	THREATENED
1327031055002002	PSOPHODES NIGROGULARIS LEUCOGASTER WESTERN WHIPBIRD	THREATENED
1327031055002003	PSOPHODES NIGROGULARIS NIGROGULARIS WESTERN WHIPBIRD	THREATENED
1327031055002004	PSOPHODES NIGROGULARIS PONDALOWIENSIS WESTERN WHIPBIRD	THREATENED
1327031109010001	PARADOXORNIS HEUDEI (LOWER YANGTZE KIANG CROW-TIT) YANGTZE SUTHORA	INDETERMINATE
1327031110002001	PICATHARTES GYMNOCEPHALUS YELLOW-HEADED (WHITE-NECKED) ROCK-FOWL	ENDANGERED

1327031110003001	PICATHARTES OREAS RED-HEADED (GREY-NECKED) ROCK-FOWL	ENDANGERED
1327031115015002	ACROCEPHALUS KINGI NIHOA MILLER-BIRD	RARE
1327031115016002	ACROCEPHALUS LUSCINIA REHSEI NAURU NIGHTINGALE WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327031119002001	BEBRORNIS RODERICANUS RODRIGUEZ WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327031119003001	BEBRORNIS SECHELLENSIS SEYCHELLES WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327031120001002	BOWDLERIA PUNCTATA WILSONI CODFISH ISLAND FERNBIRD	RARE
1327031179004001	AMYTORNIS GOYDERI EYREAN GRASS-WREN	ENDANGERED
1327031187002002	DASYORNIS BRACHYPTERUS LONGIROSTRIS WESTERN BRISTLEBIRD	DEPLETED
1327031187003002	DASYORNIS BROADBENTI LITTORALIS WESTERN RUFIOUS BRISTLEBIRD	RARE
1327031199010001	SERICORNIS NIGROVIRIDIS WATUT LEAF WARBLER	INDETERMINATE
1327031222008002	PETROICA MULTICOLOR MULTICOLOR SCARLET-BREASTED ROBIN	ENDANGERED
1327031222012001	PETROICA TRAVERSI CATHAM ISLAND ROBIN	INDETERMINATE
1327031240001001	METABOLUS RUGENSIS TRUK MONARCH	INDETERMINATE
1327031241028001	MONARCHA TAKASUKASAE TINIAN MONARCH	INDETERMINATE
1327031244005002	PONAREA NIGRA NIGRA TAHITI FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327031246004001	TERPSIPHONE BOURBONNENSIS COQ DE BOIS	DEPLETED
1327031246006001	TERPSIPHONE CORVINA SEYCHELLES BLACK FLYCATCHER	THREATENED
1327031249018001	RHIPIDURA LEPIDA PALAU FANTAIL	INDETERMINATE

1327031259001002	TURNAGRA CAPENSIS CAPENSIS PIOPIO	ENDANGERED
1327031259001003	TURNAGRA CAPENSIS TANAGRA PIOPIO	ENDANGERED
1327041007002001	RUKIA (SANFORDI) LONGIROSTRA PONAPE GREAT WHITE-EYE	INDETERMINATE
1327041007005001	RUKIA RUKI TRUK (GREAT) WHITE-EYE	INDETERMINATE
1327041008002001	SPEIROPS BRUNNEA FERNANDO PO SPEIROPS	INDETERMINATE
1327041011036001	ZOSTEROPS MODESTUS MAHE (SEYCHELLES) WHITE-EYE	VERY RARE
1327042019006001	MELIPHAGA CASSIDIX HELMETED HONEYEATER	VERY RARE
1327042022004001	MOHO BRACCATUS KAUAI OO	ENDANGERED
1327042025001001	NOTIOMYSTIS CINCTA STITCHBIRD	VERY RARE
1327042032001002	PROSTEMADERA NOVAESEELANDIAE CHATHAMENSIS CHATHAM ISLAND TUI	THREATENED
1327043004009002	AMMODRAMUS MARITIMUS MIRABILIS (AMMOSPIZA MIRABILIS) CAPE SABLE SPARROW	THREATENED
1327043004009003	AMMADRAMUS MARITIMUS NIGRESCENS (AMMOSPIZA NIGRESCENS) DUSKY SEASIDE SPARROW	RARE
1327043004010002	AMMODRAMUS SANDWICHENSIS PRINCEPS (PASSERCULUS PRINCEPS) IPSWICH SPARROW	THREATENED
1327043040002002	NESOSPIZA ACUNHAE ACUNHAE TRISTAN BUNTING	VERY RARE
1327043040002003	NESOSPIZA ACUNHAE QUESTI TRISTAN BUNTING	VERY RARE
1327043040003002	NESOSPIZA WILKINSI DUNNEI WILKINS'S BUNTING	VERY RARE
1327043040003003	NESOSPIZA WILKINSI WILKINSI WILKINS'S BUNTING	VERY RARE

