



SUMMARY RECORD
CITES ANIMALS COMMITTEE
12TH MEETING
ANTIGUA, GUATEMALA
11 to 14 September 1995

© Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in
Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
April 1996

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

Twelfth Meeting of the CITES Animals Committee
Antigua, Guatemala, 11 to 14 September 1995

SUMMARY RECORD

Members

Oceania:R. W. Jenkins (Australia), Chairman
Africa:J. Hutton (Zimbabwe)
J. Ngog Nje (Cameroon)
Asia:C.-H. Giam (Singapore)
T. Soehartono (Indonesia)
Europe:R. Blanke (Germany)
North America:C. Dauphiné (Canada)
South and Central America
and the Caribbean:M. Quero de Peña (Venezuela)
O. F. Lara (Guatemala)

Alternates

Africa:E. L. M. Severre (Tanzania)
Europe:J. Kucera (Czech Republic)

Secretariat

J. Barzdo
O. Menghi
M. de Campos

Rapporteurs

D. Bowles (EIA)
S. Einsweiler (United States of America)
J. K. Grunner (The Biodiversity Forum)
P. Hannon (RSPB)
M. Howe (United States of America)
R. W. Jenkins (Australia)
A. Lindley (RSPCA)
D. Morgan (United Kingdom)
T. Telecky (HSUS)
L. Reifschneider (Rosgorscirk, The State Company
Circus of Russia)
J. P. Ross (IUCN)

1. Welcome

The meeting was opened with a welcome speech from the Vice Minister of External Affairs of the Republic of Guatemala, Mr Bernardo Arévalo; the Private Secretary to the President, Mr Enrique Secaira and the Co-ordinator of the *Comisión Nacional del Medio Ambiente* Mr Bruno Busto Brol. The Chairman of the Animals Committee responded with thanks and then adjourned the meeting.

2. Review of the availability of documents

The meeting re-convened at 10h32 and the Chairman informed the participants about the logistical arrangements for the meeting.

The Chairman reviewed the availability of documents and provisions were made to copy and make available documents not included in the package already provided to participants.

It was noted that the report on significant trade in selected species (Doc. AC12.7.6), owing to its great length, had only been distributed to members of the Animals Committee. The Chairman regretted that shortage of funds precluded more widespread circulation but said that copies would be made available for all participants to examine and for the production of additional copies. In response to a question on the procedure for submission of documents, the Chairman reiterated that documents should be submitted to the Chairman 30 days in advance. He also encouraged all authors to bring additional copies of their reports to future meetings to ensure full distribution.

3. Adoption of the Provisional Agenda

Following the review of documents, the Chairman turned the attention of the meeting to document Doc. AC12.1 (Rev. 5) - Provisional Agenda and suggested that in view of the shortage of time, items should only be considered under agenda item 23 - Other business, if time allowed. He then asked whether the Committee wished to discuss any topics under 'Other business'.

Dr Blanke (Representative of Europe) informed the meeting that the German Management Authority had requested that the issue of CITES procedures for loans of giant pandas from China be considered. Dr Giam (Representative of Asia) said that, as he had not had the opportunity to consult with Parties in the Asian region, there could be no substantive discussion of this subject. The observer from WWF reminded the meeting that this issue was under consideration by the Standing Committee and the Secretariat gave a brief resume. The Standing Committee had requested the Secretariat to draft a new Notification to the Parties, in consultation with China and would address the issue at its meeting in January 1996. The Secretariat suggested that it was therefore not appropriate for the Animals Committee to discuss the issue. Dr Blanke asked whether this issue was not properly the responsibility of the Animals Committee.

The Chairman however agreed to allow discussion of this subject, for the information of the Committee, if time permitted.

3. Adoption of the Working Programme

The Chairman then addressed document Doc. AC12.2 (Rev. 5), the Working Programme, and after discussion it was approved with the following amendments.

1. Item 5 on Sharks was deferred to 12 September at 09h00.

2. Working groups on hybrids and pharmaceuticals would not be created but a working group on sharks would be created.
3. Item 8 on Significant Trade, was deferred until the afternoon of 13 September and the items scheduled for that afternoon would be considered on 11 September.

4. Adoption of summary records of the 10th and 11th meetings of the Animals Committee

The Chairman presented documents Doc. AC12.3.1 and Doc. AC12.3.2 for approval.

The observer from the United States of America stated that her delegation had some small editorial amendments, which would be submitted to the Secretariat.

Dr Dauphiné (Representative of North America), referred to the record of the 11th meeting page 5, second paragraph, regarding resource ownership and property rights and captive breeding, noting that TRAFFIC had been called to explore with the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity possible proposals for funding. The observer from TRAFFIC International responded that initial discussions had been held between the Director of TRAFFIC and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity and that there would be further discussions.

The reports were approved.

17. Review of Scientific Authorities

Introducing document Doc. AC12.16, the CITES Secretariat reported that 75 responses to the questionnaire had been received from Parties and the results would soon be compiled and analyzed. The Chairman congratulated the Secretariat on the high response. The observer from the United States of America offered the Secretariat its help in analyzing the questionnaires received. The observer from IUCN asked what follow up was planned. The Secretariat recalled the procedure established in Resolution Conf. 8.6, noting that the Secretariat should prepare guidelines for the Parties regarding the work of Scientific Authorities.

Following some brief announcements, the Chairman closed the session at 12h35.

Third Session: 11 September 1995: 13h30 - 15h30

6. Review of Resolution Conf. 5.16 on Trade on Ranched Specimens

Dr Hutton (Representative of Africa) introduced document Doc. AC12.5 (Review of Resolution Conf. 5.16, prepared by Africa Resources Trust). He noted that Resolution Conf. 5.16 (Trade in Ranched Specimens) supplemented Resolution Conf. 3.15 (Ranching). He considered that there were no real objections to Resolution Conf. 5.16 except from those Parties involved in manufacturing goods from crocodile skin. Resolutions Conf. 8.14 and Conf. 9.22 (Universal tagging system for the identification of crocodilian skins) had been adopted by the Conference of the Parties specifically to address this trade.

Resolution Conf. 8.14 referred Resolution Conf. 5.16 to the Animals Committee for further consideration. While Resolution Conf. 5.16 had been discussed at the Animals Committee meeting in Harare, and a working group had been constituted to address the issue, nothing had been produced from this process. Dr Hutton suggested to the Animals Committee three possible recommendations to the Conference of the Parties: that it repeals Resolution Conf. 5.16; that it amends Resolution Conf. 5.16 to exclude reference to the crocodilian trade; or that it amends Resolution Conf. 5.16 to make it more general, addressing issues such as captive breeding.

The Chairman noted that the reason why Resolution Conf. 5.16 existed was because Parties were concerned that there needed to be a mechanism in place to ensure that products from ranches or captive breeding operations could be readily distinguished from those obtained from the wild. He proposed that a simple resolution be directed to the Parties, recommending that Parties seeking approval of captive-breeding or ranching operations should describe a proposed system for marking the products, so that the Conference of the Parties could consider whether each particular marking system would be sufficient to address the identification problem.

Dr Blanke proposed that the Animals Committee wait to see the effectiveness of Resolution Conf. 9.22 before considering any action that would eliminate reference to the marking of crocodile products from Resolution Conf. 5.16. The observer from the United Republic of Tanzania said that as Resolution Conf. 9.22 has been in place for some time, the Committee could consider the changes to Resolution Conf. 5.16 elaborated by Dr Hutton.

The observer from the International Wildlife Management Consortium (IWMC) considered Resolution Conf. 5.16 to be largely redundant. The observer from IUCN (Crocodile Specialist Group) reminded the Committee that there were ranches and captive-bred animals other than crocodiles that required marking and opposed the idea of repealing the resolution. He considered that there was a need to retain a general statement on marking of products, to be applied as needed, but that it needed to be recognized that each species had its own marking requirements. He supported the Chairman's suggestion.

The observer from the United States of America agreed with the Chairman's suggestion. She also noted that Resolution Conf. 9.24 (on amending Appendices I and II) had precautionary annexes, so that if a ranching operation were approved and it failed to meet the standards proposed, then exports from the operation could be terminated.

The Chairman appointed Dr Hutton to lead a small working group to draft a resolution to address the issues discussed and report to the next meeting of the Animals Committee. Dr Blanke, Dr Giam, the Chairman and the observer from the United States of America agreed to participate in the working group.

23. Other Business: Presentation on Research in Argentina on the Patagonian Fox

The observer from Argentina presented information on the research in Argentina on the Patagonian fox, which is hunted for the fur trade. The Patagonian fox is the second largest fox in South America, with a range in Chile and Argentina. Fox hunting is conducted in rural areas by local people who use traps and dogs. The foxes are killed to reduce predation on sheep, but their fur is also an important source of income, constituting 25% of income for some people. The Argentine research has shown that, although hunting has significantly reduced fox numbers in hunting areas, those populations recovered the following year due to immigration of foxes from other areas where foxes are protected from hunting. The research demonstrates the importance of having protective refuges. The research also pointed to the need to have regional management of the fox.

18. Review of Latest Development in Transponder Technology

Dr Blanke introduced document Doc. AC12.17, on transponder technology. He stated that ISO would like to keep the Animals Committee informed of the latest transponder technology. ISO had developed international standards that specified the radio frequency for transponders and the structure of the identification code for animals. This could be applied for animals in agriculture, for CITES, and for the pet trade. Under the agreed international standards, every country would have its own national identification code.

Dr Blanke raised the question of the practicality and cost of using transponders for CITES purposes.

The Chairman noted that there was a resolution of the Conference of the Parties that recommended the use of microchips when it was appropriate, however, this use was not mandatory. Many captive-breeding operations were applying microchip technology to mark animals. The Chairman noted that microchip technology was a developing science, and that CITES should have the best technology available for its use.

The observer from the United Kingdom noted that the use of transponders for CITES purposes was experimental, and he suggested that this continue.

The Secretariat reported that it had received quotations from ISIS and from WCMC for maintaining a database of transponder numbers; in the case of WCMC this involved a linkage to the database of annual report statistics. However, the Secretariat had not taken action to establish a database because the Parties had not started to report transponder numbers.

Several problems were noted with respect to the use of transponders. Mr Soehartono (Representative of Asia) noted that the distance for reading the microchip was about 20 cm so it was easier to use for some species (e.g. fish) than for others (e.g. primates). He added that the transponders were too big to implant in very small animals. The Chairman agreed that there were practical problems with the technology and its application. The observer from the IWMC also pointed out that microchips might "outlive" the animals in which they are placed. The observer from Spain noted also that transponders could be lost within marked animals. Dr Blanke responded that transponders were often lost when they were applied by inexperienced people, but losses tended to occur within a week of implanting, so the animals need to be rechecked after one week to make sure that the transponders were still in place.

Dr Blanke said that the Animals Committee needed to decide whether to recommend that ISO should set aside specific CITES codes to indicate that an animal had been marked for CITES purposes. The Secretariat noted that the main concern was to ensure that each transponder, and thus each marked animal, was identified by a unique code, and they noted that this was achieved without any special additional code.

