CoP17 Prop. 15 [Namibia and Zimbabwe] Amend the present Appendix II listing of the population of Zimbabwe of African Elephant *Loxodonta Africana* by removing the annotation in order to achieve an unqualified Appendix II listing.

Zimbabwe’s elephant population was transferred to Appendix II in 1997, subject to a series of annotated conditions. Currently, various forms of trade (i.e. hunting trophies, live animals to appropriate and acceptable destinations, hides, hair, leather goods and ivory carvings) is conditionally allowed, with all other specimens, including raw ivory, deemed to be specimens included in Appendix I and ineligible for commercial international trade. Zimbabwe seeks to remove the annotation, that it regards as a prejudicial “long list of proscriptions”, in its entirety to achieve an unqualified Appendix II listing.

The annotation to the current listing of Zimbabwe’s elephants in Appendix II outlines various conditions that function as special measures under the terms of the precautionary measures in Annex 4 of Resolution Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16). The proposal only seeks the deletion of the current annotation and does not propose replacing it with any new special measures.

Under the precautionary measures set out in Annex 4 of Res. Conf. 9.24 (Rev. CoP16), Parties would therefore need to be satisfied that Zimbabwe is implementing the requirements of the Convention, particularly Article IV, and that appropriate enforcement controls and compliance with the requirements of the Convention are in place. The Supporting Statement indicates that Zimbabwe adopts an experimental, adaptive approach to management of its African Elephants. It is not possible to determine if such an approach would be effective in implementing Article IV if this proposal were accepted. Regarding enforcement controls and compliance, the Supporting statement itself, as well as analysis from ETIS in the annex to CoP17 Doc. 57.5, indicate that this may be problematic in some areas, such as the Supporting Statement’s warning of “significant illegal hunting in the Sebungwe and Zambezi Valley regions”. It seems therefore that the requirement for satisfaction precautionary measures is not met.

In addition, looking at the wider context it is not clear what tangible benefits the deletion of the existing special measures in the annotation would bring to the conservation of the species. With the success of current efforts to reverse illegal trade trends and cool demand forces in end markets in such fine balance, continuance of the existing special measures is a precautionary necessity in light of continuing unsustainable levels of poaching and ivory trafficking globally.

**REJECT**