1327043061001002	TORREORNIS INEXPECTATA INEXPECTATA ZAPATA SPARROW	INDETERMINATE
1327043061001003	TORREORNIS INEXPECTATA SIGMANI ZAPATA SPARROW	INDETERMINATE
1327044006007001	DENDROICA CHRYSOPARIA GOLDEN-CHEEKED WARBLER	OUT OF DANGER
1327044006013001	DENDROICA KIRTLANDII KIRTLAND'S WARBLER	VERY RARE
1327044006019008	DENDROICA PETECHIA AUREOLA COCOS YELLOW WARBLER	INDETERMINATE
1327044006019028	DENDROICA PETECHIA PETECHIA BARBADOS YELLOW WARBLER	THREATENED
1327044013001001	LEUCOPEZA SEMPERI SEMPER'S WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327044025002001	VERMIVORA BACHMANII BACHMAN'S WARBLER	VERY RARE
1327045001002002	HEMIGNATHUS LUCIDUS AFFINIS MAUI NUKUPUU	ENDANGERED
1327045001002003	HEMIGNATHUS LUCIDUS HANAPEPE NUKUPUU	ENDANGERED
1327045001004001	HEMIGNATHUS PROCERUS KAUAI AKIALOA	ENDANGERED
1327045001005001	HEMIGNATHUS WILSONI (HAWAIIAN NUKUPUU) AKIAPOLAAU	ENDANGERED
1327045002002004	LOXOPS COCCINEA OCHRACEA MAUI AKEPA	INDETERMINATE
1327045002003003	LOXOPS MACULATA FLAMMEA MOLOKAI CREEPER	ENDANGERED
1327045002003004	LOXOPS MACULATA MACULATA OAHU CREEPER	INDETERMINATE
1327045002003007	LOXOPS MACULATA NEWTONI MAUI CREEPER	RARE
1327045004001001	PSEUDONESTOR XANTHOPHRYS MAUI PARROTBILL	INDETERMINATE
1327045005002001	PSITTIROSTRA BAILLEUI PALILA	INDETERMINATE

1327045005003002	PSITTIROSTRA CANTANS CANTANS LAYSAN FINCH-BILL	OUT OF DANGER
1327045005003003	PSITTIROSTRA CANTANS ULTIMA NIHOA FINCH-BILL	OUT OF DANGER
1327045005007001	PSITTIROSTRA PSITTACEA O U	ENDANGERED
1327045009001001	PALMERIA DOLEI CRESTED HONEYCREEPER	RARE
1327047010015002	ICTERUS LEUCOPTERYX BAIRDI GRAND CAYMAN TROUPIAL	ENDANGERED
1327047013002003	MOLOTHRUS AENEUS ARMENTI (TANGAVIUS ARMENTI) COLUMBIAN RED-EYED COWBIRD	INDETERMINATE
1327047018005001	QUISCALUS (CASSIDIX) NICARAGUENSIS NICARAGUA GRACKLE	INDETERMINATE
1327047018007001	QUISCALUS (CASSIDIX) PALUSTRIS SLENDER-BILLED GRACKLE	ENDANGERED
1327048002006001	ACANTHIS (WARSANGLIA) JOHANNIS WARSANGLI LINNET	INDETERMINATE
1327048015007008	PYRRHULA PYRRHULA MURINA SAO MIGUEL BULLFINCH	ENDANGERED
1327050014006001	FOUDIA RUBRA MAURITIUS FODY	DEPLETED
1327050014007001	FOUDIA SEHELLARUM SEYCHELLES FODY	ENDANGERED
1327051003021001	APLONIS PELZELNI PONAPE MOUNTAIN STARLING	INDETERMINATE
1327051013001001	LEUCOPSAR ROTHSCHILDI ROTHSCHILD'S (STARLING) MYNAH	INDETERMINATE
1327054001001002	CALLAEAS CINEREA CINEREA SOUTH ISLAND KOKAKO	ENDANGERED
1327054001001003	CALLAEAS CINERA WILSONI NORTH ISLAND KOKAKO	THREATENED
1327054002001002	CREADION CARUNCULATUS CARUNCULATUS SOUTH ISLAND SADDLEBACK	VERY RARE
1327054002001003	CREADION CARUNCULATUS RUFUSATER NORTH ISLAND SADDLEBACK	VERY RARE