The Chairman agreed that it was unnecessary to reserve a field for CITES, since every transponder code was unique without such a field. He suggested that the Animals Committee should communicate to ISO the problems in practical application of transponder technology identified (including short distance of reading, interference with other materials, and the size of transponders).

Dr Giam, Mr Soehartono and the observers from Bahamas, Chile and Honduras discussed their specific concerns with the use of microchips, repeating concerns about the cost of the technology and its usefulness in detecting smuggling. The Chairman suggested that those interested in knowing more about the use of transponders could talk to Dr Blanke and Mr Soehartono.

Fourth Session: 11 September 1995: 16h04 - 18h30

12. Ten-Year Review

The Chairman opened the session at 16h04 and passed the Chair to Dr Blanke. Dr Blanke referred to three outstanding items from earlier discussion of the ten-year review.

1. The maintenance of *Odocoileus virginianus mayensis* (Guatemalan white-tailed deer) in Appendix III by Guatemala, in view of the uncertain taxonomic status of the subspecies. Mr Lara (Representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean) stated that deer are extensively, although illegally, hunted for subsistence purposes, for recreation and for trophies, some of which are exported to neighbouring countries. Retention of the subspecies in Appendix III supported national efforts for conservation and helped with data collection; improved regulations and enforcement were under development. Dr Blanke requested the Management Authority of Guatemala to seriously consider

removing the taxon from Appendix III, reiterating the dubious validity of the taxon, or that Guatemala amend the listing to include the species rather than the subspecies in Appendix III.

2. Further action on listing Unionidae (freshwater clams). The observer from the United States of America briefly reviewed the history of this listing proposal, which was withdrawn from consideration at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. She informed the meeting that the issue was under consideration by the CITES Nomenclature Committee and it was hoped that a solution would be prepared for consideration at the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties. She said that, at the next meeting of the Animals Committee, she would report any progress.
3. Listing of *Equus hemionus* (Asian wild ass). Dr Blanke explained that the adoption of a standard taxonomy had removed earlier confusion and now the best listing for this species could be considered. Germany had considered making a proposal, for submission to the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties, taking account of the statement of the IUCN/SSC Equid Specialist Group that the listings of the different species and subspecies of this group in the CITES appendices are not consistent with their conservation status. However, as the trade in this group was restricted to a small number of exchanges between zoos, and there was no documented trade from the wild, such a proposal was not currently a priority for Germany. The real conservation problems for this group could not be solved by CITES.

Dr Blanke then took up document Doc. AC12.11, on species with a very low volume of trade. The Committee was asked to consider making recommendations to change the listing of these species; such recommendations could then be referred to range States for the preparation of proposals for the Conference of the Parties.

Mr Jenkins informed the meeting of the recommendations of the Management Authority of Australia on Australian species listed on document Doc. AC12.11 as follows:

Delete from the appendices: *Burramys parvus*, *Dendrolagus bennettianus*, *Dendrolagus lumholtzi*, *Turnix melanogaster*, *Pedionomus torquatus*, *Hoplocephalus bungaroides*.

Retain as listed: *Phalanger intercastellanus*.

Mr Jenkins also communicated the desire of the Management Authority of Papua New Guinea to retain *Zaglossus* spp. and *Phalanger orientalis*, and the joint wish of Australia and Papua New Guinea to retain *Dugong dugong* in the appendices in view of the evidence of illegal trade in this species between the two countries.

The Management Authority of New Zealand had indicated to Mr Jenkins that they would agree to the removal of *Paryphanta* spp. and *Gallirallus australis hectori* from the appendices. No decision on *Rheobatrachus* spp. had been reached at this stage; it was noted that the species had not been reported in the wild for some years.

Discussion was then opened on the other taxa listed in document Doc. AC12.11 and a number of recommendations were made as follows:

Bradypus sp. (sloth) – The regional representative for Central and South America and the Caribbean, Mr Oscar Lara, undertook to consult with range States and to inform the Animals Committee of their conclusion.

Vulpes cana (Afghan fox) – It was noted that this species was reported to be of high value in trade and that any present trade was between States previously part of the USSR and was unreported. It should be retained.

Cryptoprocta ferox (fossa) – Noting the lack of information on status and that there had been several recent applications to import this species into the EU (specifically the Netherlands), it should be retained.

Several Parties expressed concern that consultation with range States was desirable before making recommendations. Mr Jenkins then proposed that the remaining species listed in document Doc. AC12.11 should be referred to the appropriate regional representative in the Animals Committee for consultation. This was agreed after brief additional comments on the following species:

Pudu mephistophiles – The observer from Chile and the Secretariat recommended retention in Appendix II, noting inclusion of other species in the genus and potential for illegal trade.

Trichechus senegalensis – The observer from the Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) noted that all other species of this family were in Appendix I and it should therefore be retained in Appendix II.

Dr Blanke then undertook to inform each regional representative in the Animals Committee of the species listed in document Doc. AC12.11 in their region. He requested the representatives to consult with the range States and to send a recommendation to him for presentation at the next meeting.

Attention was then directed to the third page of document Doc. AC12.11, concerning the listing of species of *Ovis* (mountain sheep). The adoption of a standard nomenclature had clarified that there were four species of *Ovis* of concern to CITES. Unfortunately there was continued confusion regarding the taxon *O. vignei* and regarding which subspecies were now amalgamated under the name *O. vignei*. The observer from the United States of America explained her view that only the populations of *O. vignei* that, according to modern taxonomy, were included under the subspecies *O. vignei vignei* were listed. Other participants stressed that as the second edition of "Mammal Species of the World" had been accepted by the Conference of the Parties as the standard taxonomic reference, this meant that, under the listing of *Ovis vignei* in Appendix I of CITES, all subspecies were included. Extensive discussion followed, considering diverse views without clear resolution.

Mr Jenkins proposed that a working group be formed to consult with range States and other interested Parties and organizations, including the IUCN Caprid Specialist Group, and to prepare a discussion paper, which could contain draft recommendations, for consideration at the next meeting of the Animals Committee. Dr Blanke was asked to chair this working group, which would include representatives of the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the IUCN Caprid Specialist Group.

The observer from Italy asked the meeting also to consider the listing of *Ovis ammon musimon*. It was pointed out that the new standard nomenclature assigned this taxon (European mouflon) to the species *Ovis aries* and that it was therefore unlisted. Some discussion followed. Mr Jenkins then returned to the chair and noted that the Parties were supposed to follow the adopted nomenclature (despite dissenting taxonomic opinions) and that the Animals Committee was required to do so. Discussion on document Doc. AC12.11 was then closed.

15. Treatment of *Felis bengalensis* in the CITES Appendices

The Secretariat informed the meeting that, in accordance with the recommendation adopted at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, this species was now included in the appendices under the genus *Prionailurus*. It was noted that the species was also under consideration in the context of Resolution Conf. 8.9 - the review of significant trade.

16. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.15, Conservation of *Collocalia* spp.

The CITES Secretariat reported progress in convening a workshop in Indonesia in response to Resolution Conf. 9.15. Document Doc. AC12.15 was a draft of a programme for the workshop and discussions were well advanced with the host country, Indonesia, and with Italy regarding funding. Funds were not yet secured but proposals had been exchanged between Indonesia and Italy. It was noted that the proposed timing of November or December 1995 would overlap with the meeting of the Convention on Biological Diversity in Indonesia, creating a problem for the Management Authority of Indonesia. Mr Soehartono proposed postponement to early 1996. The Committee noted that Resolution Conf. 9.15 required the Secretariat to convene the workshop by November 1995 and that the Secretariat should not be condemned for having to postpone the meeting for practical reasons. The observer from the HSUS requested that additional items be considered in the draft programme for the workshop on swiftlets, under item 9, on Conservation Action, and that improved management and enforcement be added to research. The observer from TRAFFIC International suggested that the issues of mechanisms to regulate the trade and product-labelling be considered.

Following some brief announcements, the session was closed at 18h30.

Fifth Session: 12 September 1995: 09h00 - 10h30

The Chairman opened the meeting at 09h00 with distribution of the following documents:

- Doc. AC12.4.3, Sharks - Biological Limitations and Trade Status.
- Doc. AC12.6.1, Trade in CITES-listed Corals 1989-1993.
- Doc. AC12.4.4, International Shark Conservation Initiatives.

7. Trade in Corals - Identification Problems

The observer from the United States of America drew attention to a paper submitted for circulation that had been prepared for the United States Government by TRAFFIC USA. The Chairman invited the authors to present the documents.

Mr Soehartono introduced his paper (document Doc. AC12.6) outlining the problems of controlling the coral trade in Indonesia – 1,000,000 specimens a year of 100 species from designated locations. Slides showing the process of sorting, storing and packing corals were presented. Shipments of corals were measured by weight or by number of pieces. It was not always possible to identify pieces of coral to the level of species. Quotas were set by number of pieces or by weight, depending on the taxon. It was noted that the quotas were confusing as they referred to "base rock", "shingle", "recently dead coral" and "stony coral".

The observer from the United States of America introduced document Doc. AC12.6.2. As a major importer the United States had experienced the same identification problems as Indonesia and therefore proposed a system of monitoring based on taxonomic levels, type of coral and weight or numbers. She said that live and raw corals could be identified to the level of genus; worked coral (e.g. jewellery) could only be identified to the level of family; and sand and "live rock" to the level of order. She suggested that, for the sake of standardization of measurements, units of weight be used to record that trade, and, in addition, for live coral the number of pieces be recorded. Live coral is transported in water which makes weighing difficult.

The Secretariat pointed out that the Guidelines for the preparation of annual reports already indicated that trade in coral should be reported by weight but these could be amended in due course by a Notification to the Parties to, suggest that live coral be reported by number of pieces, as this seemed desirable.

The observer from TRAFFIC USA presented document Doc. AC12.6.1, prepared at the request of and funded by the United States of America. She said that the trade data did not relate to living coral reefs, that trade monitoring was hampered by identification problems and that the size of some shipments also made monitoring difficult. The Chairman thanked the presenters for their comprehensive treatment of the subject.

The observer from TRAFFIC International asked whether CITES required identification to species level. The Secretariat confirmed that since the Convention required a non-detriment finding to be made for export of species in Appendix I or II it effectively required control at the level of species. However the Conference of the Parties had recognized the difficulties of identification and, with respect to reporting, had accepted that trade in certain species of plant could be exceptionally recorded at the level of genus.

The Chairman noted that Australia had proposed 17 genera for listing at fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties and had prepared identification sheets. He identified several issues: uniformity in reporting and description; identification; control of trade in coral sand and whether trade was significant and adversely impacted conservation of corals.

The observer from the United Kingdom said that in his country species declared as fossil coral had been subfossils. He asked whether TRAFFIC had looked at this trade. He also expressed the view that control of trade in coral sand had little conservation benefit.

Dr Blanke agreed. However, he said living rocks played an important part in coral reefs and therefore trade in them should be monitored. Research in Germany had shown that in some cases the genera of living rocks could be identified.