1327060005036001

CORVUS TROPICUS  
HAWAIIAN CROW

ENDANGERED

APPENDIX THREE

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA LIST OF ENDANGERED NATIVE AND FOREIGN BIRDS

Public Law 93-205, December 28, 1973

Endangered Species Act of 1973

The U. S. list of Endangered Foreign and Native Birds was published in the Federal Register, Vol. 35, No. 223 - Wednesday, December 2, 1970, and revised in Vol. 42, No. 135 - Thursday, July 14, 1977.\*

"The term 'endangered species' means any species which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range..."

\*Species included in federal list as a result of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species are listed separately in Appendix Four, Part I.

## APPENDIX THREE

## UNITED STATES LIST OF ENDANGERED NATIVE BIRDS

1327031035002003	PHAEORNIS OBSCURUS MYADESTINA KAUAI THRUSH	ENDANGERED
1327031035002005	PHAEORNIS OBSCURUS RUTHA MOLOKAI THRUSH	ENDANGERED
1327031035003001	PHAEORNIS PALMERI SMALL KAUAI THRUSH	ENDANGERED
1327031115015001	ACROCEPHALUS KINGI NIHOA MILLERBIRD	ENDANGERED
1327042022004001	MOHO BRACCATUS KAUAI OO	ENDANGERED
1327043004009002	AMMODRAMUS MARITIMUS MIRABILIS (AMMOSPIZA MIRABILIS) CAPE SABLE SPARROW	ENDANGERED
1327043004009003	AMMODRAMUS MARITIMUS NEGRESCENS (AMMOSPIZA NIGRESCENS) DUSKY SEASIDE SPARROW	ENDANGERED
1327043065009002	ZONOTRICHIA (MELOSPIZA) MELODIA GRAMINEA SANTA BARBARA SPARROW	ENDANGERED
1327044006013001	DENDROICA KIRTLANDII KIRTLAND'S WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327044025002001	VERMIVORA BACHMANII BACHMAN'S WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327045001002001	HEMIGNATHUS LUCIDUS KAUAI AND MAUI NUKUPOUS	ENDANGERED
1327045001004001	HEMIGNATHUS PROCERUS KAUAI AKIALOA	ENDANGERED
1327045001005001	HEMIGNATHUS WILSONI AKIAPOLAAU	ENDANGERED
1327045002002003	LOXOPS COCCINEA COCCINEA HAWAII AKEPA	ENDANGERED
1327045002002004	LOXOPS COCCINEA OCHRACEU MAUI AKEPA	ENDANGERED

1327045002003003	LOXOPS MACULATA FLAMMEA MOLAKAI CREEPER	ENDANGERED
1327045002003004	LOXOPS MACULATA MACULATA OAHU CREEPER	ENDANGERED
1327045002003005	LOXOPS MACULATA MANA HAWAII CREEPER	ENDANGERED
1327045003001001	MELAMPROSOPS PHAEOSOMA POO ULI	ENDANGERED
1327045004001001	PSEUDONESTOR XANTHORPHRYS MAUI PARROTBILL	ENDANGERED
1327045005002001	PSITTIROSTRA BAILLEUI PALILA	ENDANGERED
1327045005003001	PSITTIROSTRA CANTANS LAYSAN AND NIHOA FINCHES	ENDANGERED
1327045005007001	PSITTIROSTRA PSITTACEA OU	ENDANGERED
1327045009001001	PALMERIA DOLEI CRESTED HONEYCREEPER	ENDANGERED
1327047001009001	AEGELAIUS XANTHOMUS YELLOW-SHOULDERED BEACHBIRD	ENDANGERED
1327060005036001	CORVUS TROPICUS HAWAIIAN CROW	ENDANGERED

## APPENDIX THREE (CONTINUED)

## U.S. LIST OF ENDANGERED FOREIGN BIRDS

1327009045007002	EMPIDONAX EULERI JOHNSTONEI EULER'S FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327013002003001	XENICUS LONGIPES NEW ZEALAND BUSH WREN	ENDANGERED
1327016001002001	ATRICHORNIS CLAMOSUS NOISY SCRUB-BIRD	ENDANGERED
1327020004028001	CORACINA (COQUUS) NEWTONI REUNION CUCKOO SHRIKE	ENDANGERED
1327020004042001	CORACINA (COQUUS) TYPICUS MAURITIUS CUCKOO SHRIKE	ENDANGERED
1327021006004003	HYSIPETES BORBONICUS OLIVACEUS MARURTIUS OLIVACEOUS BULBUL	ENDANGERED
1327028013002017	TROGLODYTES AEDON GUADELOUPENSIS GUADELOUPE HOUSE WREN	ENDANGERED
1327028013002021	TROGLODYTES AEDON MESOLEUCUS ST. LUCIA WREN	ENDANGERED
1327029002001002	CINCLOCERTHIA RUFICAUDA GUTTURALIS MARTINIQUE BROWN TREMBLER	ENDANGERED
1327029012001001	RAMPHOCINCLUS BRACHYURUS WHITE-BREASTED THRASHER	ENDANGERED
1327031014005002	COPSYCHUS NIGER CEBUENSIS CEBU BLACK SHAMA	ENDANGERED
1327031014008001	COPSYCHUS SEYCHELLARUM SEYCHELLES (MAGPIE-ROBIN) SHAMA	ENDANGERED
1327031055002001	PSOPHODES NIGROGULARIS BLACK-THROATED (WESTERN) WHIPBIRD	ENDANGERED
1327031110002001	PICATHARTES GYMNOCEPHALUS YELLOW-HEADED (WHITENECKED) ROCK-FOWL (FLYCATCHER)	ENDANGERED
1327031110003001	PICATHARTES OREAS RED-HEADED (GREYNECKED) ROCK-FOWL (FLYCATCHER)	ENDANGERED

1327031115016001	ACROCEPHALUS LUSCINIA NIGHTINGALE (REED) WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327031119002001	BERBRORNIS RODERICANUS RODRIGUEZ WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327031119003001	BEBRORNIS SEHELLENSIS SEYCHELLES WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327031179004001	AMYTORNIS GOYDERI EYREAN GRASS-WREN	ENDANGERED
1327031187002002	DASYORNIS BRACHYPTERUS LONGIROSTRIS WESTERN BRISTLEBIRD	ENDANGERED
1327031222008002	PETROICA MULTICOLOR MULTICOLOR SCARLET-BREASTED ROBIN FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327031222012002	PETROICA TRAVERSI ULTIMA CATHAM ISLAND ROBIN FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327031241028001	MONARCHA TAKATSUKASAE TINIAN MONARCH	ENDANGERED
1327031244005002	POMAREA NIGRA NIGRA TAHITI FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327031246006001	TERPSIPHONE CORVINA SEYCHELLES BLACK FLYCATCHER	ENDANGERED
1327031249018001	RHIPIDURA LEPIDA PALAU FANTAIL (FLYCATCHER)	ENDANGERED
1327031259001001	TURNAGRA CAPENSIS PIOPIO	ENDANGERED
1327041007002001	RUKIA (SANFORDI) LONGIROSTRA PONAPE GREAT WHITE-EYE	ENDANGERED
1327041011036001	ZOSTEROPS MODESTUS MAHE (SEYCHELLES) WHITE-EYE	ENDANGERED
1327042019006001	MELIPHAGA CASSIDIX HELMETED HONEYEATER	ENDANGERED
1327044006013001	DENDROICA KIRTLANDII KIRTLAND'S WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327044006019028	DENDROICA PETECHIA PETECHIA BARBADOS YELLOW WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327044013001001	LEUCOPEZA SEMPERI SEMPER'S WARBLER	ENDANGERED