The observer from TRAFFIC USA said that 64,000 pieces of living rock were imported into the United States in 1993. She agreed with Dr Blanke that living rock was important to coral reefs and that the CITES appendices could be annotated to exclude coral sand. She also noted that specimens of other CITES-listed species were sometimes attached to living rock in trade.

The observer from the Netherlands also agreed that trade in living rock should be monitored and supported the idea of removing controls on coral sand.

The observer from the Bahamas pointed out that the annual report of his country had included the dimensions of specimens of coral in trade, and asked whether this was acceptable. The Secretariat recalled that the Guidelines for the preparation of annual reports indicated that coral trade should be reported by weight but they added that there was of course no problem if additional information was included.

The observer from the United States of America asked if Indonesia had a view on whether trade in coral sand was detrimental to coral reefs. Mr Soehartono said that coral sand for trade was usually taken from the beach, therefore little damage was done by its removal.

Dr Ngog Nje (Representative of Africa) referred to difficulties in coral identification and protection of coral in the natural environment. The Chairman, referring to the CITES Identification Manual, said that problems of identification could be addressed by producing sheets for the Manual for use in enforcement. The observer from the United States of America said that her country had produced an identification manual for inspectors and was discussing with the Secretariat the possibility of including this in the CITES Identification Manual. The observer from Japan said that the need for information in Japan had led his country to produce an identification manual, and he offered details to Indonesia.

The observer from the United States of America indicated that the TRAFFIC document had been produced as part of the International Coral Reef Initiative, involving many States, aiming to preserve coral reefs and promote their sustainable use. A regional workshop on identification and other issues was planned, contingent upon availability of funding.

Contributions from interested parties were invited. She added that significant trade in coral could be discussed later in the agenda.

The Chairman indicated that having heard the range of complex issues it would be difficult to assess whether trade was significant.

The observer from the United States of America asked whether document Doc. AC12.6.1 would come up again under the discussion of Resolution Conf. 8.9. She added that coral was heavily traded and that it would be beneficial if it were covered by the significant trade review.

The Secretariat agreed that coral could be considered in the review of significant trade.

Summarizing the results of the discussion, the Chairman said:

1. The paper produced by TRAFFIC should be referred to the Secretariat for circulation to range States for comments, and the paper and the result of the review should be considered in the context of Resolution Conf. 8.9;
2. Continued regulation of trade in coral sand was a waste of resources and an annotation of the appendices was required.
3. Standardization of reporting was necessary to enable it to be of use.

Regarding the second point, the Secretariat noted that many if not all shipments of coral sand contained chunks of coral that could be identified as coral, possibly at the level of genus, even if the species could not be identified. Shipments of coral sand that contained such pieces of coral could not be excluded from the provisions of the Convention. The Secretariat believed that if coral sand were traded without such pieces of coral, and without any indication that it was derived from coral, it would not be considered as a CITES specimen.

Regarding the third point, the Secretariat reiterated that it could amend the Guidelines for preparation of annual reports to indicate that live corals should be reported by weight and by number of pieces. The Chairman asked whether Indonesia could report trade in live corals using both units. Mr Soehartono thought that this might create problems in establishing export quotas. The Secretariat noted that the units used in the annual report need not affect the units in which the quota is set. The observer from the Netherlands said that recording the size of pieces in trade had advantages. The observer from TRAFFIC stated that a paper on Philippine corals provided tables for converting sizes of coral pieces into weight.

On the question of the taxonomic level of reporting, the Secretariat stressed the obvious desirability of recording trade by species. However, they recognized the problems of identification which, in the case of some plants, had been dealt with in a resolution of the Conference of the Parties.

The Chairman asked the observer from the United States of America to prepare a draft resolution on the taxonomic level of reporting for consideration at the next meeting of the Animals Committee.

The observer from the United States of America accepted the Chairman's suggestion and undertook to prepare a resolution in consultation with Indonesia and the Netherlands.

The Chairman concluded that:

- corals would be considered in the review of significant trade;
- the TRAFFIC paper would be distributed by the Secretariat for comments;

- the United States of America would draft a resolution on the level of identification of corals in annual reports; and
- the Secretariat would amend the Guidelines for the preparation of annual reports, as discussed.

The Chairman asked Dr Blanke to liaise with the observers from the Netherlands and the United States of America on the question of regulation of trade in living rock.

Sixth Session: 12 September 1995: 11h00 - 12h30

5. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.17 on Sharks

The observer from Panama introduced document Doc. AC12.4, stating that it summarized his activities on this issue since the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties. An extended report on this topic had also been presented to the regional members of the Animals Committee. Document Doc. AC12.4.1 was a summary of a text adopted at a recent meeting of FAO concerning fisheries.

The observer from the United States of America then presented document Doc. AC12.4.3, which related to the management of shark fisheries. These had increased recently owing to the high price of fins and cartilage. Fisheries had grown from localized to global activities, and now affected all shark species. Shark fisheries tended to be ephemeral and collapse within a few years owing to a number of biological factors: shark species are long-lived, and slow to mature, have a long inter-birth interval, produce small broods, and tend to give birth in inshore areas where they are more vulnerable to fishing pressures. In addition there is little biological information on most species, there are few catch data at the species level, and the fisheries models used are based on bony rather than cartilaginous species. Therefore if a sustainable fishery for sharks were to be attempted it would have to take a conservative approach.

The observer from TRAFFIC USA presented document Doc. AC12.4.2, which showed that the trade in many shark products, including fins, oil, meat and cartilage was increasing. TRAFFIC had initiated a global review of the trade in shark products in 1994 and this was due for completion in October 1996. Preliminary results showed that the markets were poorly understood, and that the effects of subsistence catches, pollution and by-catches needed to be clarified. The study will examine trade data, uses of shark products, and the impact of trade on populations, and will analyze management frameworks and develop recommendations. The problems encountered to date included the fact that there are relatively few data and that these cover a short time period, and the fact that the Customs classifications on products in trade are inadequate to allow monitoring of the trade in sharks.

The observer from the IUCN/SSC Shark Specialist Group introduced document Doc. AC12.4.4, which summarized the current activities related to shark conservation. These included the development of a Shark Action Plan, the identification of species for a Red Data Book and the production of a field guide to identifying sharks, from whole specimens and from parts.

9. Review of Resolution Conf. 8.15 on Captive Breeding

Dr Dauphiné, introduced document Doc. AC12.8.1, which identified issues that the Animals Committee should discuss in relation to captive breeding, specifically the implementation of Article VII, the definition of "bred in captivity" and how to simplify the process of registration of captive-breeding operations. Prior to discussions the Chairman circulated for the information of participants a letter from the American Society of Primatologists (Doc. AC12.8.5).

The observer from the International Primate Society introduced document Doc. AC12.8.2, which dealt with the interpretation of Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Rev.) in connection with primates, particularly the definition of the term "bred in captivity" in reference to free-ranging primates. The status of the founder breeding stock and the definition of "a controlled environment" also required clarification.

The observer from the Environmental Investigation Agency introduced document Doc. AC12.8.3, which also raised issues that could be discussed under this agenda item. These could be categorized as definition problems, which included defining "a controlled environment" and "captive-bred stocks", and enforcement problems such as the development of a marking scheme and adequate supervision and control of a captive-breeding operation.

The observer from Rosgorscirc, the State Company Circus of Russia, introduced document Doc. AC12.8.4, which examined some of the problems arising from Resolutions Conf. 2.12 and Conf. 8.15. They suggested that a more streamlined approach and a simpler registration process were required and that this would involve revising Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Rev.).

11. Transport of Live Animals - Implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.23

The observer from the United States of America introduced document Doc. AC12.10.1, which included recommendations of certain courses of action that the Animals Committee could take to implement Resolution Conf. 9.23.

The observer from the Royal Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (RSPCA) introduced document Doc. AC12.10.2, which indicated that there were two issues from Resolution Conf. 9.23 that needed to be considered by the Animals Committee. The first was the definition of "significant high mortality", and the second was the need to state what were the appropriate measures to be taken by the Parties if a species was found to experience high mortality in trade.

The observer from the HSUS introduced document Doc. AC12.10.3. This presented data on the mortality rates of CITES-listed species of birds imported into the United States of America during the period 1989-1992, for those species for which the "dead on arrival" figures were higher than 10% and the "died in quarantine" figures were higher than 15%. The levels used were taken from discussions that had occurred at a previous meeting of the Transport Working Group.

Appointment of Chairmen of Working Groups

The Chairman of the Animals Committee then nominated chairmen of the three working groups as follows: Dr Susan Lieberman to chair the group on transport; Dr Charles Dauphiné to chair the group on captive-breeding; and Dr Choo-Hoo Giam to chair the group on sharks.

Seventh Session: 13 September 1995: 09h00 - 10h30

19. Trade in Sturgeons

A paper had been presented to the previous meeting of the Animals Committee by IUCN, outlining the threatened status of many of the 27 species of sturgeon, and indicating the need to list 13 species in Appendix I and eight species in Appendix II.

Dr Blanke had undertaken further study of the issue and had held discussions with the IUCN/SSC Sturgeon Specialist Group. He proposed shortly to hold a seminar of experts in collaboration with this group, and to undertake further research to investigate causes of decline. His findings to date were presented in document Doc. AC12.18. Dr Blanke concluded that there was already much evidence to indicate that trade was a major cause of decline. It was his view that, because of this, and because of the problem of similarity of products, particularly caviar, the best course might be to list all species in Appendix II.

Following the forthcoming seminar, Germany would consider whether to make a proposal to this effect.

Document Doc. AC12.18.1, presented by the observer from TRAFFIC, reinforced the views expressed by Dr Blanke. The observer from TRAFFIC said that a study of legal and illegal trade was currently in progress; the results were expected to be available for the next Animals Committee meeting.

The Chairman noted that FAO statistics on sturgeon trade were also available, and that it was important to involve the FAO in any future discussions or actions. The observer from TRAFFIC said that they had already discussed the issue with FAO.

The observer from IWMC suggested that the trade in sturgeon products was similar to the trade in nests of swiftlets (*Collocalia* spp.), being a very high volume trade, with difficulty in distinguishing species. He asked whether Parties would be capable of controlling and managing trade. The Secretariat disagreed with the comparison, saying that *Collocalia* nests could be identified to species. The Secretariat added that if a proposal were prepared to list species of sturgeon, it should address the question of enforcement, in particular identification.

The observer from the United States of America indicated that there would be problems of enforcement and management if all species were listed in Appendix II, although this fact should not be a reason for not listing the species if the biological and trade criteria for listing were met. She undertook to evaluate current United States data on trade in caviar, and to provide information to the next meeting and she urged other Parties to do the same.

In summary, the Chairman noted that there was general support for the view that sturgeons should be considered for inclusion in the appendices, urged Germany to seek to involve as many range States as possible in the forthcoming seminar to consider management and enforcement problems, and asked Germany to consider developing a draft proposal to include the species in the CITES appendices, for consideration at the next Animals Committee meeting.

22. Trade in *Hirudo medicinalis*

Dr Blanke introduced documents Doc. AC12.21 and Doc. AC12.21.1. Recent information from a study commissioned by Germany had revealed a very large trade in leeches (in excess of six tonnes) from Turkey to Switzerland, Germany and France, which appeared likely to have a detrimental effect on the population. Turkey had agreed with this assessment, and had set an export quota of six tonnes for 1995. Dr Blanke said that Germany hoped to be able to fund further studies, and suggested to the Committee that the species be brought within the review of significant trade.

The observer from the United States of America reported a substantial level of import of live specimens of the species to the United States, mainly from France, and asked to what extent the species was being bred in captivity in Europe. Dr Blanke reported that success was low from the one breeding operation in France. The observer from the United Kingdom reported that in his country there was one farm breeding leeches on a large scale. He believed that most exports from Turkey were being imported by one company, with operations in three European countries, which may be stockpiling supplies, in anticipation of increased controls.

The Secretariat reported that they had received no response from the Turkish authorities to correspondence on this issue, but one exporting company had indicated a willingness to cooperate. The Secretariat added that the Turkish parliament had approved the accession of Turkey to CITES, and that the process leading to accession was proceeding slowly.

The Secretariat asked how the Animals Committee thought the Secretariat should deal with permits awaiting confirmation. Dr Blanke suggested that, as Turkey had a quota of six tonnes

for 1995, and six tonnes had already been exported, no further permits should be confirmed. He suggested that the Secretariat again contact Turkey, to suggest that they impose a lower quota for next year. Dr Ngog Nje asked what would be the financial impact of reducing the quota to 1.5 tonnes as recommended in document Doc. AC12.21. Dr Blanke agreed to try to find the answer to this, and to inform Dr Ngog Nje.

10. Trade in Hybrids Specimens - Review of Resolution Conf. 2.13

The Chairman introduced document Doc. AC12.9, on the problem of the administrative burden imposed by strict implementation of Resolution Conf. 2.13 in circumstances involving large-scale production of captive-bred animals through hybridization of a common species with an Appendix-I listed species, illustrated by the example of commercial farming of *Cervus dama mesopotamica* hybrids in Australia. He said that if Resolution Conf. 2.13 were strictly implemented, each farm would need to be registered as a captive-breeding operation, imposing a considerable administrative burden for no conservation purpose.

The Chairman suggested that options to deal with the problem might be: for the Management Authority to make a determination that meat from these deer farms was "not readily recognizable", in order to avoid treating the products as Appendix-I specimens; to develop an annotation for the listing of *C. dama mesopotamica* to indicate that the listing was for specimens within the native range States only; or to amend the basic provisions of Resolution Conf. 2.13.

The observer from the United States of America said that Resolution Conf. 2.13 was satisfactory in most cases, so she would support an annotation for the specific case, rather than amending the Resolution.

Dr Hutton pointed out that there was already an analogous annotation for ostrich indicating that only the populations of certain countries were included, to avoid administrative problems in dealing with captive-bred flocks, and this may be taken as a precedent.

The Secretariat suggested that the annotation relating to chinchillas was more relevant. They remarked that the majority of trade in hybrids was of captive-bred or artificially propagated specimens, and that the general principle applied in CITES was to reduce the level of control of trade in such specimens but that Resolution Conf. 2.13 had the opposite effect. The Secretariat noted that plants had in effect been removed from the influence of Resolution Conf. 2.13 since Appendix-I hybrids needed only to be treated as Appendix-I species if derived from an Appendix-I species specially annotated, but no species had been so annotated. The Secretariat asked whether the Committee considered that Resolution Conf. 2.13 served any useful purpose.

The observer from the United States of America indicated that Resolution Conf. 2.13 was valuable in enforcement of controls on trade in high-value psittacines, where hybrids may be difficult to distinguish from true species. She stated that, without Resolution Conf. 2.13, specimens of true species could be claimed to be hybrids, and so traded without control. Dr Blanke said that Germany had similar problems with hybrid falcons.

The observer from the Netherlands referred the Committee to discussions that had previously taken place in the Plants Committee, because many hybrids were traded in very large numbers, which had led to the development of the procedure whereby only those species for which trade in hybrids was likely to raise enforcement problems would be made subject to the provisions of Resolution Conf. 2.13. A similar procedure could be developed for animals.

In summary the Chairman noted that the nature of the problem was recognized by the Committee, and suggested that the representative of Oceania, the observer from the United States of America and the Secretariat should develop a document that would address the problem, to be considered at the next meeting of the Committee.

21. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.22, Universal Tagging System for the Identification of Crocodylian Skins

The Secretariat noted that crocodile skins in trade must be tagged and thanked the main countries of export for their co-operation in implementing Resolution Conf. 9.22. The Secretariat had registered about five companies that were manufacturers of tags and had notified companies that wished to be registered but did not comply with Resolution Conf. 9.22. There was a particular problem with Brazil because it had stocks of tags that did not meet the requirements specified in Resolution Conf. 9.22 and Brazil would like to use them before having new tags made to the required standard. The Secretariat was concerned that Resolution Conf. 9.22, Annex 2, indicated that the Secretariat was to keep track of data on computer of all exports of skins that were to be made into belts. It was unclear how the Secretariat could comply with this instruction because it had inadequate funds and personnel. In general, Parties were complying with Resolution Conf. 9.22.

Mr Soehartono said that, when Indonesia started tagging, it used tags from a company in the United States of America. He asked whether all products, including raw material, should be marked.

The Secretariat indicated that tagging was not required for any product except raw material (skins, flanks and tails).

Mr Soehartono asked whether marking was required only for crocodile specimens. He added that some countries required the tag number of the skin to be attached to the end products; other countries wanted end products to be separately marked.

The Secretariat said that Annex 1 of Resolution Conf. 9.22 included a list of species the specimens of which required marking and reiterated that marking was only required for raw material, not finished products.

The Chairman indicated that countries that required marking of end products were imposing requirements stricter than Resolution Conf. 9.22. However, countries were free to impose stricter national measures.

Dr Giam stated that, while CITES permitted stricter measures, this may be an example of unnecessary protection of trade.

The observer from the Florida Alligator Association, speaking on behalf of the International Alligator and Crocodile Trade Study, said he was in complete support of universal tagging and sought clarification on certain points. There was confusion about the requirement to tag certain products. He suggested that the tag referred to in paragraph c) of Resolution Conf. 9.22 was different from the "non-reusable tag" referred to in paragraphs a) and d). The difference must be recognized to ensure accurate trade data. He believed that the tag for by-products referred to in paragraph c) did not have to be issued by a Management Authority. A Management Authority could simply require submission of data to keep track of the sale of by-products. He said that clarification from the Secretariat would be helpful.

The Secretariat referred to paragraph b) of Resolution Conf. 9.22, which applies to skins and flanks, while paragraph c) applied to other parts that were exported in transparent containers. These containers should be tagged to indicate the weight. It was the Secretariat's understanding that the tag referred to in paragraph c) was not necessarily the "non-reusable" tag referred to in paragraph a). Some countries, such as Venezuela, however, did use the same tag for both purposes and had found that this was more practical and economical.

The Chairman requested that the observer from the Florida Alligator Association, who was about to leave, should take up further questions in writing direct with the Secretariat.

Dr Hutton said that the Resolution was clear and used the term "tag" in paragraph b) and c). He said that they referred to the same tag, which was described in paragraph d). He noted that the difference in interpretation might result in discrepancies in trade data.

The observer from the Florida Alligator Association said that paragraphs a) and d) referred to a non-reusable tag and paragraph c) did not, and that distinction justified the view that two different tags were being referred to.

The Chairman said that the working group that drafted Resolution Conf. 9.22 had intended to refer only to one tag and should have used the term "non-reusable" throughout the Resolution.

8. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9

The Secretariat introduced document Doc. AC12.7.1, Primary Recommendations of the CITES Animals Committee Regarding Non-Prioritized Taxa, relating to recommendations of the Animals Committee sent to the Parties concerned on 12.01.94. This document was presented simply for information.

The observer from the United Kingdom congratulated the Secretariat on its work. Noting that there were primary recommendations outstanding for four taxa, however, he asked whether it was correct that the Standing Committee had decided that no further action was required for these taxa. The Secretariat confirmed that the Standing Committee had decided not to take any further action itself in these cases, although the Secretariat had an ongoing responsibility to monitor implementation of the recommendations of the Animals Committee and continued to discuss them with the countries concerned.

The observer from the United States of America considered that Resolution Conf. 8.9 was still effective and also congratulated the Secretariat on its work. She stressed that the Animals Committee needed to draft recommendations that were clear so that the Secretariat and Parties could determine whether they had been implemented.

The observer from the RSPCA congratulated the Parties because the implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 had been a very successful process. He asked whether there was a mechanism for the Animals Committee to be informed of the results of studies undertaken. He also said that it appeared sometimes that the actions taken by Parties did not match the recommendations and yet the Secretariat was satisfied. He asked what process was used by the Secretariat to determine whether it was satisfied? He gave the example of *Loriculus galgulus* from Malaysia.

The observer from the Netherlands felt that the Secretariat's proposals to establish quotas provided an escape from the original recommendations. He also asked, when a country proposes a quota, and the Secretariat proposes another, what is the basis for this counter-proposal.

The Chairman said that Resolution Conf. 8.9 was one of the most powerful tools available to improve the implementation of CITES. It worked in part because range States continued to remain in control, and had the opportunity to address problems.

The Secretariat stated that copies of the reports of studies would of course be provided to the Animals Committee. They pointed out that document Doc. AC12.7.1 contained only notes to help keep track of implementation of the Resolution and so provided only a summary of information. The Secretariat explained that the recommendations of the Standing Committee, as in the case of Malaysia, effectively override the recommendations of the Animals Committee. The Secretariat is trying to encourage the efforts of Parties to implement the recommendations rather than to punish the Parties and stressed the need to strike a balance. With respect to discussions on quotas, these took place only where the Standing Committee had recommended the establishment of a cautious quota. In these cases, as a rule

of thumb, the Secretariat would recommend that a quota be set at the level of half the average annual exports of the previous five years. The Secretariat was prepared to consider a higher level as sufficiently cautious if the Party concerned could justify it with scientific data.

The Secretariat explained that, to make a judgement about whether a recommendation of the Animals Committee had been implemented, they looked at each individual element of a recommendation and then decided whether action had been initiated by the country concerned to satisfy that element. If the Parties responded in good faith to the recommendation and attempted to implement it, they were not referred to the Standing Committee.

Dr Blanke shared the concerns of the observer from the Netherlands that it was not enough to simply establish a quota. The next step must be to obtain data to support the quota.

The Chairman emphasized that the process created in Resolution Conf. 8.9 was iterative and that issues would be reconsidered periodically to ensure that measures taken by the Parties were sustainable. He added that the process required continuous consultation.

In response to a question from Dr Blanke, the Secretariat noted that it had a responsibility to continue to monitor the implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 and carry on contacting Parties subject to recommendations for as long as necessary. However, where the Secretariat felt there was a need, it would refer the matter to the Standing Committee.