1327044025002001	VERMIVORA BACHMANII BACHMAN'S WARBLER	ENDANGERED
1327047018007001	QUISCALUS (CASSIDIX) PALUSTRIS SLENDER-BILLED GRACKLE	ENDANGERED
1327048015007008	PYRRHULA PYRRHULA MURINA SAO MIGUEL BULLFINCH	ENDANGERED
1327050014007001	FOUDIA SEHELLARUM SEYCHELLES FODY	ENDANGERED
1327051003021001	APLONIS PELZELNI PONAPE MOUNTAIN STARLING	ENDANGERED
1327051013001001	LEUCOPSAR ROTHSCHILDI ROTHSCHILD'S (STARLING) MYNAH	ENDANGERED
1327054001001001	CALLAEAS CINEREA KOKAKO	ENDANGERED

FOX RIVER BOND  
25% COTTON

APPENDIX FOUR

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA  
MARCH 3, 1973

AVES

Part I "...shall include all species threatened with extinction which are or may be affected by trade. Trade in specimens of these species must be subject to particularly strict regulation in order not to endanger further their survival and must only be authorized in exceptional circumstances."

Part II "...shall include:

- (a) all species which although not necessarily now threatened with extinction may become so unless trade in specimens of such species is subject to strict regulation in order to avoid utilization compatible with their survival; and
- (b) other species which must be subject to regulation in order that trade in specimens of certain species referred to in sub-paragraph (a) of this paragraph may be brought under effective control."

All forms contained in Part I of Appendix Four should also be included as "endangered" on the listing in Appendix Three, "United States of America List of Endangered Native and Foreign Birds", due to a revision of the latter listing in the Federal Register, Vol. 41, No. 191, Thursday, September 30, 1976.

APPENDIX FOUR

CONVENTION ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE IN ENDANGERED SPECIES  
OF WILD FAUNA AND FLORA  
March 3, 1973

FAUNA

AVES

Part I. Aves Threatened with Extinction

PASSERIFORMES

Contingidae

1327007009005001	COTINGA MACULATA	Banded cotinga
1327007027002001	XIPHOLENA ATROPURPUREA	White-winged cotinga

Pittidae

1327012001014001	PITTA KOCHI	Koch's pitta
------------------	-------------	--------------

Atrichornithidae

1327016001002001	ATRICHORNIS CLAMOSA	Noisey scrub-bird
------------------	---------------------	-------------------

Muscicapidae

1327031055002001	PSOPHODES NIGROGULARIS	Black-throated (Western) whipbird
1327031110002001	PICATHARTES GYMNOCEPHALUS	Yellow-headed (white-necked) rock-fowl
1327031110003001	PICATHARTES OREAS	Red-headed (gray-necked) rock-fowl
1327031179004001	AMYTORNIS GOYDERI	Eyrean grass wren
1327031187002002	DASYORNIS BRACHYPTERUS LONGIROSTRIS	Western bristlebird
1327031187003002	DASYORNIS BROADBENTI LITTORALIS	Western rufous bristlebird

Zosteropidae

1327041011003001	ZOSTEROPS ALBOGULARIS	Norfolk white-throated white-eye (White-breasted silver-eye)
------------------	-----------------------	--

Meliphagidae		
1327042019006001	MELIPHAGA CASSIDIX	Helmeted honeyeater
Fringillidae		
1327048004009001	CARDUELIS (SPINUS) CUCULLATUS	Red siskin
Sturnidae		
1327051013001001	LEUCOPSAR ROTHSCHILDI	Rothschild's (starling) mynah

PART II. Aves Potentially Threatened with Extinction

PASSERIFORMES

Cotingidae		
1327007024002001	RUPICOLA PERUVIANA	Andean (Peruvian) cock-of-the-rock
1327007024003001	RUPICOLA RUPICOLA	Guianan cock-of-the-rock
Pittidae		
1327012001006002	PITTA BRACHYRA NYMPHA	Fairy pitta
Hirundinidae		
1327018001003001	PSEUDOCHELIDON SIRINTARAE	White-eyed river martin
Muscicapidae		
1327031214	MUSCICAPA RUECKI	Roeck's blue flycatcher
Fringillidae		
1327048004025001	CARDUELIS (SPINUS) YARRELLII	Yellow-faced siskin
Paradisaeidae		
1327059	All species	