The Chairman indicated that document Doc. AC12.7.2 summarized the process agreed by the Committee for the selection of species to be reviewed in accordance with Resolution Conf. 8.9. This document had been adopted by the Conference of the Parties and was recorded as a Decision of the Conference.

The Secretariat noted that it had received from WCMC the print-out referred to in paragraph ii) of document Doc. AC12.7.2 and copies had been provided to the members of the Committee.

Referring to document Doc. AC12.7.3, the Chairman said that it must be read in conjunction with document Doc. AC12.7.1. The Management Authority of Colombia had been requested to develop a national management programme for *Tupinambis* spp., in consultation with other range States. As a result of the CITES mission to Colombia in February 1994, it had become clear that harvest of *Tupinambis* spp. was not significant and that the main export was of neonates for the pet trade, derived from closed-cycle captive breeding. This recommendation was therefore no longer relevant. The Committee decided to revoke this recommendation and requested the Secretariat to notify the Standing Committee and the Management Authority of Colombia accordingly.

Document Doc. AC12.7.5, a copy of a fax from IUCN, related to field assessments of species that had been subject to recommendations in accordance with Resolution Conf. 8.9. The question was raised of how the Committee dealt with studies conducted by organizations outside of CITES. There was considerable discussion on this issue. Among the aspects discussed were: the ways in which field studies not approved by the CITES Standing Committee should be integrated into the process of implementing Resolution Conf. 8.9; the way in which desk studies should be integrated into this process; the need for care in reviewing reports from NGOs; potential problems in using the guidelines for projects in Notification to the Parties No. 763; and the need for collaboration with the Committee in the development of proposals. Dr Hutton also suggested that IUCN should be asked to produce a simple guide for Parties and NGOs on the process of implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9. The Chairman noted that all reports submitted to the Secretariat that resulted from the review of significant trade should be available to members of the Animals Committee. Closing the debate, he said that he would discuss this subject further with the Secretariat and would report to the next meeting of the Committee.

The Chairman referred to document Doc. AC12.7.6 prepared by IUCN, TRAFFIC and WCMC. The Secretariat pointed out that a draft version of the report had been sent for review to each range State, a total of 128, of which only 28 had sent comments.

1. *Cercopithecus petaurista* (spot-nosed guenon)

Dr Hutton said that the only action needed was to ask Ghana for more information since the species was protected and could not be traded. Dr Ngog Nje believed that international trade was not affecting the populations but additional information was required.

2. *Chlorocebus aethiops* (green monkey)

The observer from the United Republic of Tanzania was concerned about the analysis and stated that the green monkey was an agricultural pest in his country.

It was noted that two subspecies in Ethiopia were rare, although it was not known whether they were in trade.

Dr Ngog Nje said that the number of animals in Cameroon was decreasing.

3. *Monodon monoceros* (narwhal)

The Chairman referred to document Doc. AC12.8.7.4.

The observer from the Environmental Investigation Agency (EIA) presented a brief summary of document Doc. AC12.8.7.4 He concluded that Greenland's trade responded to changes in the market, including price, and he recommended stricter reporting requirements for Greenland and the setting of quotas for Greenland and Canada.

Dr Dauphiné questioned some of the conclusions and offered to provide a critique from a specialist in Canada. He also agreed that it would be valid to request information about the basis for Canada's non-detriment finding.

Dr Blanke was concerned about the Baffin Bay population in view of the population size and the level of trade. It seemed that taking of narwhals was not sustainable and that catches were under-reported. A study of the situation was required, particularly for Greenland.

The observer from IUCN pointed out that there was not a demonstrated correlation between the number of animals killed and the level of trade.

4. *Alisterus chloropterus* (Papuan king-parrot)

The observer from WCMC reported that, as a result of discussions with the Indonesian Management Authority, it now seemed that the trade statistics included some double-recording of shipments as a result of the way in which the trade had been reported in past years. This was confirmed by Mr Soehartono.

5. *Aratinga wagleri* (scarlet-fronted parakeet)

The Secretariat reported that it was currently trying to secure funds to carry out a study of the species in Peru. The Chairman suggested that action by the Committee would be unnecessary until a study was completed.

The observer from Chile said that his country had had many problems with illegal trade in birds from Peru and Bolivia. About 4,000 parrots in intercepted shipments were currently being held while attempts were made to determine the origin of the birds.

The meeting was adjourned.

Tenth Session: 14 September 1995: 09h00 - 12h30

8. Implementation of Resolution Conf. 8.9 (continued)

6. *Chalcopsitta duivenbodei* (brown lory)

7. *Charmosyna papou* (Papuan lorikeet)

The observer from WCMC reported that, although there had been a decline in the reported trade in specimens of these species from Indonesia and the recent levels of trade were unlikely to have been detrimental to their conservation, there was little information available on their populations.

Mr Soehartono said that both species were considered to be common and were not threatened by trade. It was noted that Indonesia had established an export quota of zero for both species. The Chairman observed that neither of these species appeared to warrant any action under Resolution Conf. 8.9.

8. *Loriculus pusillus* (yellow-throated hanging-parrot)

The observer from WCMC, noted that although earlier exports of this species had been numerous, the present export quota was zero and the main threat to the species was habitat clearance in Bali and Java.

9. *Poicephalus gularis* (red-fronted parrot)

The observer from WCMC reported that, although this species was widespread in many African countries, levels of reported trade from some countries were a cause of some concern. Reported levels of exports from Zaire and Côte d'Ivoire in the apparent absence of adequate protective legislation was a concern. Exports of specimens from Guinea were problematic as Guinea was apparently not a range State for this species. The Secretariat undertook to discuss this point with the Management Authority of Guinea.

10. *Psittacula alexandri* (red-breasted parakeet)

Although present levels of exports of specimens of this species were lower than those recorded in previous years, the effects of present exports of this species from Viet Nam and Myanmar were uncertain.

Mr Soehartono undertook to look into the fact that capture quotas had been established for this species from four provinces of Sumatra where it was not known to occur.

11. *Psittacula finschii* (grey-headed parakeet)

The observer from WCMC reported that, although present levels of reported exports of this species were not regarded as excessive, the majority of exports originated from Myanmar. The conservation status of the species in Myanmar and the scientific basis for allowing exports were not known.

12. *Geochelone sulcata* (spurred tortoise)

The observer from WCMC noted that, although populations of this species were widespread, available information suggested that they were sparsely distributed. There was insufficient information to assess the sustainability of recorded exports of this species.

The Chairman expressed concern that the Committee might formulate recommendations relating to species for which less than adequate information was available and suggested that further communications should take place with the Management Authorities of the principal exporting range States to ascertain whether or not present levels of exports represented a conservation problem.

The observer from the United States of America believed that there was evidence of increasing trade in this species and that there appeared to be problems with the implementation of Article IV of the Convention.

13. *Chamaeleo gracilis* (graceful chameleon)

The observer from WCMC reported that although this was a widespread species, increasing levels of trade might be having an adverse affect on some local populations in some countries.

The observer from the Netherlands provided a brief overview of the biology and ecology of the species.

The observer from the HSUS stated that she had evidence of substantial recent imports of live specimens into the United States and that this was cause for concern. The observer from the United States of America undertook to check the information.

The observer from the RSPCA noted that there was a need for more effective regulatory controls in light of increasing demand for live specimens of this species.

14. *Varanus indicus* (Pacific or mangrove monitor)

The observer from WCMC, introducing the discussion on this species, stated that the trade figures did not appear to indicate a threat to the species as a whole but that the live animal trade might have an adverse affect on some island races. The taxonomy of some island forms required clarification.

Dr Blanke stated that the taxonomy of this species had been revised and the results had been published recently. He suggested that these be referred to the Chairman of the CITES Nomenclature Committee for advice.

The observer from the HSUS reported that a large number of live specimens of this species had been imported into the United States of America from Indonesia in 1993.

It was noted that the United States of America, according to its import data had imported more specimens in 1992 and 1993 than Indonesia's export quota for those years. Mr Soehartono agreed to check on exports permitted and to report back to the Committee. He reported that the species was widespread in Irian Jaya and that present capture quotas established by Indonesia were considered sustainable.

15. Tridacnidae spp. (giant clams)

The observer from TRAFFIC International introduced the discussion on this group of species, noting the difficulties that resulted from differences in the reporting of trade statistics.

She reported that many populations of most species, particularly the larger species such as *Tridacna derasa* and *T. gigas*, had been severely depleted as a result of poorly regulated harvesting. Although there had been some development of commercial cultivation of tridacnid clams in some Pacific countries, the quantity of products derived from this source remained small and was unlikely to supply demand and hence to reduce the pressure on wild populations.

There was little evidence that exporting countries were making scientifically based non-detriment findings for specimens of clams harvested from the wild.

The observer from the Japan Wildlife Research Centre agreed to obtain information on whether it was possible to identify clam species from the meat.

16. *Strombus gigas* (queen conch)

The review suggested that past, and in some cases, current harvests of this economically important marine resource in the Caribbean region had resulted in some local populations becoming severely depleted. It was not possible to make a meaningful comparison of data on trade with data on wild populations because of the absence of field data on abundance and the lack of standardized reporting.

In the ensuing discussion, observers from several Parties in the Caribbean region spoke of the need for greater co-ordination between the CITES Management Authority and agencies responsible for management of marine resources (Bahamas, Panama and Venezuela).

The observer from the United States of America noted that the review had been beneficial in creating a greater awareness within the region of the problem and recommended that the Secretariat notify all Parties to be vigilant in ensuring that all imports are accompanied by appropriate CITES documents.

The Secretariat advised that it would be visiting several countries in the region in October 1995 and would be discussing the issue of trade in this species with the Management Authorities and would then be able to provide the Committee with more information.

The Secretariat also agreed to issue a Notification to the Parties to remind Management Authorities of the need to share information and co-ordinate activities with their counterparts responsible for fisheries, who often do not have responsibility for or experience of CITES matters.

13. Review of CITES-listed Animals used by the Pharmaceutical Industry

The observer from the Japan Wildlife Research Centre, Dr Ishii, the former Asian Representative on the Committee, as Chairman of the Working Group that was established at the 10th meeting of the Committee, introduced his report (Doc. AC12.12). He requested further direction from the Committee. He in particular raised the question of what type of study would be needed as a priority to meet the objectives of the Committee.

The Chairman drew attention to a number of relevant activities that had taken place in the previous year. HSUS had produced a publication that had been widely circulated. TRAFFIC East Asia had published a report on trade in bears.

The Chairman advised the meeting of an initiative by TRAFFIC East Asia in organizing a consultative seminar on Traditional Chinese Medicines with representatives of the Traditional Chinese Medicine community. The Chairman had received an invitation to attend the proposed seminar, which was scheduled to be held in Hong Kong in October 1995. Dr Ishii was requested to attend the seminar, representing the Chairman of the Animals Committee who was unable to attend in person because of other commitments.

The observer from HSUS felt that document Doc. AC12.12 was not a good summary. She had understood that the Working Group was supposed to pick one or two groups of species for further consideration and that it had agreed to consider bears and deer in the East Asian pharmaceutical trade. She stated that there was a lot of information available on bears and bear farming, including an HSUS document distributed at the ninth meeting of the Conference

of the Parties. She also suggested that the Working Group should focus on trade in specimens of Appendix-I species of bear.

The observer from TRAFFIC International agreed that groups of species had been selected by the Working Group. She added that a database established by TRAFFIC containing information on endangered species in the patented medicinal trade was available to the Parties.

The observer from the United States of America provided details of the public education programme, in her country, dealing with trade in products claiming to contain specimens from Appendix-I species, including rhinoceroses, tiger and bears. The United States of America was preparing materials in many languages, which would be available to the Parties.

The Chairman invited Dr Ishii to continue chairing the Working Group and suggested that the seminar in Hong Kong be used as an opportunity to collaborate with TRAFFIC East Asia in preparing a proposal for a study. It was recommended that the Working Group obtain copies of the documents that had been produced on this subject.

The Secretariat was asked to comment on whether it could take on projects involving species not listed in the CITES appendices. The Secretariat said that it could not take these on as there were too many projects already, and projects for species in Appendix I had first priority.

The observer from HSUS asked whether the Committee could discuss the problem of continued illegal trade in Appendix-I species of bear.

After some discussions, the Chairman agreed that this could be discussed under "Any other business" if time allowed.

14. Review of Appendix III - Implementation of Resolution Conf. 9.25

This item was included on the agenda at the request of the Secretariat, for consideration of information on progress since the ninth meeting of the Conference of Parties in implementing Resolution Conf. 9.25. Document Doc. AC12.13 contained a copy of a letter of 5 July 1995 from the Secretariat to the Management Authorities of those Parties with taxa included in Appendix III, drawing to their attention the request to review the status of species included in Appendix III, using the guidelines contained in Resolution Conf. 9.25. The Secretariat had sought advice from these Parties as to whether the review had been conducted or whether assistance of the Animals Committee was requested. Two Parties had responded, Canada and Mauritius. They did not wish to make any amendment to Appendix III for the time being.

20. Review of Trade in Armadillos (*Chaetophractus* spp.) - Trade in *Callopistes* spp. and *Phymaturus* spp.

The observer from Chile introduced document Doc. AC12.19. He also introduced document Doc. AC12.19.2, which contained a plan to include *Chaetophractus nationi* in Appendix II, and document Doc. AC12.19.3, which contained a detailed plan to include in Appendix II various species of Chilean reptiles (*Callopistes* spp. and *Phymaturus* spp.) that were subject to high levels of trade.

With respect to armadillos, the observer from Chile stated that the objective of his country was to reconsider the proposal that had been rejected at the ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties owing to insufficient information. He disagreed that there was insufficient information. He referred to Chile's action plan, its objectives and its domestic and international trade, and recognized that there was an international trade within South America.

The Chairman invited the observer from TRAFFIC International to present its analysis of trade in armadillos (Doc. AC12.19.1).

In the discussion that followed it was suggested that some trade might be taking place in specimens of armadillos to Asia. The Chairman asked the representatives of Asia to find out more about the trade in armadillo specimens to Asia.

The observer from Paraguay believed that the proposal under discussions was weak regarding both biological and trade data. She suggested to Chile to contact, when preparing the amendment proposal, the Management Authority of Bolivia as one of the main range States of this species and also one of the countries where handicrafts using armadillos was significant.

It was agreed that the observer from Chile would continue to communicate with the Chairman in developing further a case in support of listing *C. nationi* in Appendix II and should consult other countries in the region. The observer from the United States of America offered to provide information to Chile and to help in preparing a proposal.

With respect to the two genera of reptiles the observer from Chile presented information on the status of the species and on international trade. He noted that export from Chile was prohibited but there was a network of smugglers. When asked whether inclusion of the species in Appendix III would be considered, the observer from Chile said that this would be contemplated only after the tenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties, as the provisions relating to Appendix-III species were not believed to be enforced effectively. Ms Quero de Peña said it was unfortunate that the office of TRAFFIC South America had been closed as this would have been a good source of information.

The Chairman requested the Secretariat to notify the Parties about the prohibition on export from Chile. It was agreed that this subject would be discussed further at the next meeting of the Committee.

Reports of the *Ad hoc* Working Groups

As written summary records of the outcome of the discussions of each group were not available for circulation to participants, the Chairman requested each of the delegates who had been appointed to chair one of the three *ad hoc* working groups established to present orally the conclusions reached by each group. In view of the limited time available for the remainder of the meeting, it would not be possible to entertain extensive discussion of the issues dealt with by each group. The Chairman noted that all the major issues had been adequately discussed in the working groups and that all three items had been advanced in the working groups and provided useful direction for the Committee to make progress for consideration by the next meeting of the Committee.

The reports of the three working groups are annexed in the following order:

Annex 1 *Ad hoc* Working Group on Captive Breeding

Annex 2 *Ad hoc* Working Group on Transport of Live Animals

Annex 3 *Ad hoc* Working Group on Sharks

24. Provisional Dates and Venue for the 13th Working Meeting of the Animals Committee

In light of the scheduled timing of the next meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention and the requirement for submission of papers for that meeting, it was decided to convene the next meeting of the Committee during September-October 1996.

In response to remarks by the Chairman on some of the issues that will be dealt with by the next meeting of the Committee, the European Representative undertook to explore whether the Czech Republic might host the 13th meeting of the Animals Committee.

25. Closing Remarks

In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked all participants for their contributions to the meeting and to the discussions of issues that had been considered during the previous three days. Special thanks were extended to the interpreters, for ensuring that all participants were able to communicate more effectively with one another, and to those participants who had acted as rapporteurs. On behalf of all the participants in the meeting, the Chairman expressed his gratitude to the representative of Central and South America and the Caribbean Region and to the host Government for all they had done to ensure that the 12th meeting of the Animals Committee was successful.

The part of the meeting that was open to observers from non-governmental organizations was closed at 12h30.

Report of the Working Group on Captive Breeding

Treatment of captive-bred specimens

9. Review of Resolution Conf. 8.15 on Captive Breeding

9.1 The working group agreed with the thrust of document Doc. AC12.8.1 that this matter could be divided into three main components:

- Use of Article VII, paragraphs 4 and 5
- Definition of "bred in captivity" in Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Rev.)
- Process for registering commercial captive-breeding facilities under Resolution Conf. 8.15

These are in many ways, however, interdependent.

9.2 Implementation of Article VII, paragraphs 4 and 5

There was concern that although Article VII, paragraph 4, says that specimens of Appendix I species bred in captivity for commercial purposes shall be deemed to be specimens of species included in Appendix II, some Parties stated that they were permitting export of such specimens under Article III. This may be a function of the fact that "commercial purposes" in the context of Article VII, paragraph 4 is not defined in the resolutions of the Conference of the Parties.

It is not clear whether the provisions of Article VII, paragraph 5, obviate the need for an Article III import permit for specimens of species listed in Appendix I.

Prior to the next Animals Committee meeting, Tonny Soehartono (Indonesia) will, in co-operation with Canada, the United States, United Kingdom and the Secretariat, and taking into account comments made by working group members, prepare a draft definition of the term "commercial purposes" in the context of Article VII, paragraph 4.

9.3 Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Rev.)

It was recognized that this Resolution applied to Appendix I and Appendix II species and so striking the right balance was difficult. The diversification of captive-breeding techniques (island breeding, use of wild males of Asian elephant) coupled with ambiguous wording in paragraphs b, b i) and b ii) makes modification to this Resolution desirable.

Taking into account the diversity of views expressed by the members of the working group, the Chairman of the working group will prepare a modified version of Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Rev.) for discussion at the next Animals Committee meeting. The aim of the modification should be to achieve increased flexibility to allow for benign activities, whilst providing safeguards for species under threat.

9.4 Resolution Conf. 8.15

The interdependence of this issue with the application of Article VII, paragraphs 4 and 5, and Resolution Conf. 2.12 (Rev.) and the variety of views expressed, meant that there was no consensus on how to deal with Resolution Conf. 8.15. There was agreement that the Secretariat should be given greater flexibility when dealing with the registration of a second or subsequent operation for a particular species in a given State. It may be worth comparing Resolution Conf. 8.15 with Resolution Conf. 9.19 – the comparable resolution for artificially propagated plants – to see if any good ideas can be incorporated into the procedure for animals.

It was agreed that the marking of products from registered operations should be dealt with under the revision of Resolution Conf. 5.16, to be led by the Animals Committee representative for Africa.

Report of the Working Group on Transport of Live Animals

The following report presents the conclusions of the working group, all of which were agreed unanimously and are recommended for adoption by the Animals Committee.

The Objective

The working group set out to examine the means by which a general reduction in mortality during transport might be achieved, and then to identify a targeted process to benefit particular species, thereby implementing the recommendations of Resolution Conf. 9.23. It was agreed that, the better the general improvement, the fewer the specific measures would be required.

The Method - General

The working group noted that Resolution Conf. 9.23 and Secretariat Notification to the Parties No. 848 requested data collection by Parties in order to facilitate implementation of treaty requirements for the humane and healthy transport of live animals. The working group considered each of the stages in the transport process as follows, and made the following recommendations:

Pre-export

Parties should be collecting data on pre-export mortality. Not only is this an element to be considered for evaluation in trade studies under the significant-trade process, but also these data could be used, when appropriate, in management by quota systems and to prompt remedial action. In the implementation of export quotas, information on pre-export mortalities is considered by the working group as vital in making the required non-detriment findings and otherwise implementing Article IV.

Holding and Conditioning

Within seven days of shipment, all mammals, birds, reptiles and amphibians should be subjected to a veterinary examination.

Shipment

While transport conditions for many animals have improved, it is necessary to continually improve implementation of the treaty through application of the IATA Live Animals Regulations. The Conference of the Parties has recommended that the requirement to comply with these regulations be printed on all permits, and Parties should consider refusing consignments without such compliance. The Secretariat is asked to write to Parties to remind them of the need to adhere to these regulations. If there are any specific problems with IATA requirements, the working group would welcome information about them.

Where non-compliance by particular importers or exporters can be identified, advising that any unacceptable consignment in the future will be refused has been shown to produce improvements in shipping practices.

The working group considered factors that might influence mortality, such as consignment size, and concluded that the value of large consignments may, in and of itself, induce practices which aim to limit mortality, and that any necessity for additional action was best addressed as part of the species-by-species consideration referred to later. It was agreed to remind Parties that shipments should be transported by the "shortest and most expeditious route" and that the most expeditious route may be one which avoids airports where there are transit problem and avoids certain times of flight or types of aircraft.

The working group will continue to work with the IATA Live Animals Board to improve the Live Animals Regulations.

The Parties should be reminded that they are required to ensure compliance not only with the Container Notes in the IATA Regulations but with the all Regulations.

Finally, the importance of the documentation accompanying the consignment was stressed, and the transition to paperless electronic transmission should not prevent this from happening.

Managing Improvement

The management of the improvements suggested above requires the collection of data on levels of mortality at each stage, and training in live animal transport, as effected by the Secretariat. The working group believes that regional representatives on the Animals Committee could stimulate improvements by promoting the measures suggested to Parties in their regions and reporting back to the next Animals Committee meeting on the changes secured. The working group recommends that regional representatives in the Animals Committee be asked to prepare such reports.

The Significant Mortality Process

Having considered the means by which a general reduction in mortality might be achieved, the working group debated the recommendation in Resolution Conf. 9.23 for "appropriate measures" to be taken in cases of "significant high mortality", and recommends the following process.

The implementation of Article IV requirements for "preparation without injury, damage to health, and cruel treatment" should be incorporated into the highly successful Resolution Conf. 8.9 process, in the following way:

- 1) The working group will consider the 100 mammals, 100 birds, and 100 reptiles and amphibians traded live in the largest quantities, and select 10 species or genera of greatest concern in each class for detailed examination. For the bird species, the existing mortality data will be used to make the selection. Conservation status and other available information may also influence the selection.
- 2) Mortality data will be collected for the mammal and reptile/amphibian species. Although information is already available for the bird species, additional information will be sought.
- 3) The causes of mortality will also be assessed for each species or shipment when possible. Parties will be asked to inspect every consignment for export and import, of the species selected for study, with veterinary examination where appropriate.
- 4) Remedial action will be recommended, which may be specific to a taxon or to a country of export or import, and could involve a range of handling and management issues.
- 5) In accordance with Resolution Conf. 9.23, in cases where mortality is high, and where no remedial action is identifiable, or where remedies identified are not implemented or effective, the Secretariat may recommend temporary suspension of trade in the species concerned.
- 6) Having completed the first cycle of the process, the working group will consider whether there are any general recommendations relating to transportation that it needs to make in the light of its studies, and will select the next group of species to be studied.

CITES Guidelines for Transport

The working group considered the long-standing commitment referred to in Resolution Conf. 9.23 to revise the CITES guidelines for transport (other than air) and agreed on the following process:

- 1) Within the next 45 days the Chairman asks to receive from the participants at the meeting of the Animals Committee suggestions of specialist, trade, and interest groups competent to comment on the suitability of the IATA guidelines for modes of transport other than air, with an indication of the relevant container notes.
- 2) The Chairman will send a letter to all suggested specialist and interest groups with a copy of the relevant IATA notes inviting comments within sixty days of receipt.
- 3) The working group will review all new data and write new guidance for the cases identified where an alternative to the IATA regulation is needed for other modes of transport.

Review of Juridical Aspects

In the absence of information about the Secretariat project, the working group was unable to consider this subject.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Animals Committee approve the foregoing proposals and that the working group on transport of live animals continue as a working group of the Animals Committee to progress the proposals as agreed by the Animals Committee.

Report of the Working Group on Sharks

Recommendations of the Shark Working Group to the Animals Committee

1. Parties should submit to the CITES Secretariat all available information on sharks. A letter with this request should be issued by the CITES Secretariat. Data received by the CITES Secretariat should be sent to the United States of America and Panama for analysis and for production of a report.
2. An Expert Consultation should be convened at which FAO and other international organizations should be invited to participate.
3. Both the above (points 1 and 2) should be carried out simultaneously.
4. Panama has offered to host the Expert Consultation, and this offer should be accepted.
5. Panama should continue to take an active role in implementing Resolution Conf. 9.17.

Twelfth Meeting of the CITES Animals Committee
Antigua, Guatemala, 11 to 14 September 1995

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Members of the Committee

Dr Rainer BLANKE
Bundesamt für Naturschutz
Gruppe 1.2
Scientific Authority to CITES
Konstantinstrasse 110
D-53179 Bonn
GERMANY
Tel.: (49) 228-954 3440
Fax: (49) 228-954 3470

Dr Charles DAUPHINE
Canadian Wildlife Service
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Place Vincent Massey
Hull, Québec
K1A 0H3
CANADA
Tel.: 1) 819-953 1429
Fax: 1) 819-953 6283

Dr Choo-Hoo GIAM
c/o Primary Production Department
Ministry of National Development
5 Maxwell Road
SINGAPORE 0106
Tel.: (65) 325 7640
Fax: (65) 220 6068

Dr Jonathan HUTTON
African Resources Trust
P.O. Box HG 690
Highlands
Harare
ZIMBABWE
Tel.: (2634) 731 719/732 254/732 625
Fax: (2634) 795 150

Mr Robert JENKINS
Chairman of CITES Animals Committee
Australian Nature Conservation Agency
(ANCA)
P.O. Box 636
Canberra, ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Tel.: (6162) 500 392
Fax: (6162) 500 243

Mr Oscar LARA

Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas
(CONAP)
8a. avenida 3-72, Zona 1
001001 Ciudad de Guatemala
GUATEMALA
Tel.: (502 2) 253 7061 (a.m.);
Fax: (502 2) 230 0594

Mr Oscar LARA (*As from 01.01.96*)
Escuela de Biología
Universidad de San Carlos de
Guatemala
Edificio T-10
Ciudad Universitaria, Zona 12
Tel.: (502 2) 276 9856 (p.m.)
Fax: (502 2) 769 808

Dr Jean NGOG NJE
Directeur
Ecole de Faune
B.P. 271
Garoua
CAMEROON
Tel.: (237) 273 135/1125
Fax.: (237) 271 800/3135

Licda. Mirna QUERO DE PEÑA
PROFAUNA MARNR
Dirección de Manejo de Especies
Comerciales
Centro Simón Bolívar
Edificio Camejo Norte
(frente al Pasaje Zingg)
Entrada Oeste; Nivel Mezzanina
Caracas 1010
VENEZUELA
Tel.: (582) 545 1257; 408 1514
Fax: (582) 545 3912

Alternate Members of the Committee

Mr Jan KUCERA
Ministry of the Environment
Vrsovicá 65
10010 Praha 10
CZECH REPUBLIC
Tel.: (422) 6731 0309 / 6712 1111
Fax: (422) 6731 0308 / 6731 1388

Mr Emmanuel L.M. SEVERRE
Ministry of Tourism Natural
Resources and Environment
Wildlife Division
P.O. Box 1994
Dar Es Salaam
UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
Tel.: (255) 51-23 230; 21 241-9
Fax: (255) 51-23 230

Mr Tonny SOEHARTONO
Ministry of Forestry, Indonesia
D.G. of Forest Protection and Nature
Conservation
Dep. Kehutanan Lt. 8
Jalan Gatot Subroto
Jakarta 10270
INDONESIA
Tel./Fax: (6221) 572 0227;
(621) 573 4818

CITES Secretariat

Mr Jonathan BARZDO
Management Authorities Coordinator

Dr Obdulio MENGHI
Scientific Coordinator

Mrs Maritza de Campos

CITES Secretariat
Case postale 456
1219 CHATELAINE/Geneva
SWITZERLAND
Tel.: (41) 22-979 91 39
Fax: (41) 22-797 34 17

Observers (CITES Parties)

Ms Aída Luz AQUINO
Oficina CITES - PY
Ministerio de Agricultura y
Ganadería
República Argentina 1599
Asuncion
PARAGUAY
Tel./Fax: (59521) 660 563
Fax: (59521) 443 444

Prof. Emilio BALLETO
Dipartimento di Biologia Animale
Via Accademia Albertina 17
I-10123 Torino
ITALY
Tel.: (39 11) 812 2374
Fax: (39 11) 812 4561

Prof. Dimas M. BOTELLO L.
Instituto Nacional de Recursos
Naturales Renovables (INRENARE)
Apartado 2016 - Paraíso
Corregimiento de Ancón
PANAMA 5
Tel.: (507) 232 4083; 232 4518;
232 4870; 232 4325
Fax: (507) 232 4975; 232 4083

Sra. Karla CANTARERO
Departamento de Areas Protegidas
y Vida Silvestre
AFE\COHDEFOR
Apartado Postal 1378
Tegucigalpa, M.D.C.
HONDURAS
Fax: (504) 224 346; 222 653; 223 348

Dr José CASTRO
Senior Research Scientist
Southeast Fisheries Science Centre
75 Virginia Beach Drive
Miami, FL 33149
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 305-361 4494

Fax: (1) 305-361 4515

Mr Gustavo CHIARAMONTE
Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales
c/o Ms Victoria Lichtschein
Dirección de Fauna y Flora Silvestre
Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y
Ambiente Humano
San Martín 459 - 3° piso
1004 Buenos Aires / ARGENTINA
Tel.: (541) 394 5161; 394 5111
Fax: (541) 394 6155; 334 8152

Mr Luis COLOM GUARCH
C/-Modolell, 64
08021 Barcelona
SPAIN
Tel.: (34 3) 701 5959
Fax: (34 3) 212 7579

Mr Juan Carlos CUCHACOVICH R.
Ingeniero Civil
Jefe de Departamento de Protección de
Recursos Naturales Renovables
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
Av. Bulnes 140
Santiago
CHILE
Tel.: (562) 672 1394
Fax: (562) 699 2778
Ms Nancy DAVES
CITES Coordinator
Office of Protected Resources
National Marine Fisheries Service
1315 East-West Hwy
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 301-713 2319
Fax: (1) 301-713 0376
Email: Nancy_Daves@ssp.nmfs.gov

Sra. Emma DIAZ DE GORDILLO
Consejo Nacional de Areas Protegidas
CONAP
8a. Avda 3-72, Zona 1
001001 Ciudad de Guatemala
GUATEMALA
Tel.: (5022) 537 061
Fax: (5022) 537 612

Ms Sheila EINSWEILER
Wildlife Inspection Coordinator
Division of Law Enforcement
US Fish and Wildlife Service
4401 N. Fairfax Dr., Room 500
Arlington, VA 22203
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1 703) 358 2271
Email: Sheila_Einsweiler@mail.fws.gov

Lic. Carlos Roberto HASBUN
Comisión Nacional CITES
Apdo Postal 115-A
Antiguo Cuscatlán
EL SALVADOR
Tel.: (503) 273 4334

Dr Marinus S. HOOGMOED
CITES-Committee of the Council for
Nature Management
Nationaal Natuurhistorisch Museum
P. O. Box 9517,
2300RA Leiden
NETHERLANDS
Tel.: (31 71) 162 618; 143 844
Fax: (31 71) 133 344

Mr Marshall HOWE
Office of Scientific Authority
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Washington, DC 20240
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: 1) 703-358 1708
Fax: 1) 703-358 2276
Email: Marshall_Howe@mail.fws.gov

Mr Agustín IRIARTE WALTON
Departamento de Protección
de Recursos Naturales Renovables
Servicio Agrícola y Ganadero
Av. Bulnes 140
Santiago
CHILE
Tel.: (562) 672 1394
Fax: (562) 699 2778

Dr Maurice C.L. ISAACS
Veterinary Officer
Department of Agriculture
P.O. Box N3028
Nassau
BAHAMAS
Tel.: 1-809-325 7413
Fax: 1-809-325 3960

Mr Mean Jhong KIM
Deputy Director General for
Deep-sea Fisheries Production
Division
National Fisheries Administration
Daewoo Centre Bldg
541 5-Ga Namdaemoon-Ro
Jung-Gu Seoul, KOREA
Tel.: (82) 2-753 8331
Fax: (82) 2-752 5738

Ms Victoria LICHTSCHEIN
Dirección de Fauna y Flora Silvestre

Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y
Ambiente Humano
San Martín 459 - 3° piso
1004 Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA
Tel.: (54 1) 348 8551/54
Fax: (54 1) 348 8554/8601

Dr Susan LIEBERMAN, Chief
Branch of Operations
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Office of Management Authority
4401 N. Fairfax Dr., Room 420
Arlington VA 22203
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: 1) 703-358 2095
Fax: 1) 703-358 2280; 358 2281
Email: Susan_Lieberman@mail.fws.gov

Lic. José V. MORALES MOLINA
Secretaría Nacional CITES-NI
Ministerio del Ambiente y Recursos
Naturales (MARENA)
Kilómetro 12 1/2 Carretera Norte
Apartado No. 5123
Managua - NICARAGUA
Tel.: (5052) 31111; 31112; 31595;
31952
Fax: (5052) 632 595

Mr David H.W. MORGAN
UK CITES Scientific Authority for
Animals
Joint Nature Conservation Committee
Monkstone House, City Road
Peterborough, PE1 1JY
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: 44) 1733 62626
Fax: 44) 1733-555 948

Dr Hideki NAKANO
National Research Institute of Far
Seas Fisheries
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and
Fisheries
5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu 424
JAPAN
Tel.: (81) 543 34 0715
Fax: (81) 543 35 9642

Mr Andres NOVARO
Dirección de Fauna y Flora
Silvestre
San Martín 459 - 3° piso
Oficina 310
1004 Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA
Tel.: (541) 394 5161; 394 5111

Fax: (541) 334 8152

Mr Francisco J. PALACIO, Ph. D.
Asesor Científico, Autoridad
Administrativa CITES-Panamá
8730 S.W. 51 Street
Miami, Fla. 33165
USA
Tel.: (305) 598 7494
Fax: (305) 598 7496

Ms Maria Luisa REYNA DE AGUILAR
Comisión Nacional CITES
Apdo Postal 115-A
Antiguo Cuscatlán
EL SALVADOR
Tel.: (503) 273 4334

Ms Zulma RICORD DE MENDOZA
Comisión Nacional CITES
Apdo Postal 115-A
Antiguo Cuscatlán
EL SALVADOR
Tel.: (503) 273 4334

Dr Jacques RIGOLET
Parc zoologique de Paris
Museum national d'histoire naturele
53, Avenue de St. Maurice
75012 Paris, FRANCE
Tel.: (33) 1-44 75 20 00
Fax: (33) 1-43 43 54 73

Ms Maria Elena SANCHEZ
Procuraduría Federal de Protección
al Medio Ambiente (PROFEPA)
Subprocuraduría de Recursos Naturales
Dirección General de Inspección y
Vigilancia Forestal y de Flora y
Fauna Silvestre
Avenida Progreso No. 5, Col Coyoacán
México, D. F., MEXICO
Tel.: (525) 554 9065
Fax: (525) 251 6096

Mr Hideki TSUBATA
Deputy Director
Office of Ecosystem Conservation
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and
Fisheries
2-1-1 Kasumigaseki
Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100
JAPAN
Tel.: (81) 3-3502 0736
Fax: (81) 3-5395 1426

Mr Yuji UOZUMI
National Research Institute of
Far Seas Fisheries
Fisheries Agency of Japan
Ministry of Agriculture Forestry and
Fisheries
5-7-1 Orido, Shimizu 424
JAPAN
Tel.: (81) 543 34 0715
Fax: (81) 543 35 9642

Mr Jan VAN SPAANDONK
CITES-bureau
Directie Natuurbeheer
Bezuidenhoutseweg 73
Postbus 20401
2500 EK Den Haag
NETHERLANDS
Tel.: (3170) 379 3911 (Ministry);
(3170) 379 2914 (direct)
Fax: (3170) 383 0716

Observers (Non-Governmental Organizations)

Mr J. Don ASHLEY
ASHLEY ASSOCIATES, INC.
INTERNATIONAL ALLIGATOR/CROCODILE
TRADE STUDY
P.O. Box 13679
Tallahassee, Florida 32317
USA
Tel.: (1) 904-893 6869
Fax: (1) 904-893 9376

Deputy Co-Chair,
IUCN Shark Specialist Group
Scully Science Centre
550 South Bay Ave.
Islip, NY 11751
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 516-581 2927
Fax: (1) 516-581 5268

Mr David BOWLES
ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION
AGENCY (EIA)
1611 Connecticut Avenue
N.W., Suite 3B
Washington, DC 20009
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 202-483 6621
Fax: (1) 202-483 6625
Dr Merry CAMHI
Staff Scientist
NATIONAL AUDUBON SOCIETY

Mr Stuart CHAPMAN
Conservation Officer
WWF UK Panda House
Weyside Park
Cattesnall Lane
Godalming, Surrey GU7 1XR
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1483-426 444
Fax: (44) 1483-426 409

Mr Dave CURREY
ENVIRONMENTAL INVESTIGATION
AGENCY (EIA)
15 Bowling Green Lane
London EC1R 0BD
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 171-490 7040
Fax: (44) 171-490 0436

Ms Birga DEXEL
THE DAVID SHEPHERD CONSERVATION
FOUNDATION
P.O. Box 123
Godalming, Surrey GU 8 418
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1483-208 576
Fax: (44) 1483-208 253

Mr Pedro DOMINGUEZ
Asociación Natura
Malabia 2334, 5° Piso 17
1425 Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA

Ms Marta ELISETCH
FACYF
(Federación Argentina para la
Comercialización e Industrialización
de la Fauna)
San José 334, 7mo. Piso
Buenos Aires
ARGENTINA
Tel.: (54 1) 814 3047
Fax: (54 1) 814 3047/51

Ms Sonja V. FORDHAM
Fisheries Project Manager
CENTER FOR MARINE CONSERVATION/
SEC./TREAS.IUCN SHARK SPECIALIST
GROUP
1725 DeSales Street
NW, Ste. 500
Washington D.C. 20036
USA
Tel.: 1-202-429 5609
Fax: 1-202-872 0619
Ms Andrea GASKI
Director of Research
TRAFFIC USA
1250 Twenty-Fourth St., NW
Washington DC 20037
USA
Tel.: (1) 202-293 4800
Fax: (1) 202-775 8287

Mr Jay K. GRUNER
Executive Director
THE BIODIVERSITY FORUM
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Suite 1350
Vienna, VA 22182
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 703-847 3686
Fax: (1) 703-760 7899

Mr Paul HANNON
International Officer
ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE PROTECTION
OF BIRDS
The Lodge, Sandy
Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1767-680 551
Fax: (44) 1767-683 211

Mr Tim INSKIPP
WORLD CONSERVATION MONITORING
CENTRE
219 Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1223-277 314
Fax: (44) 1223-277 136
Email: Tim.Inskipp@wcmc.org.uk

Dr Nobuo ISHII
JAPAN WILDLIFE RESEARCH CENTRE
2-29-3 Yushima Bunkyo-Ku
Tokyo, 113
JAPAN
Tel.: (81) 3-3813 8897
Fax: (81) 3-3813 8898

Dr Bidda JONES
Member, Captive Care and
Breeding Committee
INTERNATIONAL PRIMATOLOGICAL
SOCIETY
Research Animals Department
RSPCA, Causeway
Horsham RH12 1HG
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1403-223 231
Fax: (44) 1403-241 048

Mr Yoshio KANEKO
GLOBAL GUARDIAN TRUST
Toranomom 3-7-5
Minato-ku
Tokyo 105
JAPAN
Tel.: (81) 3-3459 5447
Fax: (81) 3-3459 5449

Mr San Wei LEE
Vice Chairman
SWAN International
37 Nanhai Road
Taipei
TAIWAN, R.O.C.
Tel.: (886) 2-312 4045
Fax: (886) 2-312 5857

Dr Arthur LINDLEY
Head of Wildlife Department
Wildlife Department
RSPCA Headquarters
Causeway, Horsham
West Sussex RH12 1HG
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1403-264 181
Fax: (44) 1403-241 048

Mr A.B. MCNABNEY
Chair
AFA-CITES Committee
1161 Leisure Lane No. 7
Walnut Creek, CA 94595
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel./Fax: 1) 501-945 1785

Mr Marshall MEYERS
PET INDUSTRY JOINT ADVISORY COUNCIL
1220 19th Street NW
Suite 400
Washington DC 20036
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 202-452 1525
Fax: (1) 202-293 4377
Dr Bill MORRILL
Director of Conservation
SAFARI CLUB INTERNATIONAL
455-B Carlisle Drive
Herndon, VA 22070
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 703-709 2293
Fax: (1) 703-709 2296

Ms Teresa MULLIKEN
Programme Officer
TRAFFIC INTERNATIONAL
219c Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1223-277 427
Fax: (44) 1223-277 237
Email: Teresa.mulliken@wcmc.org.uk

Dr Mike PIENOWSKI
Head
International Legislation and
Funding Department

The ROYAL SOCIETY FOR THE
PROTECTION OF BIRDS/BIRDLIFE
INTERNATIONAL
The Lodge, Sandy
Bedfordshire SG19 2DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1767-680 551
Fax: (44) 1767-683 211

Ms Laura REIFSCHNEIDER
AKIN, GUMP, STRAUSS, HAUER &
FELD, L.L.P.
Attorneys at Law
1333 New Hampshire Avenue N.W.,
Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 202-887 4127
Fax: (1) 202-887 4288

Dr Debra ROSE
TRAFFIC USA
1250 Twenty-Fourth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 202-293 4800
Fax: (1) 202-775 8287

Dr James Perran ROSS
Executive Officer
Crocodile Specialist Group
IUCN/SSC
Florida Museum of Natural History
Gainesville, FL 32611-7800
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: 1) 904-392 1721
Fax: 1) 904-392 9367

Dr Alison ROSSER
Wildlife Trade Programme Officer
IUCN/SSC
219c Huntingdon Road
Cambridge CB3 0DL
UNITED KINGDOM
Tel.: (44) 1223 277 966
Fax: (44) 1223 277 845

Drs Kees SCHOUTEN
SCHOUTEN NATURE CONSULTANCY
Ridderspoorweg 278
NL-2565 At The Hague
THE NETHERLANDS
Tel./Fax: (31) 70-323 5233

Dr Teresa M. TELECKY
Director
Wildlife Trade Program
THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED
STATES
2100 L Street, NW
Washington, DC 20037
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
Tel.: (1) 301-258 3142
Fax: (1) 301-258 3080

Dr Ying WANG
SWAN International
37 Nanhai Road
Taipei
TAIWAN, R.O.C.
Tel.: (886) 2-312 4045
Fax: (886) 2-312 5857

Mr Grahame WEBB
WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INTERNATIONAL
PTY LTD.
P.O. Box 530
Karama NT 0812
AUSTRALIA
Tel.: (61) 89-992 355
Fax: (61) 89-470 678